Eastern Shore General Advertiser.

EASTON—(MARYLAND) Printed and Published every *Tuesday Morning*, by THOMAS PERRIN SMITH, Printer of the LAWS of the UNITED STATES.

[VOL. II.....14.] TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 2, 1813. [No. 27.....554.]

THE TERMS OF THE STAR,

Are *Two Dollars and Fifty Cents* per annum, payable half yearly, in advance: No paper can be discontinued until the same is paid for.

Advertisements are inserted three weeks for *One Dollar*, and continued weekly for *Twenty-Five Cents* per square.

CHANCERY SALE.

By virtue of a Decree of the High Court of Chancery,

The subscriber will expose to public sale, at Lowe's tavern in Easton, on Monday the 8th day of March next, if fair, if not, the next fair day thereafter—That valuable tract of LAND, lying in Talbot county, called *Rolle's Range*, containing 217 acres, mortgaged by John Rolle to Mary Harrison. It is deemed unnecessary to give a further description of this property, as it is presumed those who wish to purchase will view the premises previous to the sale. Sale to commence at 12 o'clock.

LOUIS GASSAWAY, Trustee.

The Terms of Sale are

The purchaser or purchasers to pay the purchase money on the day of sale, or on the ratification thereof by the Chancellor; and on payment of the purchase money, the subscriber will convey.

LOUIS GASSAWAY, Trustee.

feb. 16——3*

VALUABLE PROPERTY FOR SALE.

To be sold at public sale, on Tuesday, the ninth day of March next,

That large and excellent Brick House and Lot in New Market (Dorchester county) now occupied by capt. *Alexander Tarlton*, and a small brick house and lot in the said village—And also, a small farm containing about 120 acres, near New Market. Sale to be at Capt. Tarlton's, and terms made known on the day of sale, by

ARTHUR RICH.

feb. 16——3

LAND FOR SALE.

Will be offered at public sale, on the premises, on MONDAY the 5th of April next,

A Tract of LAND situated in Dorchester county, on the main road from Vienna to Chicknecomico Bridge, and about 3 miles from each place. The tract contains three hundred acres of valuable land, and well timbered with white oak, fit for ship building. One third of the purchase money will be required on the day of sale, the balance in two equal annual instalments, and possession given the first of January, 1814. An indisputable title will be given to the purchaser, on his compliance with the terms of sale.

THOMAS DAFFIN,
EDWARD N. HAMBLETON.

feb. 23——6

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN,

That the time of receiving subscriptions for Stock in the City Bank of Baltimore, allotted to Dorchester county, as published in the Star, of the 9th inst. is put off until Tuesday, 16th of March next.

RICHD. GOLDSBOROUGH,
RICHD. HAYWARD,
JAMES CHAPLAIN, } Comm'rs.

Cambridge, feb. 16——5

MERINO SHEEP.

The subscriber offers for sale Merino Lambs of the present season, at the following prices:

Full-blood Ram Lambs at			$50
3-4	do.	do.	10
1-2	do.	do.	6

Persons wishing to purchase must make application on or before the first of April, and the lambs must be taken away by the 10th of July.

EDWARD LLOYD.

feb 23——4

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN,

That the Levy Court for Talbot county will attend on THURSDAY the 4th day of March next, for the purpose of appointing Constables—and also on the 6th of April next, to appoint Overseers of the public roads in said county.

J. LOOCKERMAN, Clk.

feb. [illegible]——2

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
WASHINGTON CITY,
12th February, 1813.

GENERAL ORDERS.

All regimental officers and soldiers on furlough, and belonging to the several corps of the army on or near the Niagara river, are hereby directed to join their respective corps immediately.

By order of the Secretary of War.
T. H. CUSHING, Adj. Gen.

☞ Printers authorised to publish the laws of the Union, are requested to insert the preceding notice three times in their respective papers.

feb. 23——3

SCHOOLMASTER WANTED

A man that can come well recommended to take charge of a School in a healthy part of the county, will receive a liberal salary by immediate application to

HUGH AULD, or
JAMES DAWSON.

feb. 23——3

CASH

Will be given for a good Cook, either male or female, that is honest and sober—and for an Ostler and Carriage-Driver of the same character—Also for a good Seamstress. Apply to the Editor of the Star.

Talbot county, feb. 23——3

FOR SALE

A Negro BOY, about 18 years of age, who is acquainted with farm work, and has acted as a waiter and ostler. Apply at this office.

jan. [illegible]——m

THIS IS TO GIVE NOTICE,

To all my Creditors,

That I intend to offer *a Petition* to the honorable the judges of Talbot county court, at their next May term, for the benefit of the act of Assembly, entitled "an act for the relief of insolvent debtors," passed at November session 1809, and of the several supplements thereto.

JOHN DAVIS, Ship Carpenter,
Talbot county.

☞ Michael Nelson, [illegible]

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 8.

DEBATE ON THE NEW ARMY BILL.

MR. CLAY'S SPEECH,

(CONCLUDED.)

I omitted yesterday, sir, when speaking of a very delicate and painful subject, to notice a powerful engine which the conspirators against the integrity of the Union employ to effect their nefarious purpose—I mean Southern influence—The true friend to his country, knowing that our constitution was the work of compromise, in which interests apparently conflicting were attempted to be reconciled, aims to extinguish or allay prejudices. But this patriotic exertion does not suit the views of those who are urged on by diabolical ambition. They find it convenient to imagine the existence of certain improper influences, and to propagate with their utmost industry belie of them. Hence the idea of Southern preponderance—Virginia influence—the yoking of the respectable yeomanry of the north, with the negro slaves, to the car of southern nabobs. If Virginia really cherished a reprehensible ambition, and aimed to monopolize the chief magistracy of the country, how was such a purpose to be accomplished? Virginia, alone, cannot elect a President, whose elevation depends upon a plurality of electoral votes and a consequent concurrence of many states. Would Vermont, disinterested Pennsylvania, the Carolinas, independent Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Louisiana, all consent to become the tools of an inordinate ambition? But the present incumbent was designated to the office before his predecessor had retired. How? By public sentiment—public sentiment which grew out of his known virtues, his illustrious services, and his distinguished abilities. Would the gentleman crush this public sentiment—is he prepared to admit that he would arrest the progress of opinion?

The war was declared because Great Britain arrogated to herself the pretension of regulating our foreign trade under the decisive name of retaliatory orders in council—a pretension by which she undertook to proclaim to American enterprize—"Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther" Orders which she refused to revoke after the alledged cause of their enactment had ceased; because she persisted in the practice of impressing American seamen; because she had instigated the Indians to commit hostilities against us; and because she refused indemnity for her past injuries upon our commerce. I throw out of the question other wrongs. The war in fact was announced, on our part, to meet the war which she was waging on her part. So undeniable were the causes of the war—so powerfully did they address themselves to the feelings of the whole American people, that when the bill was pending before this House, gentlemen in the opposition, although provoked to debate, would not, or could not, utter one syllable against it. It is true they wrapped themselves up in sullen silence, pretending that they did not choose to debate such a question in secret session. Whilst speaking of the proceedings on that occasion, I beg to be permitted to advert to another fact that transpired—an important fact, material for the nation to know, and which I have often regretted had not been spread upon our journals. My honorable colleague (Mr. M'Kee) moved, in committee of the whole, to comprehend France in the war! and when the question was taken upon the proposition, there appeared but ten votes in support of it, of whom, seven belonged to this side of the House, and three only to the other!

It is said that we were inveigled into the war by the perfidy of France; and that had she furnished the document in time, which was first published in England, in May last, it would have been prevented. I will concede to gentlemen every thing they ask about the injustice of France towards this country. I wish to God that our ability was equal to our disposition to make her feel the sense we entertain of that injustice. The manner of the publication of the paper in the question, was undoubtedly extremely exceptionable. But I maintain that, had it made its appearance earlier, it would not have had the effect supposed; and the proof lies in the unequivocal declarations of the British government. I will trouble you, sir, with going no further back than to the letters of the British minister, addressed to the Secretary of State, just before the expiration of his diplomatic functions. It will be recollected by the committee that he exhibited to this government a dispatch from Lord Castlereagh, in which the principle was distinctly avowed, that to produce the effect of a repeal of the orders in council, the French decrees must be absolutely and entirely revoked as to all the world, and not as to America alone. A copy of that dispatch was demanded of him, and he very awkwardly evaded it. But on the 16th of June, after the bill declaring war had actually passed this House, and was pending before the Senate (and which, I have no doubt, was known to him) in a letter to Mr. *Monroe*, he says: "I have no hesitation, sir, in saying that Great Britain, as the case has hitherto stood, never did, nor ever *could* engage, without the greatest injustice to herself and her allies, as well as to other neutral nations, to repeal her orders as affecting America alone, leaving them in force against other states, upon condition that France would except singly and specially America from the operation of her decrees." On the 11th of the same month, the bill still pending before the Senate, he repeats: "I will now say, that I feel entirely authorized to assure you, that if you can at any time produce a *full and unconditional* repeal of the French decrees, as you have a right to demand it in your character of a neutral nation, and that it be disengaged from any question concerning our maritime rights, we shall be ready to meet you with a revocation of the orders in council. Previously to your producing *such* an instrument, which I am sorry to see you regard as unnecessary, you cannot expect of us to give up our orders in council." Thus, sir, you see that the British government would not be content with a repeal of the French decrees as to us only. But the French paper in question was such a repeal. It could not, therefore, have induced that government, had it been earlier promulgated, to repeal her orders in council. It could not, therefore, have averted the war. The withholding of it did not occasion the war, and the promulgation of it would not have prevented the war. But gentlemen have contended that, in point of fact, it did produce a repeal of the orders in council. This I deny. After it made its appearance in England, it was declared by one of the British ministry, in Parliament, not to be satisfactory, and all the world knows that the repeal of the orders in council resulted from the inquiry, reluctantly acceded to by the ministry, into the effect upon their manufacturing establishments, of our non-importation law, or to the warlike attitude assumed by this government, or to both. But it is said, that the orders in council are done away, no matter from what cause; and that having been the sole motive for declaring the war, the relations of peace ought to be restored. This brings me into an examination of the grounds for continuing the war.

I am far from acknowledging that, had the orders in council been repealed, as they have been, before the war was declared, the declaration would have been prevented. In a body so numerous as this is, from which the declaration emanated, it is impossible to say with any degree of certainty what would have been the effect of such a repeal. Each member must answer for himself. I have no hesitation, then, in saying, that I have always considered the impressment of American seamen as much the most serious aggression. But, sir, how have those orders at last been repealed?—Great Britain, it is true, has intimated a willingness to suspend their practical operation, but she still arrogates to herself the right to revive them upon certain contingencies, of which she constitutes herself the sole judge. She waves the temporary use of the rod, but she suspends it in terrorem over our heads. Supposing it was conceded to gentlemen that such a repeal of the orders in council, as took place on the 23d of June last, exceptionable as it is, being known before the war, would have prevented the war, does it follow that it ought to induce us to lay down our arms, without the redress of any other injury? Does it follow, in all cases, that that which would have prevented the war in the first instance, should terminate the war? By no means. It requires a great struggle for a nation, prone to peace as this is, to burst through its habits and encounter the difficulties of war. Such a nation ought but seldom to go to war. When it does, it should be for clear and essential rights alone, and it should firmly resolve to extort, at all hazards, their recognition. The war of the revolution is an example of a war began for one object and prosecuted for another. It was waged, in its commencement, against the right asserted by the parent country to tax the colonies. Then no one thought of absolute independence. The idea of independence was repelled. But the British government should have relinquished the principle of taxation. The founders of our liberties saw, however, that there was no security short of independence, and they achieved our independence. When nations are engaged in war, those rights in controversy, which are not acknowledged by the treaty of peace, are abandoned. And who is prepared to say that American seamen shall be surrendered, the victims to the British principle of impressment?—And, sir, what is this principle? She contends that she has a right to the services of her own subjects; that, in the exercise of this right, she may lawfully impress them, even out of her own vessels, upon the high seas, without her jurisdiction. Now, I deny she has any right, without her jurisdiction, to come on board our vessels, upon the high seas, for any other purpose but pursuit of enemies, or their goods, or goods contraband of war. But she further contends, that her subjects cannot renounce their allegiance to her and contract a new obligation to other sovereigns. I do not mean to go into the general question of the right expatriation. If, as is contended, all nations, deny it, all nations at the same time admit and practice the right of naturalization Great Britain herself does. Great Britain, in the very case of foreign seamen, imposes, perhaps, fewer restraints upon naturalization than any other nation. Then, if subjects cannot break their original allegiance, they may, according to universal usage, contract a new allegiance.——What is the effect of this double obligation?—Undoubtedly, that the sovereign having the right to the services of the subject. If he return within the jurisdiction of his primitive sovereign, he may resume his right to his services, of which the subject, by his own act, could not divest himself. But his primitive sovereign can have no right to go in quest of him, out of his own jurisdiction, into the jurisdiction of another sovereign, or upon the high seas, where there exists either no jurisdiction, or it belongs to the nation owning the ship navigating them. But, sir, this discussion is altogether useless. It is not to the British principle, objectionable as it is, that we are alone to look—it is to her practice—no matter what guise she puts on. It is in vain to assert the inviolability of the obligation of allegiance. It is in vain to set up the plea of necessity, and to alledge that she cannot exist without the impressment of HER seamen. The naked truth is, she comes, by her pressgangs, on board of our vessels, seizes OUR native seamen, as well as naturalized, and drags them into her service. It is the case, then, of the assertion of an erroneous principle—and a practice not conformable to the principle—principle which, if it were theoretically right, must be for ever practically wrong. We are told, by gentlemen in the opposition, that government has not done all that was incumbent on it to do to avoid just cause of complaint on the part of Great Britain—that, in particular, the certificates of protection, authorized by the act of 1796, are fraudulently used. Sir, government has done too much in granting those paper protections I can never think of them without being shocked. They resemble the passes which the master grants to his negro slave, "Let the bearer, Mungo, pass and repass without molestation." What do they imply? That Great Britain has a right to take all who are not provided with them. From their very nature they must be liable to abuse on both sides. If G. Britain desires a mark by which she can know her own subjects, let her give them an ear mark. The colors that float from the mast head should be the credentials of our seamen. There is no safety to us, and the gentlemen have shewn it, but in the rule that all who sail under the flag (not being enemies) are protected by the flag. It is impossible that this country should ever abandon the gallant tars, who have won for us such splendid trophies. Let me suppose that the genius of Columbia should visit one of them in his oppressors prison, and attempt to reconcile him to his wretched condition. She would say to him, in the language of gentlemen on the other side, 'Great Britain intends you no harm; she did not mean to impress you, but one of her own subjects; having taken you by mistake, I will remonstrate, and try to prevail upon her, by peaceable means, to release you, but I cannot; arise, son, fight for you.' If he did not consider this mockery, he would address her judgment and say, 'You owe me, my country, protection; I owe you, in return, obedience. I am no British subject, I am a native born old Massachusetts, where live my aged father, my wife, my children. I have faithfully discharged my duty. Will you refuse to do yours?' Appealing to her passions, he would continue, 'I lost this eye in fighting under Truxton, with the Insurgents; I got this scar before Tripoli; I broke this leg on board the Constitution, when the Guerriere struck.' If she remained still unmoved, he would break out, in the accents of mingled distress and despair,

Hard, hard, is my fate! once I freedom enjoyed,
Was as happy as happy could be!
Oh! how hard is my fate, how galling these chains!

I will not imagine the dreadful catastrope to which he would be driven by an abandonment of him to his oppressor. It will not be, it cannot be, that his country will refuse him protection.

It is said, that G. Britain has been always willing to make a satisfactory arrangement of the subject of impressment; and that Mr. King had nearly concluded one prior to his departure from that country. Let us hear what that minister says upon his return to America. In his letter dated at New York in July, 1803, after giving an account of his attempt to form an arrangement for the protection of our seamen, and his interview to this end with Lords Hawkesbury and St. Vincent; and stating that, when he had supposed the terms of a convention were agreed upon, a new pretension was set up (the *mare clausum*), he concludes: 'I regret not to have been able to put this business on a satisfactory footing, knowing as I do its very great importance to both parties, but I flatter myself that I have not misjudged the interests of our own country, in refusing to sanction a principle that might be productive of more extensive evils than those it was our aim to prevent.' The sequel of his negociation, on this affair is more fully given in the recent conversation between Mr. Russell and Lord Castlereagh, communicated to Congress during its present session. Lord Castlereagh says to Mr. Russell:—

"Indeed there has evidently been much misapprehension on this subject, and an erroneous belief entertained that an arrangement, in regard to it, has been nearer an accomplishment than the facts will warrant. Even our friends in Congress, I mean those who were opposed to going to war with us, have been so confident in this mistake, they have ascribed the failure of such an arrangement solely to the misconduct of the American government. This error probably originated with Mr. King, for being much esteemed here, and always well received by the persons in power, he seems to have misconstrued their readiness to listen to his representations, and their warm professions of a disposition to remove the complaints of America, in relation to impressment, into a supposed conviction on their part of the propriety of adopting the plan which he had proposed. But Lord St. Vincent, whom he might have thought he had brought over to his opinions, appears never for a moment to have ceased to regard all arrangement on the subject to be attended with formidable, if not insurmountable obstacles. This is obvious from a letter which his lordship addressed to Sir Wm. Scott at the time. Here Lord Castlereagh read a letter, contained in the records before him, in which Lord St. Vincent states to Sir William Scott the zeal with which Mr. King had assailed him on the subject of impressment, confesses his own perplexity and total incompetency to discover any practical project for the safe discontinuance of that practice, and asks your counsel and advice.——'Thus you see,' proceeded L'd Castlereagh, 'that the confidence of Mr. King on this subject was entirely unfounded.

Thus it is apparent, that, at no time, has the enemy been willing to place this subject on a satisfactory footing: I will speak hereafter of the overtures made by administration since the war.

The honorable gentleman from N. York (Mr. Bleecker), in the very sensible speech with which he favored the committee, made one observation that did not comport with his usual liberal and enlarged views. It was that those who are most interested against the practice of impressment did not desire a continuance of the war on account of it, whilst those (the southern and western members) who had no interest in it, were the zealous advocates of the American seamen. It was a provincial sentiment unworthy of that gentleman. It was one which, in a change of condition, he would not express, because I know he could not feel it. Does not that gentleman feel for the unhappy victims of the tomahawk in the Western country, although his quarter of the Union may be exempted from similar barbarities? I am sure he does. If there be a description of rights which, more than any other, should unite all parties in all quarters of the Union, it is unquestionably the rights of the person. No matter what his vocation; whether he seeks subsistence amidst the dangers of the deep, or draws it from the bowels of the earth, or from the humblest occupations of mechanic life: whenever the sacred rights of an American freeman are assailed, all hearts ought to unite and every arm should be braced to vindicate his cause.

The gentleman from Delaware sees in Canada no object worthy of conquest.——According to him, it is a cold, sterile, and inhospitable region. And yet, such are the allurements which it offers, that the same gentleman apprehends that, if it be annexed to the U. States, already too much weakened by an extension of territory, the people of New England will rush over the line and depopulate that section of the Union! That gentleman considers it honest to hold Canada as a kind of hostage, to regard it as a sort of bond, for the good behaviour of the enemy. But he will not enforce the bond. The actual conquest of that country would, according to him, make no impression upon the enemy, and yet the very apprehension only of such a conquest would at all times have a powerful operation upon him!——Other gentlemen consider the invasion of that country as wicked and unjustifiable. Its inhabitants are represented as unoffending, connected with those of the bordering states by a thousand tender ties, interchanging acts of kindness, and all the offices of good neighborhood; Canada, said Mr. C. innocent! Canada unoffending!—Is it not in Canada that the tomahawk of the savage has been moulded into its death-like form? From Canadian magazines, Malden and others, that those supplies have been issued which nourish and sustain the Indian hostilities? Supplies which have enabled the savage hordes to besiege the garrison of Chicago, and to commit other horrible murders? Was it not by the joint cooperation of Canadians and Indians that a remote American fort, Michilimackinac, was taken upon and reduced, in ignorance of a state of war? But, sir, how soon have the opposition changed.——When administration was striving, by the operation of peaceful measures, to bring Great Britain back to a sense of justice, they were for old fashioned war. And now that they have got old fashioned war, their sensibilities are cruelly shocked, and all their sympathies are lavished upon the harmless inhabitants of the adjoining provinces! What does a state of war present? The united energies of one people arrayed against the combined energies of another—a conflict in which each party aims to inflict all the injury it can, by sea and land, upon the territories, property and citizens of the other, subject only to the rules of mitigated war, practised by civilized nations.——The gentlemen would not touch the continental provinces of the enemy, nor, I presume, for the same reason, her possession in the West Indies. The same human spirit would spare the seamen and soldiers of the enemy. The sacred person of his majesty must not be attacked, for the learned gentlemen on the other side, are quite familiar with the maxim, that the King can do no wrong. Indeed, sir, I know of no person on whom we may make war, upon the principles of the honourable gentlemen, but Mr. Stephen, the celebrated author of the Orders in Council, or the Board of Admiralty, who authorise and regulate the practice of impressment!

The disasters of the war admonish us, we are told of the necessity of terminating the contest.—If our achievements upon the land have been less splendid than those of our intrepid seamen, it is not because the American soldier is less brave.—On the one element organization, discipline, & a thorough knowledge of their duties exist, on the part of the officers and their men. On the other, almost every thing is yet to be acquired.——We have however the consolation that our country abounds with the richest materials, and that in no instance when engaged in action have our arms been tarnished. At Brownstown and at Queenstown the valor of veteran [illegible] and acts of the noblest heroism were [illegible]. It is true, that the disgrace of Detroit remains to be wiped off. That is a subject on which I cannot trust my feelings, it is not fitting I should speak. But this much I will say, it was an event which no human foresight could have anticipated and for which administration cannot be justly censured. It was the parent of all the misfortunes we have experienced on land. But for it the Indian war would have [illegible] a great measure prevented or terminated [illegible] ascendancy on Lake Erie acquired, and [illegible] pushed perhaps to Montreal. With the exception of that event, the war, even upon the land, has been attended by a series of the most brilliant exploits, which, whatever interest they may inspire on this side of the mountains, have given the greatest pleasure on the other. The expedition under the command of Gov. Edwards and Col. Russell, to Lake Pic[illegible] the Illinois, was completely successful [illegible] of Captain [illegible] ascended that river still higher. [illegible] destroyed the Prophet's town. We have just received intelligence of the gallant enterprise of Col. Campbell. In short, sir, the Indian towns have been swept from the mouth to source of the Wabash, and a hostile country has been penetrated far beyond the most daring incursions of any campaign during the former Indian war. Never was more cool deliberate bravery displayed than that by Newnan's party from Georgia. And the capture of the Detroit, and the destruction of the Caledonia, (whether placed to our maritime or land account) for judgment, skill, and courage on the part of Lieutenant Elliott, has never been surpassed.

It is alledged that the elections in England are in favor of the Ministry, and that those in this country are against the war. If in such a cause (saying nothing of the impurity of their elections) the people of that country have rallied around their government, it affords a salutary lesson to the people here, who at all hazards ought to support their's, struggling as it is to maintain our just rights. But the people here have not been false to themselves; a great majority approve the war, as is evinced by the recent re election of the chief magistrate. Suppose it were even true, that an entire section of the Union were opposed to the war, that section being a minority, is the will of the majority to be relinquished! In that section real strength of the opposition had been greatly exaggerated. Vermont has, by two successive expressions of her opinion, approved the declaration of war. In New Hampshire, parties are so nearly equipoised that out of 80 or 35,000 votes, those, who approved and are for supporting it, lost the election by only 1,000 or 1,500. In Massachusetts alone have they obtained any considerable accession. If we come to N. York, we find that other and local causes have influenced her elections.

What cause, Mr. Chairman, which existed for declaring the war has been removed? We sought indemnity for the past and security for the future. The Orders in Council are suspended, not revoked; no compensation for spoliations. Indian hostilities which were before secretly instigated now openly encouraged; and the practice of impressment unremitting persevered in and insisted upon. Yet administration has given the strongest demonstrations of its love of peace. On the twenty ninth of June, less than ten days after the Declaration of War, the Secretary of State writes to Mr. Russell, authorising him to agree to an armistice, upon what conditions only, and what are they? That the orders in council should be repealed, and the practice of impressing American seamen cease, those already impressed being released. The proposition was for making more than a *civil truce*; that the war should in fact cease on *both sides*. Again, on the 27th July, one month later, anticipating a possible objection to these terms, reasonable as they are, Mr. Monroe empowers Mr. Russell to negotiate in general terms for an armistice, having only an informal understanding on these points. In return, the enemy is offered a prohibition of the employment of his seamen in our service, thus removing entirely all pretext for the practice of impressment. The very proposition which the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Pitkin) contends ought to be made has been made. How are these pacific advances met by the other party? Rejected as absolutely inadmissible, coupled with jubes about the inadequacy of Mr. Russell's powers, and the want of an act of Congress is intimated. And yet the contrast vanishes if I believe it, when the legislation of that nation I believe is, where the legislation of our

---

* It is impossible to describe the pathetic effect produced by this part of the speech. The day was chilling cold, so much so, that Mr. C. has been heard to declare, that it was the only time he ever spoke, when he was unable to keep himself warm by the exercise of speaking, yet there were few eyes that did not testify to the sensibility excited.——[illegible]