SUPPLEMENT
TO THE
AMERICAN

FRIDAY, April 8, 1814.

☞ *To hold our columns, for to-morrow, in reserve for the accommodation of our adveritsing and commercial friends, we present in supplement form, the interesting debate in congress, on the repeal of the embargo and non importation acts. As the nature of the debate forbids abridgement or curtailment, we give it whole and entire, leaving our readers to make their own remarks and draw their own conclusions.*

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6.

Mr. *Beall of Ohio*, and Mr. *Ingham of Pa.* obtained leave of absence from Monday next.

Mr. *Bradley of Vt.* presented the petition of David Stone and Josiah Bellows, praying relief from the penalties of an infraction of the non importation law—referred.

Mr. *Lattimore of Mis.* presented the petition of Abner and Delilah Pipes, praying the amount of a pension due to Gustavus Campbell—referred.

Mr. *Wright of Md.* submitted the following resolution, which was read and ordered to lie on the table.

Resolved, That the following rule be added to the rules of this house: "That no amendment by way of *rider* be received to any bill on its third reading."

On motion of Mr. *Jennings of Ind.* ordered that the committee of the whole be discharged from the further consideration of the bill to define more explicitly the duties of the judges of the territories of Indiana and Illinois.

The house resumed the consideration of the report of the committee on the petition of Thomas Claxton.

A motion to re-consider the vote of the house yesterday to strike out the wosd "*three*" and insert "*two*" as the compensation to be allowed per day to the keeper of the letter and stationary office, was carried, and the house by a vote of 68 to 49 agreed to the said amendment.

A motion was made further to amend the report; when

The resolution and amendments were on motion of Mr. *Calhoun* ordered to lie on the table.

The House, on motion of Mr. *Calhoun* resolved itself into a committee of the whole, Mr. Pleasants of Virg. in the chair, on the bill to repeal the embargo and non importation acts, and the bill to prohibit the exportation of specie.

The first mentioned bill was first taken up; and the first section having been read—

Mr. *Calhoun of S. C.* (the chairman of the committee of Foreign Relations) rose to speak to the merits of the bill. In order to judge of the propriety of the measure it embraced, it would be necessary to go back to the nature and character of the war in which this nation is engaged. It was, as it had been emphatically and correctly stated, a war for Free Trade and Sailors' Rights: and, such, Mr. C said, must be the character of every war in which this nation is engaged. We are so far removed from the European contest, that we shall never enter into the struggles for continental power in that quarter of the world. Not that we should be indifferent spectators of the events in Europe, because the changes there may have a considerable bearing on the affairs and interests of this country: but the interest we feel in these events is not of such a character as to make us a primary party in any of these contests. But one circumstance always accompanying the European struggles, will more or less involve the rights of this country in them. Of such a character is the British commercial or maritime policy, which in its effect tends to destroy the free trade of this country and also to infringe the rights of our seamen. In this point of view it is a matter of great importance that we should duly reflect on the character of the present contest, to decide what part this country ought to act, and what principles should now govern our conduct. The policy of Britain, which is to contract and limit neutral rights, and which, if not resisted, would annihilate them, will always have a strong bearing on the United States. But that policy will not stop here; it will affect the interest of every country in Europe, and place them more or less on the side of this country in resistance to the commercial policy of England. It then becomes a matter of policy to unite those countries, interested in the cause of free trade, in the struggle which we are obliged to make against the usurpations of our enemy.—In this point of view the most liberal and generous policy ought to be pursued by us as to the other powers of Europe, and particularly to the great northern powers of Sweden and Russia.—But it might be said our past measures contradict this leading principle of policy. Mr. C. thought not. The restrictive system sprung from an unusual state of things: it was a pacific policy arising from the extraordinary state of the world at the time we embarked in it—and of course was a temporary rather than a permanent policy. On looking back to its origin, gentlemen would find it to be such as he had stated. It originated at a moment when every power on the continent of Europe was arrayed against Great Britain, and no one country in Europe was then interested in the support or defence of neutral rights. There was scarcely a port in Europe, which, at the commencement of our restrictive system, was not occluded to British commerce. In this state of things, the United States, in order to avoid war, not having taken the resolution at that time to declare war, resorted to the restrictive system—resorted to it because the extraordinary state of the Europeon world presented a prospect that the strong pressure of this system on Great Britatn might save the nation from a war into which we have since been reluctantly drawn.—Such was the character of the embargo measure, originating from the posture of the world at that day, when it was resorted to without the prospect of producing an impression on any neutral power; for there were then no neutrals. Gentlemen might say, that in this view of the restrictive system, it ought to have terminated at the commencement of the war.

To be candid, Mr. C. said that was his opinion; and when a motion was made by a gentleman of Massachusetts to that effect, he (Mr. C.) had advocated it on the ground that the restrictive policy was opposed to war. That motion was not successful, but it was rejected by a majority of one vote, so many members of the republican party agreeing with him in that opinion as almost to have carried the question at that time. But why was the system not then terminated? The reasons would be obvious to all who reverted to the circumstances of that time. The state of the world which originally induced the system, which gave great energy to it, continued in its pristine vigor. All Europe was still occluded to British commerce; the war between Russia and France had not broken out—Russia had not then opened her ports to British commerce. This was then the governing motive which prevented the repeal of that system. Had the state of the world then been what it now is; had all the European world, France excepted, been open to British commerce; had there existed neutral nations on the continent of Europe, of very great power and influence; Mr. C. said, had this state of things then existed, there was the strongest reason to believe, from the small minority against the resolution of the gentleman from Mass. to which he had alluded, the restrictive system would have veen terminated by the war.

As to his own views of that system, Mr. C. said he thought it ought to have terminated in war earlier than it did.—In this respect he had disagreed with gentlemen on the other side of the house, with whom he had then voted.—They wished for neither war nor restriction. But, said Mr. C. let us now attend to the present state of the world. What is the condition of England? As between us and G. Britain, there are many nations of great power now in a neutral condition. Russia, Sweden, all Germany, Denmark, Russia, Spain, for even she may be considered neutral—and perhaps Holland. Under the entire change in the circumstances of Europe, ought not the restrictive system then to terminate? Indubitably—indubitably, he said, because all the reasons which justified and recommended its continuance had ceased. It was originally resorted to as a pacific measure; having declared war, as a war measure it was continued, and was a forcible measure, because all Europe was shut against our enemy. All Europe being now open to her, that reason has ceased. Suppose we were to persist in the measure.—Does any one believe that England will feel the measure as she did when the continent was shut? Certainly not. But in addition to that consideration, the fact is that we are now contending for free trade, and ought to propitiate as much as possible every nation which has the same interest as ourselves in its maintenance. In one word, it is our interest to attach the friendship of Russia, Sweden, Holland, Denmark, and of all nations who have a deep interest in free trade, to the cause of America. Mr C. felt a strong impression, that if we opened our ports to them, and the maritime usurpations of Britain continued, they would in time make common cause with America; that in time their weight would be thrown into the scale with us to counteract the policy of Britain. It would not be decorous or wise for the U. S. standing up for the freedom of trade, to pursue a course of policy calculated to irritate those nations with whom we may have a common cause. What had the Emperor of Russia said in relation to our war with Britain, when apprised of it? He had expressed his solicitude for trade with America, and regretted that our difference with G. B would interrupt it. This sentiment he had expressed at a moment when all France and her allies marched against him, and he did not know how soon France would plant her standard in his capital. That sentiment must have still greater influence with him now, when his enemy is repelled. The same feelings which governed the Emperor of Russia in this respect, must in a greater or less degree govern every nation on the continent of Europe, whose interests are the same. In the proposition which had been made to France on the part of the allies, a solicitude had been evinced on this subject, which, if this country shews a disposition to extend the benefits of commerce to the European continent, must have weight in the British cabinet. We ought never to forget, Mr. C. said, the reason which had forced us into war. Anxious to maintain our neutral position and enjoy the benefits of neutral trade, we had for years closed our eyes against the aggressions on the part of the enemy: Sufferance on our part had provoked only further injury, which had forced us to arms in defence of neutral rights and free trade. Under this view of the subject, he hoped this committee would duly appreciate the necessity of conciliating those nations whose interests were now the same as ours, with whom we have now some trade, and in future may expect it to be greatly extended. But it might be said England would not permit this trade. To what situation, Mr. C. asked, would she then be reduced? To an alternative the most aukward and perplexing. She must either keep up her present mere cruizing or paper blockade of our sea coast, to prevent the entrance of those neutrals, or modify her system of paper blockade in favor of all neutrals. Will not a persistance in her present illegitimate blockade, and capture at sea of neutral vessels, destined for the United States, irritate and vex those nations, and detach them from the cause of Great Britain? If on the other had she modifies her blockade in their favor, Mr. C. said, we may carry on a lucrative trade to the continent of Europe not beneficial to England, but very much so to the United States. The very option which will be thus presented will embarrass the British Cabinet, and have a stronger tendency to produce peace than ten years continuance of the present system, when the prospect of its producing any pressure has become so very faint. Mr. C. said he would ask of gentlemen of the same side of the house with himself, whether if the restrictive system were now off, that there would be ten votes in the house in favor of putting it on? He contended there would not. If it were to expire on the tenth of the month, would there be ten votes in favor of its renewal? He believed not. If the house would in neither case embrace it under present circumstances, there was the strongest reason to presume that in its judgment the restrictive system is not now operative and wise. What then asked he was the objection to repealing it? A regard to consistency. He knew, he said, that regard ought always to be had to that valuable trait in governments or men. But it was not the duty of men to regulate their conduct without any regard to events. True wisdom consists in properly adapting your conduct to circumstances. Two things may change our conduct in any particular point; a change of our own opinion, or of exterior circumstances, which entirely change the reason of our former conduct. Men cannot always go straight forward, but must regard the obstacles which impede their course. Inconsistency consists in a change of conduct when there is no change of circumstances to justify it. Those who adapt their conduct to a change of circumstances, act not inconsistently but otherwise. They would be inconsistent if they persisted in a course of measures after the reasons which called for them had so changed as to require a course directly the reverse. Mr. C. said he respected the firmness of many friends around him, because it indicated their determination to persevere in any system and adhere to any measures which they believed the interest of their country to require. But, according to the view which he had taken, he did not view such a persistence in the restrictive system to be the dictate of wisdom or sound policy. There were many other observations which he might make on this subject, which he should at present forbear to urge. As to the manufacturing interest, in regard to which some fears have been expressed, the resolution voted by the house yesterday was a strong pledge that it would not suffer the manufacturers to be unprotected in case of a repeal of the restrictive system. Mr. C. said he hoped at all times and under every policy they would be protected with due care. All further remarks he reserved until he should hear the objections to the bill.

Mr. *Webster* of N. H. next took the floor. He was happy he said, that it had fallen to his lot to be present at the office which they were now about to perform, of reading the funeral obsequies of the restrictive system. He rejoiced in moderation, he felt a temperate exultation, that this system, which he conceived pernicious as to ourselves, and imbecile as to foreign nations, was about to be consigned to the tomb of the Capulets. He congratulated his friends, who had predicted this end, that that they had lived to see its existence terminate, &c. He went on to speak figuratively of the restrictive system, which he said, was something like a system of faith, to be acted, not to be deliberated on; it seemed to have been believed to be essential to our political salvation, and any departare from it as leading certainly to political perdition—and he did not believe that any Saint in the Calender ever had a set of followers less disposed to troublesome enquiry, than the followers of this restrictive system. The authors of this system however had well understood its object; the opposers of it also understood it—and that it had failed to effect its object, the late message of the president sufficiently proved. The character of the system, like that of many other things, would not be very well known or generally understood until it was destroyed. It was now passing off with general execration: its true features would now be distinctly seen, its true character correctly understood. The opponents of this system had always told its friends that it was not a system of policy truly American. The house had now been told this was a system of measures connected with the the affairs of Europe, which should fluctuate and rise and fall with the politics of that country. This had been frequently said by its opponents, but never before acknowledged by its friends. On what ground was the system now proposed to be given up but this—That that the state of things created by the predominance of French power on the continent of Europe has ceased, and the system which depended on it ought to cease also—That, in fact, no effect could be expected from it but by its co-operation with the views of France. Mr. W. said he should not now go into a view of the coincidences which might be traced, or take this occasion to shew that the first embargo was laid at the commencement of the continental system in Europe—From the nature of things, however, the measure could have no effect but from such coincidence. How was it to operate on Britain? By denying to her a market for her manufactures.—What quantity of British manufactures did we annually consume? To what amount, so to speak, did we refuse a market to her manufactures? In this point of view he said, we consumed about one-twelfth of her produce, or one-sixth of her export, though the amount had been estimated much lower. Could it be supposed, that by refusing to purchase this small amount of her whole manufactures, we could compel her to comply with our terms? It could not be supposed that we could, whilst we at the same time deprived our own citizens of the market for the whole of their surplus produce. The truth however was now acknowledged: the system had been introduced as a system of co-operation with France. [Mr. Calhoun here asked what the gentleman meant by co-operation? In one sense, he himself had not used it, and now denied its application.] Mr. Webster said he did not allude to the gentleman's speech particularly, but to say that the effect to be expected to be produced by the restrictive system, was from its pressure operating at the same time and in the same manner with circumstances in Europe. That was what he called co-operation, viz. the denial of our market to England, operating with and depending for its success on the French policy prevailing in Europe. Now, Mr. W. said, he objected to a system of policy depending on the fluctuation of affairs on the continent of Europe.—Let me ask, said he, if the people of this country, from the first introduction of this system to this moment, have been apprized of this circumstance. On the contrary, how much angry declamation had been heretefore caused by the assertion of that fact! The people had been taught to believe that the enemy would be made to feel the system by the operation of its mere pressure. Yet the House was now told it was to be abandoned bacause the state of things which was to render it effectual against the enemy had ceased to exist. The great error of and objection to this system was, that it had a tendency to make the policy of this country dependent on those of Europe, to make us fluctuate with the current of its affairs. The same reason which was now urged for the taking it off, would prevail to cause its re-enactment if the Allies should be driven beyond the Rhine, Prussia and Germany reduced to terms, and the forces of Russia be again driven into her "frightful climate"—these reasons may perhaps be urged for re enacting a system which it is now thought proper to abandon. Thus it was, that until this habit of connecting our politics with the affairs of Europe should be abandoned, we should not be an independent people. By the sudden fall of this system, thousands would necessarily be ruined, as others were in its commencement. There was nothing so objectionable in a commercial country as the habit of frequent and violent changes of policy. It was however a fact too notorious, that there was a class of men in this country to whom violent change was acceptable; men who looked upon whatever was uncommon to be wise and great. There was therefore no calculating on the course of the government—there was not a time for the last two years, when any person could calculate on the permanency of its policy for a moment beyond the present. What made it worse, was that the true standard by which the politics of the government had been managed, had never been told to the people. On the contrary, they had been led to believe, by the friends and supporters of the administration, that the politics of Europe had nothing to do with our measures, and the standard by which others adjudged them was declared to be unjust and unfounded. Who could have imagined that the restrictive system would have been abandoned so suddenly? If the people had been told that it would be abandoned when the power of France was crushed, they would have understood it, and acted accordingly. Mr. W. referred to the President's message of Dec. last; to the bill which passed this House for more effectually enforcing the non-importation act by introducing a novel principle into our laws, and departing from all established rules of law; to the bill which came from the Senate, and was now before this House, for prohibiting the importation of any articles which might have come from English possessions; to the recent decision against Paul Coffee's bill, and against the transportation by water, of lime for the use of his houseless constituents, lest they should violate the embargo—to show how rigidly this system had been upheld until the very moment that the message came into the House recommending its repeal. He adverted also to the Legislative addresses now on the table approving of the measure—and to those which though in existence had not been presented, having arrived a little too late.—A government subject to such sudden changes was not competent to manage the affairs of a great nation.———There were many other very important considerations, connected with this change in our policy ——The people had been told that this system had a great tendency to promote infant manufactures, that if it did nothing else but induce the habit of providing for our own wants by our own means, it would be a blessing.—How often had this consideration been enforced! And yet those who understood the system did not hesitate to tell the people that the moment the policy of the government required it, the manufacturers would be sacrificed with as little hesitation as the merchants had been: that the same unsparing hand would prostrate both——that the manufacturers as well as merchants would be suffered to fall without remorse and without regret. Something had indeed been said in the message in regard to double duties, which were to guard the manufacturers from loss. Mr. W. said he admonished every man in the nation not to be taken in by this intimation. The double duties would not be continued—he did not say they ought; but, if not, they ought not to be held out as likely to be continued. The proper measure would doubtless be a regular tariff of duties, and not rashly to double the duties on all articles, on coffee, tea and other necessaries, in order to encourage the manufacture of woollens, &c. The moment the purpose of affording revenue no longer required them, the double duties would be abolished, he repeated.——What was they duty of a government in respect to its policy? That it should be regular, not variable. With respect to manufactures Mr. W. thought it necessary to speak with some precision. He was an enemy to rearing manufactures or any other interest into hot-bed; he would not legislate too rashly in relation to them. All manufactures compatible with the interest of the country ought to be fostered; but for one he never wished to see a Sheffield or a Birmingham in this country. He spoke of the evils of extensive manufactories, &c. and too populous towns. He wished to let the different pursuits of society take their own course, and not to give excessive bounties or preferences to one over another. The true spirit of the constitution did not confer the power on government to change the habits of whole sections of the country, but to grant protection to all sections of it to pursue their own avocations, which ought to be encuraged but not forced. He hoped on this, as on other points, to see the government returning to an honorable and correct course. At the abondonment of the embargo he rejoiced; and should rejoice still further when the government should pursue a permanent system, announce its policy to the people, pursue measures on its own strength, and not subject us to the power and will of foreign nations. This being but a brief ketch, embraces the substance of Mr. Webster's remarks.

The chairman proceeded to read the second section of the bill.

Mr. *M'Kim* of Md. said he had, from the presentation of this bill, been of opinion that it embraced two objects which ought to be kept separate and distinct. Besides, some gentlemen might be disposed to give free scope to the industry and enterprize of the country, who were averse to a repeal of the prohibition of imposts. He therefore moved to strike out the 2d section of the bill (repealing the non-importation acts.)

Mr. *Calhoun* said he had only one observation to make. He hoped the provisions of this bill would all go together; that they would all stand or all fall.

Without debate, the motion was negatived, ayes 31.

Mr. *Oakley* of N. Y. made two successive motions, the object of which was to do away all penalties and forfeitures which shall have been incurred under the acts proposed to be repealed.

These motions were supported by Mr. O. & Messrs. Gaston, King of Mass. and Ward, on the ground that the continuation of prosecutions and collections of fines and forfeitures would answer no end, the laws being repealed, but to enrich informers, without producing any salutary effect, as the object of penalties was not to avenge but to deter from violation of law, &c. and especially in cases of offences which were constituted by temporary laws; and were opposed by Messrs. Wright of Md. and Calhoun of S. C. on the ground of necessity of enforcing general respect to the government and laws generaly, as well as of particular statutes, and on the argument that the magnitude and evil of any wanton violation of law was in no degree lessened by the repeal of the law violated, but ought to be as rigidly punished as if the law were still in existence.

These proposed amendments were negatived, the first by a large majority, and the second by the following vote:

For the amendment	52
Against it	88

Mr. *Calhoun* moved an amendment to the second section of the bill, little more than verbal, going to include in the repeal so much also of any act or acts as prohibit the importation of the products of British territories *in neutral vessels*, &c.—Agreed to.

Mr. *Bradley* of Vt. then moved to strike out the 3d section of the bill (which is recited below.) If he understood its object, it was to permit a commerce to be carried on in neutral vessels from which our own vessels were shut up. This he believed to be contrary to the true policy of the country.

Mr. *Calhoun* opposed the motion. It was advisable, he said, as far as possible, to keep our own seamen engaged in our own vessels or in our marine.

Mr. *Pickering* of Mass. advocated the motion. He thought the section might produce much inconvenience, by preventing our citizens from going out to bring home vessels detained abroad, & but little benefit, because the low wages given by neutrals would be no inducement to our seamen to leave the high wages given in our service.

Mr. *Potter* of R. I. opposed the motion. If the bill passed, all our commerce would be carried on with British capital, though under neutral colors; and, if this section was struck out, besides taking the carrying trade, the British would get our seamen also.

Mr. *Murfree* of N. C. supported the motion, principally on the ground of the discretion given to the collectors as to passports, &c. and the difficulty they would find in discriminating. This section, if retained, would prohibit the exercise of the right of emigration, to which every citizen is entitled, and was so obnoxious to him, that, unless it were struck out, he must vote against the bill.

Mr. *Oakley* moved to amend the 3d section, which he considered it important to retain, by inserting in it the words "during the continuance of the war between the United States and Great Britain," this motion was agreed to.

A motion was then made to strike out the latter clause of this section, which goes to prohibit neutral vessels from taking passengers without pasports.

The motion was opposed by Mr Calhoun on the ground that this clause was necessary to give efficacy to the preceding part of the section.

The motion to strike out the latter clause of the 3d section was negatived.

For the motion	57
Against it	81

The question then recurred on striking out the whole of the 3d section being as amended in the following words:

Sec. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That no foreign ship or vessel, during the present war between the United States and Great Britain, shall receive a clearance or be permitted to depart from the United States, whose officers and crew shall not consist wholy of the citizens or subjects of the country to which such ship or vessel shall belong, or of a country in amity with the United States: and no citizen of the United States shall be permitted to depart in such ship or vessel without a passport or permission therefor, furnished under the authority and direction of the President of the United States.

Mr. *Pitkin of Conn.* advocated the motion to strike out this section, the provisions of which he considered impolitic if not unconstitutional. It was contrary to the interest of our own people, which certainly favored the covering our property, during war, by the neutral flag, if it was practicable. The section proposed also to deprive the seamen of the United States of the right of going abroad, and would operate in the manner of impressment by forcibly detaining them in our service; and would also prove a hardship on neutral traders as well as on our own citizens.

Mr. *Fisk* of Vt. said that though he should vote for this whole bill with much reluctance for various reasons, yet if this section were stricken out, he must vote against the bill.—He made a number of remarks in reply to Mr. Pitkin. He denied it to be any hardship to our seamen to prescribe the regulations under which foreign vessels should enter and depart from our ports, and expressed his surprize at the gentleman from Connecticut to have become so far a convert to the right of expatriation, as to believe it unconstitutional or objectionable to restrict our citizens from going abroad during war. If these seamen were to go out they would only be subject to capture by the enemy, and increase the number of American prisoners now in his possession.

Mr. Potter of R. I. also opposed the motion for striking out the section, and made several appropriate remarks against the motion. If this section were stricken out, our commerce would not only be carried on with the capital and to the profit of British merchants, but would be carried on by the employment of American seamen; who, if the bill were to pass, would scud to sea in foreign vessels as rats desert a sinking ship.