AMERICAN
AND
Commercial Daily Advertiser.

BALTIMORE: SATURDAY, Feb. 5.

PUBLISHED DAILY BY
W. PECHIN & G. DOBBIN & MURPHY
(PRINTERS OF THE LAWS OF THE UNION)
NO. 4, HARRISON-STREET.

Daily Paper $8—Country Paper $5 per annum
All Advertisments appear in both.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 2.

MARYLAND MEMORIAL.

[DEBATE CONCLUDED.]

Mr. CALHOUN of S. C. rose, not to debate the mere motion before the House, which he did not consider worthy of a word, but to remark on a doctrine, which ought not to receive the sanction of this House. The gentleman from N. Carolina, by mere abstraction, overlooked the objectionable part of the memorial. He had said, and Mr. C. agreed with him, that the people had right to state facts; and that it is a fact, that the war is about to assume a character of ferocity—a fact, in which the people of that state, of the whole American people, and of the world, are interested. It was not the annunciation of a fact, in itself true, that was objected to; but it was the character given to that fact, conveying a censure, not on the government commencing in this ferocious spirit, but on the government which is acting on the defensive. This was the objection, that it imputed the blame, not to the enemy, with whom it rested, but to the American government. That this memorial should speak thus, was surprizing; that it should meet with an advocate on this floor, was doubly surprizing. In what manner does the memorial say this work of retaliation is to commence? By our protection of British traitor. And to this, the gentleman had said, there was no objection. Mr. Calhoun said he knew but one case, in which the protection of traitors was not objectionable. If a traitor of an enemy, during war, flees into this country, we are not compelled to give him up. But that we are to protect "British traitors" by a course of retaliation, was what the President never thought of doing. To do so, would be a contradiction of every principle of a moral character. The gentleman from New York had intimated, that the President, in his message, had announced such a doctrine. Let the gentleman point it out. Mr. C. understood the message only to embrace such as had incorporated themselves into our political society according to our laws. Another part of the address, said Mr. C. the allusion to the Boston port bill, the gentleman appears to think perfectly innocent. Sir, is a measure to be judged only by its effects? It is the motive which gives character to our actions. If the Boston port bill had been passed for a proper purpose, it had not driven us into the war of the revolution. It was the motive which then, as well as now, has raised the American spirit to resist British violence and usurpation, and I hope ever will. The measure of embargo, Mr. C. said, had been resorted to as a part of a system, to repel encroachments by the same enemy, after a lapse of 35 years, as before drove us to war by her injustice, &c. As to the abuse of the French emperor, Mr. C. said, he would, with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Archer) willingly leave it to the House of Delegates of Maryland to abuse him as much as they pleased, but the correctness of propriety of their abuse of him must, like all other things, be determined by its motive.—If they merely intended to express their aversion to French tyranny, he would agree with them, and so he believed, would a great majority of the American people. It was not in this point of view he was disposed to object to this part of the address. But it was that, in abusing the French emperor, they wished to justify the opposite despot over the channel, as regards this country equally terrible and more hostile. Not only does this memorial abuse the French emperor, but assigns his demerits directly or by inference as a cause why we should throw ourselves into the arms of Eugland, our deadly enemy.—Mr. C. said for these and other reasons, he should not give his vote for printing this memorial.

Mr. GROSVENOR quoted again the President's message, repeated and enforced his idea of the construction to which it was liable, and advanced many other ideas on the subject of allegiance, &c. As far as you can alienate citizens from their native country, so far you may naturalize them in a certain way, which your constitution and laws prescribe. But, unless they have gone through the process required by law, there is no pretence for saying that they are entitled to protection, at any rate without our territory. The memorial, therefore correctly stated, that they were about to sacrifice native citizens to protect those, who not being citizens of the country, never having become so, and being found in our armies, are British traitors.—When this question should come to be fully discussed, as he hoped it would, gentlemen would find that the bottom on which they stood, would fall out from under them. Mr. C. said, he had serious doubts, whether, according to the principles of public law, we can deliver a citizen from his allegiance, to his native country; whether it was compatible with the interests of society, that such a power should exist; and, whether, if we adopt the principle, we compel other nations to submit to it. He was not prepared to admit, that the law of retaliation authorised the President to proceed as far as he had in this respect. At any rate, he contended that the doctrine he had advanced in his message, was founded on principles which could not be sustained. He pledged himself to prove that the President had recognized the principle in its fullest extent, that the law of allegiance is a municipal law; and that when a nation finds its subjects *within its own territory*, it may treat them such, but cannot follow them into another's territory. This doctrine was contained in the instructions to Messrs. Monroe and Pinkney, some years ago. Admit that principle to be correct and it cannot be denied—and these men are traitors; and he trusted this House would never shrink from publishing to the world any document, merely because it contained that fact. Mr. G. concluded by repeating and enlarging on some of his former arguments.

Mr WEBSTER of N. H. spoke a few words in favor of printing. Having voted to receive the memorial, no additional respect would be shewn by printing it, which followed nearly of course. If its statements were erroneous, it was a strong reason why it should be printed, that all might read it, and a day be assigned for its discussion.

Mr. EPPES of Vir. entirely agreed with gentlemen on the other side of the house, as to the right of petition belonging to every body of freemen in a legislative or any other capacity; and he would go further and say it was the duty of the legislature, where its terms were respectful, to receive their representation, and give it such course as its merits required. The present paper was presented for no object, as was proved by the omission of a motion to refer it to any committee, and a motion was made to print it—for what purpose? Could the Legislature present its views in no other way to the people? Were his constituents to be taxed to print a memorial which stamps that war which they approve as immoral and unjust? A memorial which passes over all the enormities of the enemy and stigmatizes our own government? If they wished a subject on which to display their indignation, let them turn to the scenes of Hampton and the River Raisin. Let them remember our citizens, yet bleeding of wounds received in defence of their country, handed over to be hacked and burnt by ferocious savages, by the authority of the British nation—and, let them remmember that even female beauty and innocence could not find protection from equally savage invaders—not forgetting the towns on their own shores wantonly burnt by an atrocious foe.

Could they find nothing on which to wreak their vengence but on their own government? Because it has passed a law to prevent traitors from furnishing our enemy with the supplies which are to enable him again to annoy us, its conduct compared to that of British government in 1774. The object of the British government was to deprive us of the rights derived from God and Nature; and if at that day a man had said in Boston or any other port, that he would fit out a privateer, instead of fighting the enemy, to convey specie to the India sea, he would have the good old remedy of tar and feathers applied to his offence. The feelings of that day, Mr. E. said, had too much subsided; and it was too often the case that men were seen rising in this house and levelling their artillery exclusively against their government. We have been told, said Mr. E. that we are protecting British traitors. We well know that one of the causes of the war was the claim set up by Britain to take naturalized citizens from our vessels. The gentlemen from New-York had questioned whether it was in the power of any community whatever to absolve any subject from his allegiance. What means our constitution then? If yon cannot absolve him from his allegiance, how or why naturalize him? Did the men who formed this constitution entirely misunderstand the powers of civilized society? Did the party to which the gentleman himself belongs so far err when they acted under the constitution, and never ceased to naturalize? Can it now be doubted whether there is a power in any community to naturalize a foreigner?

The gentleman has come with his doubts too late; and has taken a most unfortunate oppitunity to disclose them, when the nation is at war for this very right recognised in our constitution, and dear to the people.—The gentleman had drawn an inference from the message neither warranted or supported by fact. It was known, Mr. E. said that among those on whom the British government had wreaked its vengeance, were men who had been twelve years naturalized, who had left wives and children behind them here when they went to battle, and who were now threatened to be executed as traitors. And under these circumstances did gentlemen in this house tremble in their shoes, adopting the pusillanimous principle of the Legislature of Maryland, and address their prayers to the enemy beseeching him to spare them? If such a disposition prevailed, it was time to give up a country we were not worthy to inhabit. Mr. E. adverted to the President's message, to which he conceived the gentleman had given an erroneous consterution—and exposed what he termed the absurdity and inconsistancy of the British pretension of perpetual allegiance.—It has been said that a new system of retaliation had been adopted. It was as old at least, Mr. E. said, as the revolutionary war; it had then compelled our present enemy to give up his infraction of the laws of war, and unfounded claims; and nothing but a want of firmness in this nation could now prevent the same result.

When the British nation find that men in our own councils doubt the right to protect men regularly naturalized, who fight for their families and fire sides, what will be their sentiments? In a moment of imprudence and frenzy they may put in execution their threats. No one will more than myself deplore the consequences; no man will weep with more sincerity over the patriot blood on one side, and the innocent blood on the other, which will be shed: but in great questions of a whole people's rights, individuals must suffer. Although I would weep over his fate, I would not withhold the victim—because I I would preserve the principle. As to this remonstrance, which *but for the notorious Alleghany election*—but for a single vote, might have been of a different character, the House of Delegates could find other means of dissiminating it. It contained nothing new or that deserved printing; it was the mere common place trash daily circulated through certain presses in the country.

Mr. HANSON, of Md. said he rose with unfeigned reluctance to take any part in this debate, because he had not been in his seat until after the member who last addressed the House had commenced. The first objection to this memorial he had understood was, that the language was indecorous to this House; the second, that it reflected upon the general government, in comparing the Embargo to the Boston Port Bill. As to the first objection, Mr. H. said, the memorial did not contain one sentiment which any patriot in this country need not be proud to entertain, because it breathed the good old spirit of 1776. There was not a sentiment in that address, he said, which he was not ready to repeat in the teeth of the whole mercenary tribe of writers, (or something to that effect) not one which he would not repeat in the face of the whole host of instruments and pensioners of the court. Were not the people, Mr. H. asked, groaning under the pressure of the measures of Government? Look at the Embargo. Had not Congress, by that measure, justly compared to the Boston Port Bill, placed the whole commerce of the country at the discretion of a single individual? Had they not raised the executive above the constitution and laws of the country, as had been done in France, where the *gens d'arms* were placed in all the ports of the empire to be the means of regulating commerce, where there was an extended system of espionage and it was made death to evade the regulations of commerce. They had placed the trade of this country in precisely the same situation as the commerce on the continent of Europe. All the Departments of government, the Executive, the Legislative, and the Judicial were, if he might be allowed to use the figure, thrown into a mortar, and with this great majority for a pestle, his high mightiness of the palace had beat and compounded them together, into a compound as poisonous as hellebore. A swarm of collectors feeding and fattening on the bowels of the people enforced a law, which so far restricted commerce, that it was even illegal for a vessel to clear out to go from Annapolis to Baltimore.

Had not the people of Maryland then a right to complain, who have fought most bravely, wherever they have met the enemy, who are always in the front rank in time of danger, for where danger is, there are their breasts presented. When the fleet of the enemy was in the Chesapeake bay, and the whole coast was in danger of invasion, and exposed to the ravages of the enemy, what was the conduct of the national executive? A memorial was forwarded to him, setting forth the dangers to which the coast was exposed—and an answer was given, that in a country so intersected with bays and rivers, it was impossible to provide for the defence of every point. When no sort of assistance was given to the state of Maryland, which felt so peculiarly the oppression of the measures of government, had it not a right to complain? As to the address the facts set forth in it were true, and known to be true—and if a single vote would have changed its complexion, had that been the case he presumed there would have been no objection to printing it; nor ought there now. Allusions had been made to men who were to be restrained, subjected to tar and feathers as traitors to their country. It was not difficult, Mr H said, to see what was the real objection to the poor indulgence asked to be extended to this address from Maryland.—She had rendered herself odious to administration. When this war was first declared, it was expected to hush opposition; she was the first to oppose the attempt—she raised ramparts around the constitution, told you, you might beat down one barrier after another, but when driven into the citadel she would make one last effort. Her citizens were determined to resist, and while they had one drop of blood, to stand in so noble a cause.—Mr H concluded by observing that the remarks made by the gentleman who preceded him, had awakened sensations which the rules of the house forbade him, and the respect he now felt for the chair prevented him from expressing.

Mr. MACON of N. C. next rose, and stated the reasons why he should vote for printing the address; because, although he did not approve, he was not afraid of it. This question, however, involved no constitutional right—Legislatures had the same right as other collections of people to address Congress, and no other—nor were they, in his opinion, entitled to more respect. As to the protection of traitors, if the persons spoken of were traitors, the great Bernadotte was a traitor; and so was George I. but it appeared that great men were not subject to the same laws as other men; that, as there is a species of men above fashion, so there is a species of men above law. He did not believe that the memorial contained the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and yet he was willing to print it. Nor did he believe in the prevalence of general dissatisfaction which his colleague had imagined; for, taking the representation in this House as the best practicable criterion, he found nearly two to one in favor of the measures of government. For his part, he said, he always wished to see a strong minority; and the smaller the majority the stronger they were—and, paradoxical as it might seem, he had seen it so in this House. As to this character of ferocity to be given to the war, his colleague had not placed it to the proper account. If it did take place, it would be from the abominations of the most abominable government that ever existed, and the most corrupt, living, he might say, on the corruption of its own vitals. Mr. M. adverted to the remarks on the embargo, which he defended—and, as to the war, quoted the repeated declaration on the other side a few years ago, that if the government would make old fashioned war, they would join and go with them. How changed the scene, he said. He adverted too to the equality of operation of the embargo, which precluded the idea of its proceeding from local feeling. If it was wrong, it was as wrong as those who were its greatest advocates as to its greatest opponents. As to its being the work of back-countrymen, it was done for the public good; and when in the revolution the back countrymen went to Boston and shed their blood in its defence, a different sentiment prevailed there. It was never complained of the brave Morgan, when he went there, that he was a back countryman. He adverted to the ravages at Hampton, in a feeling manner—higher crimes than were there committed he could not imagine—As to the right of naturalization, every nation, civilized or savage, red or white, had exercised it. He made many other pertinent remarks, for which we have not room; and concluded by saying that truth would prevail over every thing—he had seen it prevail when we had a sedition law in the country—and he had no fear for it now.

Some observations were made by Mr. Wm. Reed of Mass. and Mr. Eppes concerning the fact alluded to by the latter of a privateer clearing out from Boston with specie. Mr. Reed by inference entirely discredited the statement; which Mr. Eppes said he had no reason to doubt until it was contradicted by evidence.

Mr. CALHOUN spoke in explanation. He added that he was glad on one account, and sorry on another, that the gentleman from N. Y. had spoken so distinctly on one point: that persons who had the plighted faith of the U. States should not be protected—that persons who under sanction of our laws, have forsworn foreign allegiance, and become citizens, should not be protected whilst fighting under our banners beyond our territorial limits? If this doctrine was entertained by the gentleman, he hoped it was confined to himself and had not many advocates, even in his own party.

Mr. GASTON, not imputing to Mr. Eppes the intention of any personal allusion to him in his remarks on what he called the pusillanimous fears of the Legislature of Maryland, explained what he had meant on that subject; not that his constitutents feared to meet the enemy in fight, but they feared the progress of a system of cold blooded retaliation, the idea of which must make all men of humane or generous feelings shudder.

[During the whole of this debate there was a continued, but, as the reader will have perceived, an entirely unsuccessful effort on the part of the Speaker to confine gentlemen to the question actually before the house.]

The question was then taken on printing the memorial, and decided as follows:

For printing it	68
Against it	98

So the house refused to print it.

On motion of Mr. BURWELL of Vir. the petition of Amelie Eugenie de Beaumarchais, by James A. Chevallie, presented the 24th Dec. 1805, and all the papers relating to the claim of the petitioner, were referred to the committee of Revolutionary Claims.

Mr. MASON, of N.C. presented sundry documents, relating to the claims of J. F. M'Grew, to a tract of land in Mississippi territory. Referred.

Mr. EPPES of Va. from the committee of Ways and Means, made an unfavorable report on the petition of Jane Dauphin, which was read, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NEWTON of Va. from the committee of Commerce and Manufactures, reported a bill for the relief of Joshua Sands, which was twice read and committed.

Mr. KENT of Md. from the committee on the District of Columbia, reported a bill to incorporate the subscribers to the Union Bank of Alexandria; which was twice read and committed.

Mr. FISK of Vt. from the Committee of Elections, made a report on the petition of Burwell Bassett, contesting the election of Thomas M. Bayley, now a representative from Virginia, favorable to the sitting member.

On motion of Mr. EPPES of Va. it was ordered that Mr. Bassett have leave to occupy a seat on the floor of the House, during the consideration of the preceding report.

The House proceeded to consider the report of the Committee of Elections, when after some discussion the report was ordered to lie on the table.

FAILURE OF OUR ARMS.

A message was received from the President of the U. States, communicating a report of the Secretary of War made in pursuance of the resolution of the House of Representatives of the 31st of Dec. calling upon the President for information relative to the failure of the American arms on the northern frontier.

This report comprises simply an immense mass of documents of about 600 pages, embracing the correspondence of the Secretary of War with Generals Dearborn, Wilkinson, Hampton, Lewis, Harrison, M'Clure and other military commanders, and various correspondence between those and other officers of the United States army. The message and docaments were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

The report or such parts as are interesting to the public, shall be laid before our readers as soon as its great length and other unavoidable circumstances will permit.

FROM THE STANDARD OF UNION.

THE TIMES.

The present session of congress is advancing. Much has been effected, but more remains to be accomplished. The security and reputation of the nation as well as the safety of the constitution, rests with the representatives of the people. We trust they will guard the inestimable deposit committed to their hands.

Congress are placed in a situation of great responsibility, a responsibility which is every day increasing. We have been told that our constitution is a child of experiment, that it is adapted to the sunshine and calm of peace; but that it is too impotent to encounter, and too fragile to endure the storms of war. We look to the event with suspense and exceeding great solicitude. A pusillanimous or temporising policy, by impairing public confidence, might or would shake our political system to its centre.

We live at a time which requires great resolution, as well as strict justice. If the strength of the constitution remains to be tried, the sooner the better. Let us meet the question like men. An appearance of timidity would invite the evils which we deprecate.—Conspirators, if there are such men among us, would grow bold, confident, and fool hardy.—They would have time to prepare, mature, extend and ripen their plots. Preventive remedies are always best. The *embrio* sparks of rebellion should be extinguished.

A portion of the Massachusetts legislature is behaving unworthily. But we are not to mistake their idle scoldings for the solemn and deliberate voice of the *State of Massachusetts*.—Conspirators may assemble to their midnight orgies, and be seated around the quivering flame of their "blue light" taper, until their countenances become as pale as death—they may convene at Annapolis, celebrate British victories, and drink *dagger* toasts until they are staggered, but they have neither forces nor courage to march to the field of insurrection.

The citizens of Massachusetts know the value of union, they respect their own character too much, they prize the blessings obtained by a seven year's revolutionary struggle too highly to stake them upon the desperate fortunes of a few corrupt and unprincipled adventurers. The Editor of that firm and excellent paper, the BOSTON PATRIOT, knew his men, as well as the public sentiment thoroughly, when he plainly told them, that they might talk of treason as much as they pleased, but whenever they ventured to act it, they would find a halter. Away with these vapourings.—Rebellion would discover itself a self devoted victim, to prove the strength of the constitution. The "steady habits" of New England are not to be so easily plunged without a barque, into a wild adventure, upon a boisterous and perilous ocean.

It is time to speak plain. Let conspirators endeavor to rest tranquil on their pillows, and to undream the dangerous dreams they have dreamed. The nation fears them not, it feels no danger, it totally defies their menaces. There will be many a fearful pause, and many a solemn painful calculation, before they are ready to levy and embody an army of insurgents. Sirs, to every man who could be beguiled into rebellion, ten thousand swords are ready to leap from their scabbards, to maintain the reputation and the rights, the integrity, union, and constitution of their country.

The repeal of the last Embargo act is much to be regretted. It was a most unfortunate and untimely yielding. It gave Britain an idea that our government is weak and has encouraged domestic faction ever since. That fatal mistep of repeal has been the occasion of many a subsequent misfortune, and has probably more than any circumstance, occasioned the present war. It is not our province, and we presume not to inculcate lessons to our superiors in wisdom and experience, but we shall humbly mention one essential maxim of sound policy. *Never commit an act which is wrong, never, by reason of menaces or importunity, surrender a mea ure which is right.* The men who now pretend to question the constitutionality of the present embargo law, are quibblers instead of reasoners, who will dispute every authority and attribute of the government. We repeat what we have mentioned before, that an embargo is not an innovation or a novelty, growing out of a "*philosopher's whim*," but a measure of an efficacious character, equally calculated to protect ourselves and to distress the enemy. We farther repeat, that it is a peace measure calculated to prevent war, or force your antagonist to desist from it; and that even when it fails in producing that effect, it keeps your strength entire—your food from nourishing—your property from enriching—foreigners residing among you from corresponding,—and your Tories or *blue lights*, for we shall not dispute about the name, from assisting the enemy. Under General Washington's administration, on the 4th June 1794, an act of congress passed, not to lay and regulate an embargo by that honorable body itself, but to authorise Gen. *Waskington*, the then president, at his own sole will and discretion, to "*lay, regulate and revoke embargoes.*" That act was commended by the voice, and vindicated by the talents, of General *Hamilton*, who afterwards ascribed the willingness of the British government to treat with us, to its *powerful and self denying influence.* Yet strange, that measure so wise in its conception so pure and honest in intention, so ably devised to consummate the beneficial purposes of the nation, is now opposed, and why? because an unprincipled opposition, resolved to govern, is determined to condemn and *per fas aut nefas*, to hiss every noble and virtuous character from the stage.

Congress possess the power of declaring war. The nation had, exclusively, entrusted that honorable body with the power of raising armies, and with every other mean to carry it on. Shall the interests of this great community, the liberties and precious rights of eight millions and an half of free men, be sacrificed to an Essex junto—a British faction—a set of men who preferring to "reign in hell, rather than serve in heaven," stand ready, if they cannot govern, to abandon their country to its base and bitter enemy? There always will be factions among us. They spring from the freedom of our institutions. It is a price which we shall always have to pay for our liberties; but the evil is not the less to be guarded against. It must always be expected that malcontents will have a majority in one or more states of our general confederacy, and should the national governmant yield to local clamor, great national purposes never would be executed. It is charitably hoped, that no serious internal movements are meditated in favor of the foe; and surely it may here, emphatically be mentioned, that if there are gentlemen who have any constitutional points to discuss and settle, it would be much more patriotic and becoming, to unite in the first place, to conquer the enemy; and let us Americans adjust these matters between ourselves, when the war is over.

Shall the third campaign terminate prosperously, and every branch of the government be supported? This is the great point immediately to be decided. When Scipio delivered the Romans from the great Hannibal, his first step was to carry the war into the enemy's territory. Battles must be fought somewhere. We must invade the enemy, or they will invade us. The farther the scene is removed from our own homes, the safer and better it will be for us.

NEW-YORK, February, 2.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman at Sackett's Harbour dated Jan. 22, 1814.

"We have received information, that a part of General Wilkinson's army have taken prisoners 900 troops of the enemy, and 18 heavy pieces of cannon, intended for their naval armament at Kingston. This news is believed here."

[FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT.]

NEW-YORK, Feb. 3.

A BRITISH 74 ASHORE.

From the Correspondent of the Columbian.

NEW-LONDON, Jan. 31.

"There is an English 74 ashore on the south side of Fisher's Island a mile or a mile and a half east of Race Point. She struck yesterday (Sunday) afternoon, about 3 o'clock. The wind was blown hard from N. W. (off shore) ever since; and though her sails were set till dark, to back her off, she sticks, and this morning has her upper masts and yards struck and is much stripped of her sails and rigging.

Evening 7 o'clock.

"Since writing the above, I have learned from two sailors who deserted from the Ramilies yesterday, and reached here early this morning, that the ship on shore is presumed to be the Victorious, 74, capt. Talbot, which had been expected some time from Halfax to relieve the Ramilies. She still remains in the same dangerous situation, (as seen from the streets of our city.) From the extremity of the weather, the crew must have suffered greatly. Seven barges were discovered going to her assistance last evening.

"Admiral Cockburn shifted his flag to the Albion yesterday, on account of his own ship (the Sceptre) being hogged.

"Should it be true that the Sceptre is broken and the Victorious lost, if it may not be considered as ominous to the British power in general, I hope it will prove so to her maritime assumptions and naval force on our coast."

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 3.

IMPORTANT INTELLIGENCE.

By the General Pike, Capt. Bolton, arrived at New Castle, from St. Barts. London advices are received to the 25th of Nov. which state, that Holland had thrown off the French Yoke, invited the Prince of Orange to assume the government of that country, and that he had left England for that purpose;—that the French general St. Cyr, had surrendered Dresden with 16,000 men;—that Bremen was restored to its ancient laws and magistracy;—that Switzerland, the Isles of the Adriatic, and great part of Italy, had thrown off all allegiance to Buonaparte.

Admiral Warren is recalled, and Admiral Cochrane appointed to succeed him on the North American Station.

Lord Wellington had taken Soult's second line of defence, (before Bayonne) by storm, with considerable loss on both sides, &c.

The above accounts are all official, and were received by the Editor of the Philadelphia Gazette, from his correspondent at St. Barts.

Poulson.

By the General Pike, arrived at New-Castle, from St. Barts. London papers of the 25th and 26th Nov. have been received in this city, which contain the following important information from the Continent of Europe:

General Bernadotte, with the victorious army of the North of Germany, had arrived in Holland, and erected the standard of Batavian Independence, around which the people of Holland were rallying in myriads. The Prince of Orange had already been invited from England, to assume his hereditary dignity of Stadtholder, accompanied by 20,000 English troops.

A great battle had taken place between Lord Wellington and Marshal Soult. Soult had three strong lines of defence near Bayonne, from two of which he had been driven by Wellington, who had taken from the French 50 or 60 pieces of cannon and 3000 prisoners. The loss on the part of the French, in killed and wounded, was about 6000, that on the part of the allies 4000.

The Northern parts of Italy and the Islands of the Adriatic had declared themselves independent of France.

There was a general insurrection of the people of Tyrol and Switzerland against the French.

The French army at Dresden, 16,000 strong had laid down their arms.

There were reports of the assassination of Buonaparte, and an insurrection in the South of France, but no authentic accounts of events of that character. *True Amer.*

MOUNTED RIFLEMEN.

Richmond Feb. 1

A fine company of this description, from the county of Orange, under the command of captain Stevens arrived in town yesterday, and made a handsome display with the regularity and neatness of their hunting shirt uniform.—They have received orders, we understand, to proceed to the district of York and Hampton, to join the force stationed there for the defence of our river and bay coast.

During the last month, a number of different corps have passed through Richmond for the protection of our Eastern frontier. We are informed by Major Wheaton U. States' A. D. Q. M. G. that to Norfolk alone, during the