

lar tragic scenes have been acted in the district of Maine. Does not the rigorous prohibition of this *land* commerce alone demonstrate that other views than have ever been officially avowed really dictated the embargo? Lately we find that in Holland (a country governed by a brother of the French emperor, and absolutely under his controul) the necessities of the people for the supplies usually obtained from England, having caused evasions of the Emperor's strict decrees of blockade.. additional provisions have been made; and the breaches of those decrees are henceforward to be punished with death. With similar pace, the U. States are advancing...and by the bill before us, the embargo is to be enforced by additional regulations and penalties of unexampled rigour, and hostile to the mild spirit of American laws; and which, though not in words prescribing the punishment of death, will infallibly have that issue.

Among the reasons assigned for persevering in the embargo, are, "the present unsettled state of the world, the extraordinary situation in which the U. States are placed, and the necessity, if war be resorted to, of making it at the same time against both the belligerent nations, and these the two most powerful in the world:" and under these circumstances, a principle of justice forbade our choosing our adversary! Must not such sentiments expose us to derision? Two nations have injured us...and we should violate the principles of justice, if, to obtain satisfaction, we attacked one without at the same time attacking the other! If we would descend from the airy regions of *philosophy*, and stand on the ground of plain common sense, we should see this embarrassment which apparently overwhelms the administration, to be a mere dream. Sir, if a man travelling on the highway should meet two stout fellow travellers, and be alternately insulted and attacked by both and he at the same time perceived that they were enemies to each other; what would he do? Stand still, and be kicked and wounded by both? or co-operate with one, at least so far as was necessary to avenge his wrongs, and to provide for his own defence and security against the other? This course is so simple and obvious that even school-boys (who also have their quarrels) could not miss it. But if while, in this way, avenging the wrongs done by one adversary he, in effect disarmed the other, and made him his friend; and had, moreover, a fair prospect of inducing him to make satisfaction for the injuries he had committed; how could he hesitate to adopt it?

But we have been advised by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Giles) *to wait a little longer*, "to wait events in Europe, now in a state of rapid succession" Yes, sir, wait until we see whether Bonaparte overwhelms the Spanish nation: and if heaven permits this sad catastrophe...what then? Are we to join his arms, and by conquering Canada and Nova-Scotia, prepare those countries with no other for a new master? and hasten the glorious period when to the lofty titles of Emperor of France and King of Italy, and Protector of the Confederation of the Rhine, shall be added that of Emperor of the Two AMERICA'S? That, sir, will be the natural course of things, if, as some have wished, the British navy were destroyed.