

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM PECHIN, (PRINTER OF THE LAWS OF THE UNION.) 31, SOUTH GAY STREET, NEAR THE CUSTOM HOUSE, BALTIMORE.

Daily paper 87 and Country paper 5 per ann. All advertisements appear in both papers.

SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1866.

Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY Feb. 6.

A message, in writing was received from the President of the U. S. by Mr. Coles his secretary, as followeth:

"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:—"

"Since the date of my message of January 7, a letter of the 26th of November has been received from the minister plenipotentiary of the United States, at London, covering one from the Secretary for foreign affairs, of that government, which being on the subject of that message now transmitted for the information of Congress. Altho' nothing forbids the substance of these letters, from being communicated without reserves yet so many ill effects proceed from the publication of correspondences between ministers remaining still in office, that I cannot but recommend that these letters be not permitted to be formally published."

"TH: JEFFERSON."

Feb. 6, 1866.

The said message and letters accompanying it, was read, and ordered to lie on the table.

On a motion made and seconded, to amend the secret Journal in the House in the manner following to wit:

"TUESDAY, December 31, 1865."

"The following motion was laid on the table:

"Resolved, That dollars be appropriated by law, for the purpose of defraying any extraordinary expenses that may be incurred between the U. S. and foreign nations, to be paid out of any monies in the treasury not otherwise appropriated, and to be applied under the direction of the President of the United States; who shall have authority, if necessary, to borrow the said sum, or any part thereof, in behalf of the U. S. at a rate of interest not more than six per centum per annum; and shall cause an account of the expenditure thereof to be laid before Congress, as soon as may be."

"Resolved, That the additional duty of two and an half per centum and valorem imposed by an act, entitled "An Act further to protect the commerce and seamen of the U. S. against the Barbary powers," be continued for years."

"The question was taken "that the journal be so amended," and resolved in the affirmative, by yeas and nays, every member present voting in the affirmative."

A motion was then made and seconded that a committee be appointed to present to the President of the U. S. the resolution agreed to by this House on the 14th ultimo, in the words following, to wit:

"Resolved, That an exchange of territory between the U. S. and Spain is deemed by this House the most advantageous mode of settlement of existing differences respecting differences between the U. S. and the court of Madrid, and that any arrangement between the two governments, which shall secure to Spain an ample barrier on the side of Mexico, and to the U. S. the countries watered by the Mississippi and to the eastward of it, will meet the approbation of this House."

On which motion, debate arising, it was moved and seconded to postpone the consideration thereof until Thursday next.

And decided in the negative—Yeas 57 Nays 64.

Another motion was then made and seconded, to amend the said original motion, by instructing the same committee also to the President of the U. S. another resolution of this House, on the said 14th ultimo, in the words following to wit:

"Resolved, That dollars be appropriated by law, toward defraying the expense which may be incurred, in the purchase of the Spanish territories long on the Atlantic ocean and the Gulf of Mexico and eastward of the Mississippi, to be paid out of any money in the treasury not otherwise appropriated, and to be applied under the direction of the President of the U. S. who shall have authority, if necessary, to borrow the said sum, or any part thereof, in behalf of the U. S. at a rate of interest not exceeding six per centum per annum, redeemable it will; and shall cause an account thereof to be laid before Congress, as soon as may be."

On which motion to amend, the question being taken.

It was refused in the affirmative.

And then the main question being taken, that the House do agree to the said original motion, as now amended.

It was resolved to the affirmative.

Ordered, that Mr. John Randolph, and Mr. Gregg be appointed a committee pursuant thereto.

TUESDAY February 11.

Mr. J. Randolph, from the committee appointed on Thursday last, to present to the President of the U. S. the two resolutions of this House of the 14th ult. reported that the committee had according to order, performed that service.

Mr. T. M. Randolph, from the committee for enrolled bills, reports that the committee had examined an enrolled bill to wit:

"An act to provide for defraying any extraordinary expenses attending the intercourse be-

tween the U. S. and foreign nations," and found the same to be truly enrolled, whereupon, Mr. Speaker signed the said bill.

Ordered, that the clerk of the House ought to acquaint the Senate therewith.

WEDNESDAY, February 12. Mr. Thomas M. Randolph, from the joint committee for enrolled bills, reported, that the committee did, yesterday, present to the President of the United States, for his approbation, an enrolled bill, entitled "An act making provision for defraying any extraordinary expenses attending the intercourse between the United States and foreign nations."

TUESDAY, February 13.

A message in writing was received from the President of the United States, by Mr. Coles, his secretary, as followeth:—

"To the House of Representatives of the United States."

"On the 13th instant I approved and signed the act, entitled "An act making provision for defraying any extraordinary expenses attending the intercourse between the United States and foreign nations," which originated in the House of Representatives, and I shall, in due season, deposit it among the rolls in the office of the secretary of state."

"TH: JEFFERSON."

Feb. 13, 1866.

MONDAY, March 24.

A message, in writing, was received from the President of the United States, by Mr. Coles, his secretary, as followeth:—

"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

"I communicate to Congress a letter recently received from the Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at London, stating some circumstances which bear relation to the subject of my message of Jan. 17th. This paper being original, and to be communicated to both Houses, the return of it is requested."

"TH: JEFFERSON."

March 24th, 1866.

The said message and document accompanying it, were severally twice read.

Ordered, That the letter referred to in the said message, be returned to the President of the United States agreeably to his request.

THURSDAY, MARCH 6.

DEBATE

On Mr. GREGG'S resolution. (MR. RANDOLPH'S Speech continued.)

I am accused by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Smilie) this I suppose is a specimen of his candor—(I am reluctant to say any thing whilst he is absent—I am sorry he has fled his seat)—of designedly passing over one of the most important considerations presented by the present subject—the impressment of our seamen. And yet what did that gentleman tell you? That he himself (long as he had trespassed on your time) had been compelled to omit many important things, that he intended to say. This realizes the proverb: "One man may steal a horse, whilst another must not look over the hedge." I will tell the gentleman, if I did omit this topic, I had scarcely thrown myself into the carriage that conveyed me home, before I recollected and regretted it. The gentleman may say what he pleases, but he never had, no man ever shall have cause to upbraid me with flinching from any question that may be brought on this floor. Now, sirs, let gentlemen lay their hands upon their hearts and answer sincerely if they do believe this resolution has the power to take one American seaman out of a British ship of war? Are gentlemen hostile to impressment, and yet friendly to a naval war, to systems which must eventuate in the introduction of this system at home, in the subversion of our liberties? Let them examine the profound argument of Judge Foster on this subject. They will find that Great Britain is compelled to resort to it, to maintain her naval power and her existence. And it is because I am opposed to resorting to the same expedient (for will any man pretend that a great navy can be manned without recurring to it?) because I think it abhorrent to the genius of a free people, that I am against rushing into that naval war, into which gentlemen wish to precipitate us. No, sir, you cannot command seamen for your navy, in time of war, without impressment. The wealth of Cæsar could not sustain the expense, and even if that objection could be removed, the operation by enlistment is too tardy to meet a sudden emergency. If you have difficulty in procuring seamen to serve in the Mediterranean, what will be the case in a war against England. With all their bravery many a man who would willingly meet the corsairs, or even the Dons and Monsieurs, would feel reluctant to be led to battle against a British fleet—and why, sir? Because, waving other considerations, a great proportion of our seamen are foreigners—natives of Great Britain, who still feel prejudices for their parent country. Yes, sir, the character of the American seaman, like that of the neutral trader, too often eludes our grasp. The moment you make war, much more if you resort to impressment, the American sailor vanishes, he becomes a subject of Denmark: with the first frost, he disappears in a night.

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 assembly, much less one

of your dignity. Am I indeed so ignorant of the feelings of man? of the character 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 diluting the ridiculous futilities of their disgrace 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 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 though 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 involves an abandonment of the very doctrine for which the author 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 restriction than what may be imposed by their respective laws, or their mutual 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 affected at all by a war between others."

"As a nation not engaged in the war remains in the same relations of amity and of 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 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 despairing of his ability to affect 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 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 admit nothing to control it—"Necessity," that cannot stoop to argument. If once you admit that necessity ought, can, or does establish exceptions to this broad rule, do you 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—& by a change in the maxims and implements of war new and 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 this 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 friezes 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 ar-

gument, which the first puff of wind will demolish.

Sir, the admission, that a change of circumstances will justify a departure from the established maxims amongst nations, was 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 & Puffendorf, & the Lord knows who, 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 Aegis of neutrality over a commerce which he can no longer protect—to save him all the danger, expense 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 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 wether he deals with the subject 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—with 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 extorped 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 read but I could not get thro' 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 struck 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 able examination 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 show, 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 on a dubious case.

[Speech to be continued.]

NEW YORK, April 3.

We understand, Mr. Samuel G. Ogden yesterday appeared before the Circuit court and was bound him self in 10,000 dollars and a surety in 20,000, to stand trial on account of this connection with the Leander.

MONTEGO BAY, Feb. 22.

Yesterday evening we were favored with the Jamaica Courant of Monday, and Kingston Chronicle of the same day and Tuesday: from which the following selections are made:

Account of motions of the Fleet under Admiral Duckworth.

"On the 6th February arrived about five leagues off the city of Santo Domingo.—At 6 P. M. the Acasto frigate descried two frigates a-head making signal and firing guns.—At half after 6 saw at anchor to the right of the city, an enemy's squadron.—At 7 observed them getting under weigh.—At 8, their force was five line of battle ships, one of which was a three-decker with two frigates and a corvette, all under weigh standing close along shore to the westward, endeavoring to escape with every sail.—Five minutes after 10, the Superb commenced engaging by cutting off the headmost ship of the enemy.—Ten minutes after ten the Northumberland got into action.—Fifteen minutes after ten the Spencer did the same.—At twenty-five minutes after ten, the Canopus.—Thirty-three minutes after ten, the Donnegal, and thirty-six minutes after ten the Atlas. At forty minutes past ten perceived one of the French ship's, (L'Alexandre) main and mizen-masts go over the side.—Fifty minutes past ten the Superb and Northumberland closely engaged with L'Imperial, and directly after the Canopus.—Fifty-eight minutes past ten, the Alexandre was on fire, which was soon extinguished.—Eleven she struck.—Six minutes after eleven, again on fire in the foretop, and soon after her fore-mast went over the side.—Ten minutes after eleven, Le Brave was made prize of.—Thirty minutes after eleven, the Jupiter struck, and at the same moment the Acasto sent a boat, and gained possession of Le Brave. Forty-five minutes past eleven, saw the Diomedé who before appeared to have surrendered, hoisted her colours and recommenced firing, making sail for the shore. At twelve, the Imperial run ashore by her crew. Twenty minutes past twelve, the Diomedé also got in the same situation, and her masts went over from the shock. Twenty five minutes past twelve, the firing ceased, the Acasto took Le Brave in tow, and near one the Magicienne did the same with L'Alexandre."

On the night of the 9th inst. the Kings fisher sloop of war, Capt. Cochrane, the bearer of Sir John T. Duckworth's dispatches to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, announcing his Victory over part of the Brest fleet, sailed for England from off Santo Domingo.

General recapitulation of the killed and wounded in the action of the 6th.

British Squadron.—Superb, 6 killed, 55 wounded; Northumberland, 21 killed, 79 wounded; Canopus, 8 killed, 22 wounded; Spencer, 17 killed, 45 wounded; Donnegal, 12 killed, 55 wounded; Atlas, 8 killed, 9 wounded; Argamemnon, 1 killed, 15 wounded.—Total, 73 killed, 260 wounded—333.

French Squadron (according to the report of the prisoners).—L'Imperial, 300 killed, 500 wounded; L'Alexandre, 400 killed, and wounded; Le Diomedé, 80 killed, 150 wounded; Le Brave, 300 killed, and wounded; Le Jupiter, 200 killed, and wounded.

On the 9th current, L'Imperial, Rear Admiral Lesseigues, Captain Le Bigot, of 130 guns, and Le Diomedé, Captain Henric, were burned by Captain Dunn, of his Majesty's ship Acasta. Resistance was made for a considerable time by Captain Le Bigot to L'Imperial being destroyed under British colours, but, as might have been expected, L'Acasta, and this superb ship, the pride of the French navy, fell a sacrifice to the towering flames, with the British Flag proudly displaying over the scene of destruction.

Other crew, which are said to have originally consisted of 1500 men, very many were drowned in the surf in attempting to get on shore, after she was run aground. Lieutenant Mudge, who set fire to her, on going on board found but 10 wounded men, and not more than 150 of the whole crew are said to have been saved.

Captain Le Bigot was brought down in the Superb, and Captain Henric in the Acasta; 50 or 60 of the Diomedé's crew have also been brought in.

March 1.

Last Monday sailed from Port-Royal, his Majesty's ship Superb, captain Keels, and Acasta frigate, capt on Dunn, to join the squadron off Cuba; Sir John T. Duckworth was on board the Superb, and saluted by the respective forts.

March 1.

The schooner Dorothy, Rowlic, was arrived at New York, in 6 days from this port.

The ship Mary, 52 days from Jaffa, for Baltimore, was spoke on Saturday the 29th March, 30 leagues from Cape May.

By the ship Hope, capt. Smith, arrived yesterday from Montego Bay, we received papers of that place to the 8th ult. inclusive. The following is the only article their columns afford.

MONTEGO BAY, (Jam.) March 8.

The following interesting particulars we have received from a military officer of great respectability, who arrived at Savannah-la-Mar last Wednesday, in his Majesty's schooner Redbridge, Lieutenant Burt, which left Port Royal on Monday morning:—

"That on Sunday the Acasta frigate returned express from Sir John T. Duckworth, with information to the commanding officer at Port Royal, of having a few days previous fallen in with six French line of battle ships and some frigates, conjectured to be those of the Brest fleet which had separated from the five recently accounted for. It was further understood, the enemy's squadron had been seen going into a Spanish port on the Main, said to be Porto Cabello, where one or two of our cruisers were stationed to watch their motions."

The above gentleman states also, "that in getting under weigh on Monday from Port Royal, the Superb, with Sir John T. Duckworth's flag, was coming down, to expedite the sailing of what ships could be got in readiness; and it was supposed every line of battle ship in port would be prepared to sail in quest of the enemy on Wednesday morning."

The ship Brothers, Hepburn, from St. John's, N. B. and Bermuda, arrived at Falmouth yesterday se'night. On Saturday night the 22d ult. off Abavele, the Brothers descried six sail of ships lying to, one of them bearing a top light. In all probability these vessels may have been the other detachment of the Brest squadron, which Sir J. T. Duckworth, it is presumed, is now in pursuit of.

A bill is at present before the senate of the United States, which provides for the emission of two new and additional coins—the one to be called a double-dime, to be composed of silver, value 20 cents; the other, two-cent pieces, value one-fiftieth part of a dollar, to be composed of a mixture of silver and copper.

(Aurora.)

IMPORTANT TO MERCHANTS AND PLANTERS.

Extract of a letter to a gentleman in this city, from his correspondent in France, dated

PARIS, January 17.

"A total change is about to take place in the administration of the Finances of this country—by the new arrangement, the importation of tobacco by private individuals will be entirely prohibited. I mention this for the information of such of your friends as may be in the habit of shipping to this country."

Let the same change be made in all the her branches of taxation, which is here opposed with respect to the tobacco duty, and the people of France will not very far removed from the oppression of their ancient regime. The tobacco