FROM THE LONDON TIMES, MARCH 23.

AMERICAN TRADE.

Copy of a letter addressed to a member of Parliament.

I beg to call your attention to the very important and interesting discussions, which have recently taken place, respecting the commercial intercourse to be permitted betwixt this country and the U. States of America, during the war.

It is very generally admitted, that a commerce with an enemy is as impolitic as illegal: and that if any be licensed or allowed, it ought to be strictly limited to articles of first necessity which cannot be procured elsewhere.

When the board of trade lately came to the positive determination, to license no further commercial intercourse with the United States, not even in articles of provisions, and consequently refused the solicitations of the merchants for licenses to import from thence into Great Britain the produce of the United States even under the condition of an equivalent previous export of British manufactures, the conduct of government was generally applauded.

This vigorous policy encouraged the expectation of a permanent adherence to the grand principle, of distressing the enemy by every possible commercial privation, which our extended trade allowed us to accept, and which our naval superiority enabled us to enforce.

It will not be denied, that one of the most solid sources of riches to any country, consists in the superabundant productions of its soil and industry—nor that the United States have realized annually many millions sterling from the tobacco, corn, rice and cotton, exported to Europe, and chiefly to Great Britain——and unless the present war cause a stop to the export of these articles, the southern provinces, where they were entirely produced, will never feel the pressure of a state of warfare: and the inhabitants thereof will continue as heretofore the strenuous supporters of the French or war party in America, who have, for many years past, and who still govern that country.

The article of cotton was imported from the East Indies from the West Indies, from South America, & from the Mediterranean shores; and as it was a fact well ascertained that these countries are capable of yielding annually, for our use, more cotton than our trade and manufactures can require or consume, no alarm was created by this understood prohibition to the import of cotton from the U. States; nor did any material rise take place in the prices of the stock on hand, the same being declared more than sufficient in quantity and assortment, without further supply, for about fifteen months consumption. It appears that the government, the merchants, the spinners and the manufacturers, continued for a short time under these agreeable and satisfactory delusions, when after all arrangements were made for this new state of affairs, advices were received from the United States, that in the unblockaked parts of that country, neutral ships are loading cottons and other produce for the British ports, when they could claim legal admission to entry under the old act of Parliament, which never was enacted to legalize any such trade, but which from a dubiosity of terms had been availed of in a few instances, by the custom house departments, to admit cotton wool in neutral ships, from enemy's ports.——This occurrence naturally created a very great degree of anxiety. The merchants remonstrated loudly against the policy of receiving from an enemy, in neutral ships or in any shape, an article which could be procured in our own colonies, and from friendly countries.—The shipping interest, with equal justice, declaimed against neutral navigation in a trade which British ships might carry on from other quarters; and the financial gentlemen remind the minister, that cotton from the U. States could only be paid for with gold and silver, while cottons from all other quarters of the globe would be paid for by return of British produce, industry and manufactures. These remonstrances called forth the jealousy of the American party in this country, and likewise of some of the great spinners of cotton, who seem to unite in their endeavors to sound an alarm, that without the continued supply of cotton from the United States, our manufactures would be stopped, and the weaver thrown out of employ.

The lords of trade appear to have given a very patient hearing to all the parties, who tho't proper to state their opinions and wishes to the board; and as a result of these conferences, it was rumoured, that government was inclined to steer a middle course, with a view of pleasing all parties, which however, had a very contrary effect.

It was confidently stated that ministers intended to sanction the admission of cotton direct from the U. States, in neutral ships during the war, under a small additional duty; and to admit them circuitously, at a lower duty, in British ships.

This supposed bonus, or protection, to the shipping interest, was rejected as entirely futile.

The East India, West India and Brazil merchants offer to prove that adequate supplies of cotton of every description can be procured to take the place of the cottons of the U. States; and if, necessary, to supplant the use thereof in all our manufactures. The manufacturers and general merchants, also assert their opinions on this important point.—The former declared, that the cottons grown in the U. States can be dispensed with, and both unite in praying the government to prohibit the import of the same, until the United States are open to receive the products and manufactures of Great Britain, on equal terms with those countries which it is now proposed to take any supplies of that article.

It appears to me very singular, why there should be any hesitation on the part of the government on this question.

I conceive that the manufacturers and merchants will be able, satisfactorily, to prove what they have advanced, and I do not see what the spinners can bring forward to oppose them. I shall be happy, if required, to give you my opinion either of the policy of the measure, as a political one, or as affecting the present and future manufacturing interest of Great Britain and America, as well as Europe and Asia.

FROM THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

ALLEGIANCE.

The principle of "implied allegiance" adopted by the British government, must appear preposterous to every man of liberal reflection and unprejudiced mind. Government was originally established for the protection the safety, and the welfare of man—and men, being in their nature gregarious, gradually formed themselves into a society, and voluntarily entered into a social compact by which that society should be bound.—Endowed by nature with a capability of thought and action, they perceived that a promiscuous and unrestrained association would be replete with destruction, & therefore established laws for their better regulation and security. Hence originated government, which is defined by the Baron Montesquieu to be "a society directed by law." By this social compact, it was never understood that the contractors had power unalterably to bind their posterity; because they knew it would be not only absurd, but impracticable to attempt to bind men by their acts who should possess the same natural rights, privileges and powers of action as themselves. To them, therefore, they left the liberty (of which by the way they could not deprive them) of assenting or dissenting to the compact they had formed.—No man will I presume be so irrational as to say, that a father has a natural power to form such a compact as will not only subject him to punishment for a crime he may commit, but also to extend that punishment to his infant son To be more particular, a father cannot, by his own act, subject his son to the punishment of death for a murder which he himself has committed; because, by nature he is a distinct individual unconnected with his parents, and responsible for his own acts "Father and son," says Hue'us, Bishops of Auvranches, "are relative ideas, and the relation is at an end by the death of either" The acts therefore, of the one can have no controul over the acts of the other. By extending this reasoning a little farther the absurdity will appear more evident A man, upon the same principle, has he power of binding his descendants down to the fiftieth generation, and indeed *ad infinitum* when every possible relation must necessarily be at an end, if he should enter into a compact of a most despotic and arbitrary nature, that compact would be binding upon them though no relation existed and though they expressed their fixed dissent Surely nothing can be more absurd than this! Yet such is the right assumed by the British government "Natural or implied allegiance," says Judge Blackstone, "is such as is due from all men born within the king's dominions immediately upon their birth; for immediately upon their birth they are under the king's protection, at a time too when they are incapable of protecting themselves Natural allegiance is therefore a debt of gratitude, which cannot be *forfeited, cancelled* or *altered* by any change of time, place or circumstance. An Englishman who removes to France, or to China, owes the same allegiance to the king of England there as at home, and 20 years hence as well as now." Hence it will appear that the circumstance of having been born within the king's dominions creates *a debt of gratitude* which nothing can cancel or destroy, and though possessing the same equality of right and the same liberty of action, it is not possible to get rid of this curse which the ancestors of the individual has entailed upon him and his posterity for ever. But why is this a debt of gratitude? Because he is under the protection of the king. And what is the nature of this protection? It is impossible to tell. The parent is always the protector of his offspring from the impulse of nature. To the king they owe nothing for life or support, or safety; and if the parent neglects them, the protection of the king is a mere farce.—If the father should abandon his offspring in the forests of Bohemia, and leave them to the mercy of the prowling animals of the wilderness, by which they are nurtured to maturity, I ask if it would not be the very essence of folly to say, these men, though out of the country, owed an allegiance to the Prince of that territory which they could not cancel, and which would bind them in the remotest regions of the globe. I have before observed, that posterity is not bound by the acts of its progenitors, and that it has as great a right to enter into a distinct and essentially different compact as they had to form one, being by nature endowed with the same powers, the same privileges, and the same rights. If then the regulation or government of the society to which I belong is displeasing to me, from its disposition or oppression—when I arrive at an age capable of action and reflection I ask what human association has the *natural* right to prevent me from that society to join any other that may be more conducive to my property and happiness.—But by this principle I am not only bound by a contract, to which I have never, either expressly or impliedly, given my assent—but this political obligation extends even to my sons and grandsons, though born in a different country and under a different government Philosophers assert, and the assertion is undeniable, "that all men are born equal and owe allegiance to no prince or government *unless bound by the obligation and sanction of a promise.*" If then this promise is never given——the compact, like all others, both civil and political, is necessarily at an end when the individual expresses his dissent and removes from the jurisdiction of that prince or government to which he belonged. But according to the laws of Great Britain, this allegiance is due from the birth of the subject, whether he has or has not given the sanction of a promise, and not only due from him but from his children and grandchildren, whether born amid the trembling natives of the frigid zone—or the wandering inhabitants of the sandy desert. Can any thing be more inconsistent with the equal and natural rights of man than this? Can any thing be more absurd than the adoption of such a principle? If this doctrine were correct, not one of a thousand of those who were born in the United States can be called Americans because not one in a thousand but is the descendant of a native of some other country. Let us suppose, for a moment, that all nations now existing had adopted the same principle, (and if one has a right the whole have) a Frenchman born in England, and an Englishman born in France, must owe allegiance to both; which would be perfectly absurd. In all civil contracts there must be parties, and none are parties but those who have expressly given their consent, which alone can constitute the validity of a contract. Yet in this, the most important of all, a compact between the prince, or government, and the subject, no consent is required, and be you born where you may, if your father or grandfather has been so unfortunate as to receive his breath in Great Britain, you cannot rid yourself of this curse which pursues you to the end of life, and which, like Cain's, marks you out as a victim, whatever you may do, or wherever you may go. Like the worst of all slaves, I have not the power of swearing allegiance to the prince or government of the country of my own choice, or in which I was born—because there is another antecedent and indefinable tie which binds me with a chain of adamant, forged by my ancestors, to a prince I have never seen and with whom I wish to have no connection. Such is the absurdity and tyranny of the principle of the British allegiance—a principle that must be despised by every lover of the equal rights of mankind and hooted at by every advocate of civil liberty.

ZOROASTER.

CONGRESS.

IN SENATE—*Monday, May 31.*

Two petitions of a private nature were presented and referred.

Mr. Smith of Md. gave notice that on to-morrow he should ask for leave to bring in a bill to amend the militia laws of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Several petitions of a private nature were presented and referred.

STENOGRAPHERS.

Mr. Grosvenor presented the petition of George Richards, stating, that he had during the last session reported the proceedings of the House for the Federal Republican newspaper; and that on application at the present session for the like privilege, he had been excluded by the decision of the Hon Speaker; and praying to be admitted as heretofore for the purpose of reporting debates.

Mr. Grosvenor moved to refer the petition to a select committee.

Mr. Grundy remarked, that this was one of those questions which there was no occasion to refer to a committee, as the House was as well qualified to decide on it as any committee could be.

Mr. Grosvenor urged the reference of his memorial to a committee, as the best mode of ascertaining whether other stenographers could be admitted on the floor consistently with the convenience of the House, and a course which would be, perhaps, more decorous to the chair than any other.

Mr. Troup suggested the propriety of referring the memorial to a committee of the whole. He said the paper and the mode of its introduction into the House were calculated directly or indirectly to convey to the House and to the public an intimation that the Speaker had acted with injustice in relation to the individual petitioning. It seemed proper, therefore, that the Speaker should have an opportunity of explaining the grounds on which he had acted.

Mr. Wright was indisposed to refer the petition to any committee, for reasons which he stated.

A very desultory debate ensued, which occupied, with little intermission, the remainder of the day's sitting; of which we can, for the present at least, give little more than the names of the speakers and the general course of proceeding.

Mr. Grosvener replied to Mr. Wright's objections to the character of the Federal Republican, which, he conceived, had no bearing on the abstract question of the admission of another stenographer.

Mr. Hanson spoke at some length, with much warmth and no little eloquence, in reprobation of the opposition set up to the admission of Mr. Richards, which he viewed as an attempt to abridge the liberty of the press.

Mr. Wright replied with equal warmth to some remarks made by Mr. H. in allusion to him; and

Mr. Hanson rejoined.

The question was then taken on referring the petition to a committee of the whole House, and carried by a considerable majority.

It was made the order for to-day in preference to to-morrow, the day proposed by Mr. Grosvenor, having been negatived, 90 to 74.

Several other petitions from individuals were then presented and referred, among which were several petitions from the district of Columbia presented at the last session of congress, but not finally acted on.

Mr. Grundy presented the petition of William Kelly, contesting the legality of the election of Thomas K. Harris, now a sitting member from the state of Tennessee. Referred to the committee of elections.

The Speaker laid before the House a letter from the Commissioners of Public Lands, transmitting the report of the Commissioners appointed for the revision of claims to lands in the district of Kaskaskia.

On motion of Mr. Eppes, leave was given to the Committee of Ways and Means to sit during the sittings of the House.

On motion of Mr. Robertson,

Resolved, That the Committee of Commerce and Manufactures be instructed to enquire into the propriety of establishing a port of entry in the town of Mobile.

The House then resumed the question respecting stenographers—and

On motion of Mr. Grundy, resolved itself into a committee of the whole, Mr. Nelson in the chair, on the petition of George Richards this day presented and referred.

The petition having been again read, Mr. Grosvenor moved the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That George Richards be admitted on the floor of this House as a stenographer, and that the Speaker be requested to assign him a place thereon."

Mr. Clay (Speaker) after observing that, in his opinion, an importance had been given to this petition which did not well comport with the dignity of the House, and stated the ground on which the decision had been made by him of which the petitioner complained; which was simply this: that in consequence of the recent alterations in the House, seats had been arranged for but four stenographers—and to those places he had assigned the applicants according to seniority; and all of whom having been of longer standing than Mr. R. he had by this arrangement been excluded. If the House should deem it proper to admit others than those now on the floor, he hoped they would designate the stations they should occupy, &c.

As much debate now took place of a nature uninteresting to the public, and principally regarding the former practice and actual import of the present rule of the House, as would fill a newspaper; in which Messrs. Grosvenor, Calhoun, Gaston, Gholson, Roberts, Eppes, Seybert, Macon, Pitkin, Ingersoll, Bibb, Stockton and others bore a part.

On the suggestion of Mr. Eppes, Mr. Grosvenor so modified his resolution as to read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That provision ought to be made for the accommodation of additional stenographers on the floor of the House."

A motion was made by Mr Gholson to postpone the further consideration of the subject indefinitely. Negatived by yeas and nays.

For postponement, 71
Against it, 91

Mr. Ingersoll moved to postpone it to to-morrow. Motion lost.

A motion was made to limit the additional number to be admitted, to *two*

A motion was also made (by Mr. Roberts) to strike out the words "*on the Floor*," and insert "*in the Galleries*."

After several unsuccessful motions to adjourn had been made—

A motion for adjournment was made and carried 84 to 82, leaving the subject undecided and still before the house.

Tuesday, June 1.

SENATE.

Mr *Smith* of Maryland, introduced a bill to amend the act to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union &c and the bill was twice read and referred to Messrs *Smith*, *Worthington*, *Varnum*, *Taylor* and *Dana*.

Mr. *German* reported a bill for the relief of Alexander Phœnix.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Tuesday, June 1.

Sundry petitions were presented and referred to the standing committees.

On motion of Mr. *Robertson*,

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to enquire into the expediency of establishing a district court in the Mississippi territory, and that the said committee have leave to report by bill or otherwise.

STENOGRAPHERS.

The house resumed the consideration of the business yesterday left undecided, respecting the memorial of George Richards, requesting admission into the house as stenographer.

The desultory debate yesterday commenced was this day resumed.

After considerable debate, and the rejection of one or two proposed amendments,

Mr. *Bibb* moved to amend the original motion of Mr. Grosvenor, by striking out the whole thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following.

"*Resolved*, That the prayer of the petitioner ought not to be granted."

After further debate, in which it was said by several gentlemen that to adopt any step in consequence of the petition of Mr Richards would be to impugn the conduct of the Speaker on the execution of the duties of his station—

The amendment of Mr. Bibb was agreed to, by yeas and nays.

For the amendment, 85
Against it, 75

The resolution was then agreed to as amended, and Mr. Richards' petition was not granted.

Mr. Jackson of Va. laid on the table a resolution for appointing a standing committee, to be composed of seven members, whose duty it should be to attend to all matters relating to the Judiciary of the United States—And the House adjourned.

Wednesday, June 2.

SENATE.

The bill for the relief of Alexander Phœnix was read a second time, and ordered to a third reading.

Mr. Lacock from a select committee, reported a bill supplementary to the acts heretofore passed on the subject of an uniform rule of naturalization, which was read and passed to a third reading.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

A few petitions of a private nature were presented and referred And the House adjourned after a few minutes sitting, no reports having been prepared by the committees now engaged in digesting and maturing business for the House.

WILMINGTON, June 2.

Delaware Blockading Squadron.

Within these few days we have had various accounts from this fleet, but few of them, however are entitled to the least credit—as will appear by the following statement, which we have received from a gentleman direct from Smyrna:

On Saturday last a sloop of war put into the bay with a favorable breeze to come up, but how far she came is uncertain. On Sunday two of the enemy's barges were near Duck Creek, and captured the sloop which took down 150 of the militia (which were the day before released from New Castle, and who had concluded to return home by water) but fortunately not before they had been landed—This sloop, which took them down, put one part ashore at the mouth of Duck Creek, and the other at the mouth of Little Creek: after this she attempted to go to Cohanzy for a load of wood, when she was taken by the barges, who fastened them to her and compelled the persons on board to tow them some distance up the river.

Two sloops belonging to Smyrna, which had been prepared to sail for some time, went out of the creek on Sunday afternoon. They were both taken. The first that put out belonged to John Cummins, Esq. The captain, after getting into the river, perceived the two barges attached to the sloop, (as stated above) and immediately made an attempt to regain the creek, but unluckily got aground. The barges had cut themselves loose from the sloop, and were making for Mr. Cummins's vessel, when the captain put the cabin furniture on board the boat, and wish his men abandoned her, and by the time they reached the shore the English had possession who made an attempt to get her off, but not succeeding, they threw her cargo (principally bark, which belonged to Daniel Lawber, & Co.) overboard. Still she could not be get off—They then took off her rigging, &c and put on board their barges, and burnt her.

The next vessel which was taken belonged to Mr Joyce, who was himself on board. Not knowing that the sloop who preceded her had been taken, she put out of the creek, and was taken by the same barges about four o'clock in the afternoon of Sunday.—Our informant who left Smyrna yesterday morning, states that none of the persons on board this vessel had been liberated when he left there.

At night the barges were seen standing down the bay.

An express was sent from the bay shore to Smyrna on the appearance of the enemy—and the Military Association of that place immediately marched to the mouth of Duck Creek, but did not reach here until the British had done the injury above mentioned.

Another gentleman informs us that the sloop of war and a schooner came as high up the bay as Mispillion Creek and then sent the barges up which have succeeded in doing the mischief above described, and also alarmed the country so much within the last three days.

We regret that it is not in our power to inform the public of the precise force in our bay.

Wm. Hill Wells, Esq. (a former Senator from this state to Congress) has been elected by the legislature to fill the place in the U. S Senate occasioned by the resignation of J. A Bayard Esq.

The legislature of this state, at their late extra session, ceded to the United States the Pea Patch, upon condition that a fort, for the protection of the Delaware, be erected thereon by the general government. General Bloomfield (the United States commander of the fourth district, of which this state is a part) promised that this should be done in two weeks.

The southern members of Congress are frequently branded by the Boston and Connecticut tories with the epithet of negro representatives. The fact is, that if there be any negro representatives they are from the eastern states; for there, alone, are the blacks entitled to vote at elections. We understand that the sable electors in that quarter are generally federalists.—*Va. Arg.*