

metropolis, he had his beard shaved, his hair dressed, and put on a fine suit of linen and cloths. "Now," said he, "I'll make a decent entry into Paris."

Having, however, passed through the barriers, how great was his surprise and dismay, when he was straight conducted to the Conciergerie. He concealed his disappointment by a forced and hypocritical smile.

With what fortitude he heard his sentence, has already been stated. The President of the Tribunal having asked him if he had any thing to say why the sentence of the Law should not take place he answered—"No I have no more defenders."

His execution was ordered for Thursday Nov. 7th. but by his own request, he was beheaded on the same day on which he received his doom.

He refused the ministrations of a Priest, and spent the few hours he had to live in dressing himself. At two o'clock in the afternoon, on the 6th, ult. he received sentence, and at half past three the same day, the Executioner arrived with his cart before the Conciergerie. The streets were more filled with people, than at the execution of Louis XVI; and that part of the mob among whom he had formerly distributed his money, insulted him most, especially the Ex-Marquis de St. Hurges formerly his hireling.

When he came to his palace the cart stopped for three minutes, either designedly or on account of the great crowds of people. He longingly cast his eyes upon that superb mansion, while the mob called out, "Look, look, 'tis for the last time."

On the scaffold he attempted to harangue the people, but their shouts drowned his voice. At half past five his head was struck off; the executioner showed it twice or thrice on the corner of the scaffold, while the mob incessantly vociferated, *Bravo! bravo! Vive la Republique!*

Thus perished the most ruthless monster that ever polluted the Earth. Louis Philip Joseph Egalité, late Duke of Orleans, first Prince of the Blood, Lieutenant General of the French forces by Land and Sea, was born at St. Cloud, April 13, 1747. He was the pupil of Mirabeau, the confidant of Dumourier and the client of Petion. Previous to the Revolution, he was the richest private man in Europe. In his youth he was a bosom friend of the Dauphin, afterwards Louis the XVI. whose blood he so much thirsted after. When the King was incarcerated in 1775, Orleans, then Duke of Chartres, would not quit the King's apartment. The Duke of Orleans his father, who lived in his retirement at St. Asifille, never troubled himself about his monstrous son, who, after his father's death wallowed in all kinds of excesses and debaucheries; and even when he succeeded to his title, he was the most nefarious man of his age.

At court he was despised, for which reason he exposed all his plans, being the first peer of France.

In 1787, Louis XVI. held a bed of Justice in the Parliament of Paris, when Egalité addressed him with so much boldness and daring effrontery, that his Majesty exiled him from the Capital by a *Lettre-de-Cachet*.

On the 6th. of October, 1789, Egalité and Mirabeau went both in disguise to Versailles, with the Fish-Women, whom the former had hired, in order to murder the Queen.

## CONGRESS.

### House of Representatives.

Friday, March 14.

In committee of the whole on Mr. Madison's resolutions.

#### Mr. SEDGWICK'S SPEECH.

[CONCLUDED.]

Mr. S. then proceeded to state the regulations of Great Britain which directed her intercourse with this country—He said that respecting the West Indies, the same severe, rigid and gloomy exclusion extended equally with us to all nations; with this only difference of partial and temporary relaxations in our favor, as in her opinion her occasions required.—That respecting an immediate intercourse with Great Britain, her regulations were as favorable to us as to any country, except only where favors are the effect of direct stipulation—nay, they are more so as respects the important articles of pot and pearl-shell, pitch, tar, timber, and an exemption from the payment of alien duties.

If then Great Britain did not discriminate against us—if her discriminations were favorable to us, where was our right for complaint? Should, however, unprovoked resentment (for gentlemen would remember to put political considerations out of the question) stimulate the adoption of the proposed measures, the disposition of that country to retaliate would be certain—her capacity of retaliation was therefore to be considered.

This subject he said had been under the consideration of the British government. Should she subject American ships to alien duties—should she impose duties on our rice and tobacco and such other articles as she can procure from other countries, and on her products exported in our bottoms; and should she at the same time counteract our duties by bounties; their bounties may be so given as completely to balance our duties, and their duties of course a direct charge upon us—a charge on our exports, for the reasons he had already mentioned, depreciating their value—a charge on our imports to be satisfied by the labor

and industry of the country. These would be the salutary effects of this blessed system, so far as the trade should continue under the load of these oppressive burdens. If the commercial intercourse between America and Great Britain should be destroyed by this system of expensive irritation, the evils were obvious, both as they would affect the ease and prosperity of our people, and the preservation of the public credit.

He had called the present channels of commerce, the natural ones—there would he said, be found sufficient reason for the appellation, without entering into an extensive investigation of the subject, in this one observation; that the present state of our trade is produced by counting house calculations having interest alone for their object.

It had been said that a great part of our imports consisted of the mere articles of luxury. This was undoubtedly true, but luxurious enjoyments could not be prevented, unless we would introduce the manners of Sparta, and continue them by the institutions and laws of Lycurgus. The passion for distinction could not be controuled nor would it be eligible if it could. "If then said he, we will use Madeira wine and green tea—if we will wear silks, cambrics, muslins, and other succedania of the fig-leaf, why should we not be permitted to obtain them, when they can best be had, of the best quality and on the best terms; or do gentlemen suppose our constituents will acknowledge obligations for being compelled to procure them of inferior quality and on worse terms?"

Gentlemen had given countenance to this project under an idea that it would encourage manufactures and the carrying trade—this to his mind was preposterous. He had always supposed that to establish manufactures, our active capital must be increased; and to encourage navigation, our trade must be extended. How this measure which would lessen our active capital by the embarrassment it would create, could afford the means of establishing manufactures and building ships, to his mind was perfectly unaccountable.

He asked if it had not been demonstrated that the measure would tend to enhance the price of the commodities which we wanted to purchase, and decrease the price of the products of our country. It had indeed been conceded, that these effects were unavoidable, and yet these were the means whereby we were to extend our manufactures and navigation. Should, however, these effects result, he asked if we could feel ourselves justified in sacrificing to the encouragement of a few ship-carpenters and other mechanics, the ease and comfort of that most useful and respectable description of men, the farmer and planter? One more observation he said he would make on this head, that any measure which might oppress the community, would be felt first and most severely by the poorer class of people.

Before the subject was dismissed it ought to be viewed in a light in which it was shewn in the most baneful colours—its tendency to war and all its dreadful consequences. As the guardians of the public happiness, we ought to avoid any measure which tended to this, if it could be done consistent with the interest of our country.

He laid it down as a principle that every action had its character determined by the motives which gave it birth. What motives then originated this measure?—Were they of a commercial, or political nature? Had G. B. inflicted any commercial injuries on this country?—Had she not calculated her regulations on the same principle of all other nations—her own interest? Had she discriminated against us? Did not the details clearly shew that her regulations were as favorable to this as to other countries? And did not an infinitely more stubborn fact, the existing state of our trade, undeniably prove hers to be our best markets?

If then these measures are not justified on commercial considerations, will the nation towards whom they are directed, be at a loss to determine our true motives? If doubts could otherwise exist, recourse to the printed debates would remove it. There we find our negroes carried off; the western posts—the Savages, Algerines, and instructions to the commanders of ships, the constant theme of animated declamation. We know too well the correctness of gentlemen's understandings not to be assured that these subjects would not be so frequently repeated, if they were not design-

ed to have effect. These were not commercial, but political considerations. If then the measure could not be—if it was not justified on commercial, but political ground—if it was not designed to retaliate for commercial, but for political injuries; it followed irresistibly, that the measure assumed the complexion of hostility.

He did not mean to suggest an idea but that the injuries complained of might justify hostile retaliation; but he would affirm, if this measure was designed as such, it was infinitely too feeble, and would certainly prove ineffectual. If war was really the intention, it was our duty boldly to declare it—and, like men, prepare for the event and not involve our country in blood under the disguised pretence of our commercial regulations. If we found motives for our conduct in antipathy to one nation, and in gratitude and affection to another, and that this was the case, he appealed to the printed debates and to the faithful monitors of gentlemen—would it be supposed that Great Britain would not understand, resent and endeavor to revenge it?

Great Britain he said, was involved in a war, whether just or not, the government of this country had no right to determine—just or not, we had reason to believe it was popular. While she was pursuing this war, we complaining of injuries, and stimulated by a sense of them, adopt measures of retaliation, declaredly intended to produce embarrassments of such a nature as to induce her to change a course of conduct she has pursued for ages, and to which in her opinion she is principally indebted for her progressive prosperity.

If serious embarrassments are not to be expected, then ought the measure to be abandoned, because it would not produce the intended effect, and because it would confessedly be injurious to us.

Should it produce the embarrassments foretold, it will materially affect those resources on which she depends for the prosecution of a favorite war. Should she feel those measures as intended, would it not kindle resentment? Would she not discover the cause? And would she not feel perfect self-justification in using all the means in her power to revenge our partiality?

The evil he said would not end here. Great Britain was an important ally, and on her resources the combined powers materially depended for the prosecution of the war. A war waged with as much enmity as had provoked hostility at any period of the existence of civilized Europe. Should we strike at those resources, and from motives they will doubtless comprehend; would they tamely submit to such conduct, would they not resent and endeavor to revenge it? "I will repeat, said he, that if your measures do not materially embarrass Great Britain, and in a considerable degree destroy her resources, then will your expectations be disappointed, and the end you propose defeated, and you only accumulate distress on your own citizens. If the embarrassments you intend shall result from your measures, then do you in fact take part in the war—you will therefore provoke the vengeance of the nation against whom your measures are directed, and of her allies."

To shew the natural effects of commercial regulations pointed against nations to produce hostility, he mentioned the war which took place between Great Britain and Holland, in 1652, occasioned by the navigation act of the former—and that of 1672 between the French and Dutch, in consequence of duties imposed by the former on linen, and by the latter on wine. There was he said, peculiar reason for expecting such an event in the present instance, for by the treaty between Great Britain and Spain, it was expressly stipulated, "if either shall be attacked, molested or inquieted in any of their states, rights, possessions or interests." It is then to be made common cause.

This, he said, was not all, our real views would be known to our constituents—"They are said he, a wife and penetrating people, and will never consent to be dragged to the carnage of war, under a pretence of commercial regulations—Their honest candor will abhor and detest all covert and crooked politics."

He did not mean to charge gentlemen with unworthy motives—He could not however avoid declaring the comment which in his opinion would be made, on experience of the fatal events which would result from the adoption of the proposed system—a system incapable of benefit to the community and pregnant with enormous evils.

He said before he dismissed this part of the subject, he would submit one observation to the consideration of the committee—It was that the navigation and manufactures of the United States, had in a few years past, en-

creased with a rapidity, equal to the expectation of the most sanguine friend of this country—That this had resulted from the existing systems—That he believed it to be true, that at this moment, as great a portion of our capital was invested in those branches as was consistent with the general welfare—Under such circumstances it became the legislature cautiously to adopt measures, which might distract the present salutary order of things.

(Debate to be continued.)

## IN SENATE,

Wednesday, March 12.

[CONTINUED.]

The following written message was received from the President of the United States, by Mr. Dandridge his Secretary: United States, 12th March, 1794. Gentlemen of the Senate, and

of the House of Representatives, I transmit to you, the translation of two letters from the Commissioners of his Catholic Majesty, to the secretary of state, and of their enclosures.

G. WASHINGTON.

The message and papers therein referred to were read—

Ordered, That they lie for consideration. The petition of Robert Connelly was presented and read, praying to be inserted in the list of invalid pensioners.

Ordered, That this petition be referred to the secretary for the department of war to consider and report thereon to the Senate.

The bill, sent from the House of Representatives for concurrence, entitled, "An act to provide for the defence of certain ports and harbours in the United States" was read the first time.

Ordered, That this bill pass to the second reading.

The senate adjourned until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Thursday, March 15, 1794.

The Vice President laid before the Senate the reports of the Secretary for the department of war, on the petitions of Asa Day, William Perkins and Jonathan Holton.

Ordered, That they lie on the table.

The petition of Jabez Rogers was presented and read, praying remission of the excise duties on certain distilled spirits, said to be destroyed by fire.

On motion, Ordered, That this petition be referred to Mr. Bradley, Mr. Livermore and Mr. Robinson to consider and report thereon to the Senate.

The bill sent from the House of Representatives for concurrence, entitled, "An act to provide for the defence of certain ports and harbours in the United States" was read the second time.

Ordered, That this bill be referred to Mr. King, Mr. Gunn, Mr. Izard, Mr. Langdon, Mr. Morris, Mr. Ellsworth, and Mr. Potts, to consider and report thereon to the Senate.

Mr. Butler reported from the committee appointed to consider the bill sent from the House of Representatives for concurrence, entitled, "An act authorizing a loan of one million of dollars," that the bill pass, and the report being adopted,

Ordered, That this bill pass to the third reading.

The bill, sent from the House of Representatives for concurrence, entitled, "An act to provide a naval armament," was read the second time.

On motion, It was agreed that the further consideration of this bill, be the order of the day for Monday next.

The bill "in addition to the act for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States," was read the third time—

On motion, To expunge the 8th, section as follows.

And be it further enacted and declared, That in every case in which, a vessel shall be fitted out or armed, or attempt so to be fitted out or armed, or in which the force of any vessel of war, cruiser or other armed vessel, shall be increased or augmented, or in which any military expedition or enterprise shall be begun or set on foot contrary to the prohibitions and provisions of this act; and in every case of the capture of a ship or vessel within the jurisdiction or protection of the United States as above defined, and in every case in which any process issuing out of any court of the United States, shall be disobeyed or resisted by any person or persons having the custody of any vessel of war, cruiser, or other armed vessel of any foreign prince