NINTH CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Thursday, March 6.

Debate on Mr. Gregg's Resolution.

[*Mr. Randolph's Speech concluded.*]

But if I did not misunderstand the gentleman from Pennsylvania, he said that I had treated the house in a manner of which, sir, I trust I am incapable of acting towards any assemhly, much less one of your dignity. Am I indeed so ignorant of the feelings of man? Of the charaeter and composition of this house? No, sir, I have spoken of certain projects and their projectors in language such only as I think they deserve, and in which, claiming the same liberty which that gentleman urges and exacts, I will ever speak of such absurd and fantastical systems. The authors are no doubt interested in diffusing the ridiculous burthen of their disgraee as widely as possible. I cannot blame them for it, sir--'tis natural to wish for partners in our shame. But the great political sin, for which I have been denounced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is the opinion which I have expressed of a certain book, which seems to be his political Bible.--- And, sir, he would have me considered as an inconsiderate person, who would not scruple to call Locke a dunce, Newton a driveller, and Franklin a journeyman printer; and in an oracular saw he has pronounced that this book will live when he and I too, sir are, laid in our graves. But when he considers his own age, and the frailty of my constitution, he will confess that he has allowed but a short span for the existence of his favorite work. But even tho' it should live when we are wasting in the silent tomb, there is nothing in my composition that aspires to being considered as its author. Who is the author? Does the gentleman know? Must we have semi-official authority, even for a title page? No, sir, whatever others may think I have no ambition to have written such a book as this. I abjure the very idea. Unless my understanding has abandoned me, it mvolves an abandonment of the very doctrine for whieh the writer contends. Sir, the very cursory view which I took of this subject yesterday will compel me into some repetitions, but I must beg to be indulged in some additional remarks. What is the doctrine?

"In times of peace among all nations, their commercial intercourse is under no other restrictions than what may be impesed by their respective laws, or their mutal compacts. No one or more nations can justly control the commerce between any two or more of the others.

"When war happens between any two or more nations, a question arises, in what respect it can affect the commerce of nations not engaged in the war?

"Between the nations not engaged in the war, it is evident that the commerce cannot be rffected at all by a war between others

"As a nation not engaged in the war remains in the same relations of amity and commercial pursuits, with each of the belligerent nations, as existed prior to the war, it would seem that the war could not affect the intercourse between the neutral and either of the belligerent nations; and that the neutral nation might treat and trade with either, or both of the belligerent nations, with the same freedom as if no war had arisen between them. This, as the general rule, is sufficiently established."

Here is a faint endeavor to establish the principle that free ships make free goods. But the writer, as if desparing of his ability to effect it, goes on to say—"But in as much as the trade of a neutral nation with a belligerent nation might in certain special cases affect the safety of its antagonist, usage founded on the principle of necessity has admitted a few exceptions to the general rule"—"Usage" founded on what? Reason?—Right?—No, sir, on that law which admits nothing to controle it—"Necessity," that cannot stoop to argument. If once you admit that necessity ought, can, or does establish exceptions to this broad rule, do yon not admit all that the British doctrine requires? But, sir, it will be said that the sole legitimate proof of this necessity is *usage*. But usage must have had a beginning, and the small protection which this argument affords is thrown away by the subsequent admission, that a change in circumstances (*in the course of commerce*, for instance) will justify a departure from established maxims, will warrant the commencement of a new usage. As if all the articles contraband of war were minutely specified—and by a change in the maxims and implements of war, new & more terrible instruments of annoyance should be fabricated; would they not fall under the head of contraband? And is it not demonstrable that a direct trade to France, in gunpowder, or any other article contraband of war, would be less beneficial to her and less injurious to her enemy, than the colonial trade now in dispute; and is not (according to the writer's acknowledgment) the lesser principle involved in the greater? Am I therefore the apologist of England? I scorn to boast of my patriotism: it is indigenous. And when I am reduced so low as to plead to the charge of want of love to my country, of natural affection to my birth place my pride will tell me to bid you farewell, to go home and hide my shame. Am I the apologist of Britain, because your cause has been weakly defended, or treacherously betrayed? No, sir, this "Examiner" is her apologist. I have not minutely dissected the work. There was no occasion for it. It is something like the edifice we inhabit. 'Tis hardly worth while to be examining frizes and cornices, and architraves, and stucco work, when you know the foundation to be rotten, whilst the building is tumbling about our ears, and we are obliged to seek refuge in another. It is not, indeed, sir, worth while to consult the orders of architecture in a miserable card house of an argument, which the first puff of wind must demolish.

Sir, the admission that a change of circumstances will justify a departure from the established maxims amongst nations, was an unnecessary and fatal concession, not called for by the nature of the case. What is the "course of commerce" now? Totally changed in a few short years? The marine of France, Spain and Holland, whether for the purposes of trade or war, is no more. They have no longer navigation or navy. Again, amongst a load of quotations from Grotius and Puffendorff, and the lord knows whom, we are told it is the duty of the neutral to observe the strictest impartiality, "to behave himself alike to both the belligerent parties." But is it to behave alike to both parties, to carry for him who cannot carry for himself, to throw the ægis of neutrality over a commerce which he can no longer protect, to save him all the danger, expence and risk, of convoy and war insurance? This is a hollow, Delphic reciprocity; reciprocity to the ear, but not to the sense. If you carry contraband, or attempt to enter a blockaded port, you are liable to capture. Why? because justified by necessity. As to the motives of the neutral merchant, they are out of the question. His object, no doubt, like that of every other trader under the sun, is gain. He, sir, is too often the mere ephemeron, the butterfly of the day, who does not care one farthing whether you are at war with this or that nation, with England or with France, provided he can get good returns. His business is to post his books and balance the ledger; and whether he deals with the subjects of a white emperor or a black one, of Bonaparte or Dessalines, 'tis all one to him. No doubt, sir, it is the right of the neutral to pursue, and he will, he ought to pursue his own interest. But it is the right of a belligerent, (as conceded by this writer) to enquire how far such pursuit comes into collision with his interests and his safety. The motive of the neutral may not be hostility to either party engaged in war, but his own benefit. This, however, will not influence the belligerent nation, who takes up the question solely with a view to its effect on itself. What will Great-Britain say? That the exigency exists; it has occurred, *flagrante bello*, that the necessity admits of no delay; that you yourselves have abandoned the question in dispute; and even if you have not, that she cannot consent to sit down quietly and be extirpated from the face of nations, out of complaisance to Grotius or Bynkershoek, or in deference to the unknown author of this pamphlet, although he should exceed Bacon in genius, or Newton in intensity of thought. I must defend myself; the knife is at my throat; I have no more time for argument, but if you insist upon it, I will fight you. Sir, I have tried, but I could not get through this work, I found it so wire-drawn; the thread so fine that I could neither see nor feel it; such a tangled cobweb of contradictions, that I was obliged to give it up. The first thing that strusk me on opening it, was the peculiar infelicity with which it had surrendered the matter in dispute. And if this appeared at once to my unlearned eyes, do gentlemen suppose it will not be detected on the other side of the Atlantic? That it will receive no abler exaamination there, than the feeble and cursory one that I have given it. And after all, what does it contain? A remedy for the evil? No, a formal declaration that we are diseased Sir, we wanted no ghost to tell us that. It required no extraordinary exertion of learning or genius to shew, that we had indeed delicate subjects of difference with Great-Britain: The question is, how shall they be adjusted? We want the opinion of the doctor on the mode of treatment, and don't choose to be referred to the apothecary, because the superior does not choose to risk his reputation in a dubious case.

A gentleman from Pennsylvania has told us that Great-Britain is our commercial rival. But does not the gentleman know that the very term implies a cor-relative? That if she is your commercial rival, you are her commercial rival also. This is the very view that I have been endeavoring to take of the subject to impress on the committee; to warn the nation against being drawn into a war of commercial rivalship. Sir, when men fall out about women, they are not apt to call in some learned doctor to decide the dispute; they yield to feeling or instinct; just so with nations, commercial nations especially differing on interest, which is their instinct. And would gentlemen wish to excite this young nation as yet in the gristle, to a foreign contest with Great-Britain, in the full strength of manhood? I speak of foreign war. The will and ability to defend ourselves is one thing, to act 3,000 miles off another. They may rely as much as they please upon the French emperor's making a separate peace with the continent, to the exclusion of Great-Britain. If she puts out her strength you will feel it. This proposition will subject her to all the evils of an American war without any of the concomitant advantages. And can you expect a tame acquiescence on her part? If her minister be not a bastard; if he has one drop of the blood of Chatham in his veins, he will die contending for the liberties of his country, sooner than surrender her independence. He will do it. No, sir, whatever I may think of the vices and corruptions of the government of that country, I must applaud her intelligence and spirit, must admire her ability, wisdom and strength.

But another gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Smilie) asks if it is not astonishing that a man whom he allows to possess common sense, whom he represents as trembling at the power of Great-Britain, should be making calculations of the future power of France, instead of guarding against the immediate danger? Sir, France may become a naval power, Great-Britain never can be a military one. I ask any practical man, if the day can ever arrive when G. Britain will be able to threaten the safety of the continent of Europe or America or dictate to either of them. Is it my fault that the gentleman cannot, or will uot see this, because (as he tells you) fools and madmen can never be brought to believe that the spirit of God hath passed them by, and enlightened the understandings of other men. But to shew that this is not just cause of war, we are referred to the time of the stamp act & the non-importation agreement of 1774, which did not (it seems) produce immediate war. Is there any analogy between the two cases? We then formed one nation. A man may make a great sacrifice to preserve his friend, but when he has lost him, he will (as has been seen to-day) be denounced as the bitterest enemy. The other instances are equally defective and inapplicable. You may as well go back to the flood. The same gentleman enquires, are you indeed so peaceable towards England, who has trampled upon you, and hostile to France who has offered you no injury? Wherefore? On this occasion I must repeat the old proverb, 'tis the still hog that drinks the swill. She finds it convenient to make a miserable stalking horse, a scare-crow of Spain. The gentleman enquires how long Great-Britain has acted upon these philanthropic principles; this generous benevolent policy ascribed to her. But is any man so *weak*, or so wicked as to pretend that there is any principle of action between nations, except *interest?* Give Great-Britain the power, and se will to-morrow play the same part. Sir, we are not theophilanthropists, but politicians; not dreamers and soothsayers, but men of flesh & blood. 'Tis idle to talk of a sense of justice in any nation. Each pursues its sense of interest, and if you caculate on their acting upon any other principle, you may be very amiable, but you will prove a cully. We are asked what Great-Britain can do to annoy us. We answer at this moment more than any other nation of the world, because she commands the ocean, the sole medium of communication between us. But draw her off from that element, and France is not less omnipotent upon it. She is a great military power, and it is because Britain is not, cannot because such a power, that it is impolitic to break her down. Go to war when you will, you must become the ally of France, you will only put off by enhancing it, the danger you would guard against. You will but clap a tortoise under your elephant.

The same gentleman tells you that the gigantic power of France hangs on the brittle life of an individual. But do you believe it? Are you such drivellers in politics as to believe that the fate of such a military despotism hangs on the life of one man. If Mahomet II. had been killed under the walls of Constantinople, would the destiny of the Greek empire have been changed? Would not the power have passed into the hands of some Solyman of Selim, the terror of the civilized world? Shall we abandon practice for theory?

In some respects we are situated as the successors of Alexander were placed in relation to Rome and Carthage. Here is an iron republic, or call it what you will, that threatens the liberties of mankind; The government above all others in Europe, to which our own is most hateful and obnoxious. This is beyond dispute. Does it become us to facilitate its designs? I do not enquire as to motives, nor will that government care about them. If you give it facilities to effect its purposes, those purposes are obtained so far as depends on you. Is this wise, is it proper, is it right? Am I asked for my plan? If I meant to act efficiently, I would have begun with an embargo---I would now do what was done before ---I would treat with Great-Britain, and for the very reason that I would not have treated with her in the year 1794; for the same reason that the gentleman, whose resolution is now under discussion, then treated with her, I would not: now he is for war, I am for negociation and peace. And why? Because the state of nations has since undergone a momentous change; disastrous changes indeed have been effected in the face of things. We often hear of the abuses and corruptions of the British government; whilst the continental despotisms pass unnoticed and unregarded. Let us beware of introducing sush abuses into our own---We have no farther concern with them. Do gentlemen think worse of the character and motives of William Pitt than of Robespierre, and yet, monster as he was, Robespierre---that cannibal of his own countrymen, was in his day the sole bulwark of the human race. And whatever be her motives or professions, Great-Britain now stands exactly in the place of France twelve years ago. Take her navy out of the way to-morrow, and where are you? The secretary of the navy has indeed reported that the Chesapeake is fit for service, and that the Constitution is in a state of thorough repair, but would the real *Chesapeake*, the *bay*, be fit for use in that case, and what would be the operation on the actual constitution of the United States? Sir, I am opposed to a French war, as well as to a war with England. I would treat with England for another reason. I wish we had not a commercial treaty with any nation whatever. I am opposed to them on principle: but the principle is already settled. We have them. By your treaties with her enemies your hands are tied up from taking against them, any such measures as the one proposed; *they* are to be admitted on the terms of the most favored nation. This is probably one of the principal causes of disgust to England. Again, she made an offer to repeal her discriminating duties, if you would do so too; to trade with us upon even terms. By mercantile clamor you were deterred from meeting her half way: moreover, you have refused to ratify treaties with her, after they had been signed by your own minister. No doubt you had the right to do so. But can you be surprised under such circumstances that a haughty commercial rival has been irritated. After your obligations to France, who cannot receive a single pound of sugar or coffee, but under cover of your flag, who is dependent upon you for services which she cannot render herself, who is *not* your rival in commerce, what can you expect from a jealous competitor in trade who stands not in need of your navigation—whose every advance towards a good understanding has received a mortifying repulse? Sir, you have at this moment a negociation pending with Great Britain. You have no cause to despair of its success: far otherwise. The plain question is, will you await its issue, or will you, *pendente lite*, precipitate yourself into a measure, which must put all negociations aside, which must eventuate in war. If you want war, there is no doubt that you may have it. G. Britain will not submit to all the hardships and mischiefs of war, becaus you choose to call it peace. She will prefer open war to war in disguise: and I, sir, have no hesitation in saying, that I am for no half measures. Begin that system when you will, war or disgrace must grow out of it. I am for neither. The gentleman indeed says that this, which has been denounced as a war measure, is a measure of peace. Let us have no more *quasi* wars, I beseech you, sir—no half measures, no intermediate stage, but open war, or peace. I abhor this political quackery. Give us war, or negociation; if you resort to the one, let us abandon the other. But we are asked if American virtue will so far degrade & debase itself as to treat with the old & corrupt government of England? There is a plain answer to this. You have a treaty with her now, with every government, I believe, that would make one with you. But whilst we boast our virtue, let us beware that our own sins are not cast into our teeth. Let us see how far these punctilios are warranted by the conduct of our own agents. Look to the management of the convention of Paris of the 30th April, 1803. You have all seen the case of the New-Jersey, Nicklin and Griffith's ship. It has created a general sensation. And what is the fact? Compared with others, they have almost nothing to complain of. Bad as that case is, it is amongst the least exceptionable instances of misconduct in your ministry at Paris. It is true, Nicklin and Griffith's claim was cut down, I believe one half, because the sum appropriated would not otherwise (it was feared) be sufficient to answer all the drafts of chicanery upon it. These men were therefore mulcted fifty percent They are rich merchants—able to make their case known. It has been heard, and has rung thro' the continent There are hundreds of cases even worse than this. The claims intended to be proved for are set aside. Why? Because government has been represented abroad by unfaithful, dishonest agents Have they been called to account for their conduct? Three millions seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars stipulated to be paid, to bona fide American citizens—where have they gone? Into the pockets of renegadoes and the bureaux of Paris. Yes, the traders in neutral character have divided the spoil with the harpies of the French bureaux. These are they, in whose favor the bills have been drawn on the treasury of the United States by their own minister.--- Take the case of the Pigou---There was no question, indeed as to her being American property---but she was captured *flagrante bello:* —(when we were taking the Insurgente and Berceau) she was therefore good prize, and condemned accordingly. Yet the decision of the inferior court was reversed by the council of prizes, and this case brought within the convention---to the exclusion, no doubt, of bona fide claims for *neutral* American property captured and condemned, and for which the convention was intended to provide. This is a specimen of the mode of doing business at Paris If gentlemen doubt upon the subject, let them call on the secretary of state, for the correspondence of the commissioners. Let them call for John Mercer, one of those commissioners, a man inferior to few in point of talents; in point of character to none. Put him to the bar and examine him.

Painful as it is to me, I must defend my principles and those of my friends. Open your statute book—what does it say? That the shores and waters of the bay and river Mobile shall form a district—I brought in the bill myself. The executive had informed us, that we had purchased from France as far as the Perdido, to the east. We legislated upon it. Whence have arisen your disputes with Spain. From Pensacola or St. Augustine? No—from the very country which the statute book says is yours—in your own collection district are Spanish duties exacted and paid, from this very quarter incursions have been made into the old United States. Do gentlemen believe that this fact will be lost on Great-Britain? But we are asked by (Mr. Smilie) what has she to do with differences between us and Spain? What right has she to interfere, to enquire, or even to know, to seem conscious of what has passed in that quarter? Is this intended as a serious question? Because you have clapped a padlock upon your own mouths and wilfully shut your eyes, do you expect to hoodwink an eagle-eyed adversary? 'Tis in vain to expect that any nation in her intercourse with you, will be blind to your conduct towards others. G. Britain must shut her eyes and ears too, not to understand the state of things here—at least negatively speaking. She must know that you have taken no imposing attitude towards Spain, done nothing to strengthen the Southern frontiers, made no addition to your naval or military force, left even the militia *in statu quo ante*. Because the doors have been shut, can people be brought to believe that we have raised armies & equipped fleets in conclave? I never heard, sir, but of one army incog, and that was levied by the facetious Mr. Bayes for the service of the stage, not of the state---and from some dramatic specimens which I have lately seen, I should not be surprised to hear of a similar project being started on this floor. G. Britain will see, then what has *not* been your proceeding towards Spain. She will say, shall I suffer myself to be browbeaten by a nation, clamoring for the right of highway, that has not spirit enough to defend her own domicile? If A. acts like a poltroon towards B. who has committed a gross outrage upon him, and shall have a subsequent controversy with C. shall he pretend to bully him, and expect C. not to call to mind his cowardly behavior with B and treat him accordingly? One foreign nation will be influenced, will be governed in her concerns with you by your concessions to another, and it is the idlest thing in the world to expect that your treatment by one government will not have an effect on the deportment of others towards you.

One word more, sir, before I conclude. Gentlemen miscalculate if they suppose that mere *authority* (much less at second-hand) will do for us. They must shew us something better before we swallow their resolution. 'Tis an infirmity, sir, of my nature that I cannot yield to the imposing sound of great names; they never did and they never shall put me to silence, or drive me from my purpose. I am apprised of the secret denunciations which are on foot and I despise them. They shall never affect me; I came into public life with these principles, and I will leave it with them, leave it when I may.

BOSTON, March 24.

Late from Rotterdam.

The ship Rolla, captain Cottle, arrived here yesterday, in 30 days from Rotterdam. He brings some Dutch papers to the 15th February, but they contain no fresh intelligence of continental events.

RUMOR.

A report was in circulation on Saturday last said to have been received from France, by the way of New-London, that the emperor Napoleon had been assassinated at one of of the public theatres in Paris; and that several leading members of the government, as well as general officers, were arrested on a suspicion of being agents in the conspiracy. How, or in what manner this report originated, we know not. We have an arrival here, from Rotterdam, as late as the 19th February, which makes no mention of any event of this kind.

Bonaparte has adopted all the children of his troops killed at Austerlitz. They are to be supported and educated at the public expence; and to take the name of Napoleon. The widows made by the battle are to be pensioned at the expence of the German empire.

NEW-YORK, March 28.

A letter received in this city from St. Marcs, mentions, that the ship Leander, capt. Lewis, arrived at Jacmel about the 17th February.

The Leander sailed from this port on the 2d of February.

As the letter does not state her having touched at any other port, we presume that she has carried general Miranda and those engaged in his expedition, *direct* to that place.

Extract of a letter from a respectable gentleman in Nantz, dated 13th ult. to his friend in this city.

"A peace with England is now likely to take place soon—it is a very desirable event, and particularly for this unfortunate city. The pope is coming to reside at Versailles, and prince Borghese, brother-in-law of Bonaparte, is to be sovereign of Rome. Many other important changes are expected."

A letter received in town from France states, that the pope is about to take up his residence in Paris, which is to be the future abode of St. Peter's successors, and that the ecclesiastics of the Romish church are no longer to live a life of celibacy. The letter farther states, that Talleyrand and Fouche have been created princes—they richly deserve the honor, Bonaparte being emperor. Instead of king of Italy, Eugene Beauharnois, alias Napoleon, is to be invested with the title of king of the Romans.

Arrived, brig Friendship, Don, New-Orleans; schs. Samuel, Hudson, Richmond; Susan, Allen, Savannah; Jane, Bell, Charleston; Dolphin, Valentine, Savannah; sloops Industry, Banks, Newbern; Industry, Keeny, New-London; Culloden, Richmond; Patty, Clark, Norfolk.

Cleared, brig Fox, Thorndike, for Amsterdam; and schooner Venus, for Wilmington, N. C.

PHILADELPHIA, March 29.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman in Bordeaux, to his friend in this city, dated Feb. 14, 1806.

"The last letters from Paris talk of war again on the continent, but do not mention with what powers"

Arrived, ship Lewis William, Hartwell, Bordeaux, 30 days; brig South-Carrolina, Serrill, Charleston, 9 days.

Cleared, ships Liberty, Riley, Liverpool; Amsterdam Packet, Smith, Hamburg; brig Cyrus, Smith, Havana.

Yesterday arrived the ship Lewis William, captain Hartwell, in 29 days from Bordeaux. Sailed from the Cordavan, on the 23d of February, in company with the ships Missouri, Kennedy, of and for Philadelphia; Susan and Sarah, Mariner, of New-York, for Norfolk; Independence, Hunter, of and for New-York, and a brig belonging to Boston, captain Brown. February 26, lat. 45, 50, longitude 8, W. was brought to by a lugger privateer, hailed us and asked what cargo, and ordered us to proceed, could not ascertain of what nation she was, as she shewed no colors. March 10, lat 42, 13 long. 47, spoke the ship Thomas Turner, 17 days from Bordeaux, bound to New-York.

The brig Jane, of Philadelphia, had just arrived at Royan Rhodes.

NORFOLK, March 25.

Arrived, ship Sheffield, Carpenter, 38 days from Bordeaux On the 20th of Feb. spoke in lat. 45, 56, long. 4, 00, the ship Aurora, Alexander, from New-Orleans bound to Bordeaux, 35 days out, and on the 27th, in lat 49, 49, long. 14, 3, the ship Golden Rule, Boyd, from Savannah bound to Liverpool, out 25 days.

Susan and Sarah, Marner, 28 days from Bordeaux. Left the Cordovan the 22d Feb. in company with the ships Lewis, Williams, and Missouri, for Philadelphia; Independence, of and for New York; brig Sally, of and for Boston; ship Arcturus, Main, sailed for New-York the 21st Feb. Spoke, March 19th, in lat. 35, 55, long 67, 58, the sloop Revenue, Noyes, 23 days out from Turks Island for New-London, supplied her with provisions and a foresail.

List of American vessels left at Bordeaux the 18th February.

Ships, Ulysses, Simmonds, for New-Oleans; Philipsburg, Liffingwell, do. both ready to sail; Mary Ann Burk, for New York; Garland, Snow, for Boston; Providence, Gibson of Philadelphia, to sail in 10 days for New Orleans; *Robert, Briscol, of Philadelphia to sail in 10 days for Baltimore; Elizabeth, Jordan, of and for Baltemore in 10 days;* Morning-Star, Hopkins, of and for Boston in 4 days; Nancy, Thompson, of New-York; Jane, Green, of New Haven, for Boston in 8 days; Titus, Custing, Philadelphia; Livinia, Hill, of Philadelphia; Eliza Ann, Burgher, New-York; Bellisarius, Prior, of Duxbury; Hampshire, Talbert, Philadelphia; Baltic, Missroon, Charleston; Brigs Bellisarius, Holmes, New-York; Vigilant, Dodd, Boston; Hope, Fisher, Charleston, going to the Isle of Rhe, for salt; Betsey and Patty, Fowler, in 4 days for Charleston; New-Orleans Packet, Pierce, for New-Orleans; Ship-Wright, Doak, in 20 days for Boston; Josephine, ——, of Norfolk; Resolution, Barker, cleared for New-York; *Orient, Dinsmore, Baltimore;* Eliza, Simpman, Boston; Neptune, Crafts, New-York; Lydia, Webb, Philadelphia; Mary, Rich, Boston; Olivia, Tibner, New-York; Only Son, Davis, Boston; Schooners Joseph, Graves, Marblehead; Amity, Dolliver, do. Ann, Francis, in 8 days for do Bellisarius, Gooseberry, in 8 days for Boston; Venus, Allen, in 8 days for Weymouth.

Sch'r Ann Maria, Davis, 17 days from Tobago. Left there, the brigs Alliance, Rankin, for Kennebeck in 12 days; Sally, Prescott, for Portsmouth, (N. H.) in all February; Alert, Rollins, discharging; schooners Experiment, Nash, of Norfolk to sail in 10 days for St. Bartholomews; Hope and Sally, Harris, for Norfolk; Alert, Darling, of Newburyport; Delphin, Oakes, of ——, in 15 days; Unity, Perkins; brig Liberty, ——, Kennebeck; ship Fredonia, Richardson, from Norfolk; sloop Favorite, Brown, to sail for Norfolk in 10 days.

Ship Huntress, Chace, 48 days from Liverpool; the ships Monticello, Wilson; Latona, Huston; and Mercury, Hodge, sailed from Liverpool, for this port, 7 days before the Huntress. The Intrepid, Steed, from this port arrived at Liverpool in 21 days from this port.

Schooner Comfort, Drummond, 4 days from Charleston.

Sch'r Fair American, De Butts, 32 days from Antigua.

The ship Willing Maid, Hall, of and from this port, bound to Campeachy, went on the Bahama Banks, in a gale the 27th February; vessel and cargo totally lost, crew saved.

Cleared, ships Redligheten, Fagerberg, Lisbon; Princess Wilhelmina, Kiohn, do. Alexander, King, Liverpool.

Sale by Auction.

On SATURDAY next,

At 3 o'clock in the afternoon, at No. 191, Market-street, two doors above the Indian Queen, will commence the sale of the entire STOCK IN TRADE, *of a person about to retire from the Book-selling business,*

CONSISTING OF

An extensive and valuable collection of BOOKS on

DIVINITY	LAW
HISTORY	SCIENCES
VOYAGES	ARTS
TRAVELS	ARCHITECTURE
PHILOSOPHY	MISCELLANIES, &c. &c.
GEOGRAPHY	

With a variety of the Classics, School and Blank Books, &c. &c. And a variety of Quills and other stationary.

The sale will be continued from day to day, until the whole is disposed of.

SOWER & S. COLE, Auct's.

The articles are now arranged, and ready for immediate inspection.

March 27. d5t

Jesse Hollingsworth

HAS FOR SALE,

Rhode-Island POTATOES of the *early* kind, fit for shipping, and particularly so for seed or family use.

March 28. eo3t§