gagements, under Treaty, of the British government to make reparation for them. Yet notwithstanding this engagement, reparation has been to this day evaded, under the pretext that the claims under one article depend on the construction given to a preceding article. Now suppose in the French treaty there were the same provisions as in the British treaty; would this have produced payment? No. The operations under the treaty might have gone on as long as under the British treaty, with the like effect, and without any substantial provision being made. I state these circumstances barely to shew that the renunciation in the French treaty is not so grievous as some gentlemen imagine.

It is manifest that an inattention to similar claims has been considered as less a departure from right among nations than among individuals. And judging of the future by the past, my opinion is that a retention of the article stricken out of the French convention, would not have benefitted the claims of our merchants, or afforded them any adequate eventual compensation. In France, as on the other side of the channel, there would have been claim raised against claim, pretext against pretext, and the boards for adjusting the several claims, might have been, in this case, as in the other, dissolved.

It is said by the gentleman from Delaware, that it is the object of gentlemen on his side of the House to prevent a repeal of the Internal taxes. Though I admire the gentleman's candor, I believe it is needful to repeal these laws. I believe too the people wish them repealed. But I further believe, that if future events shall shew the necessity of restoring these taxes, the good sense of the people will restore them; and if the indemnities agreed to be made shall require them, I believe they will be restored. The work of examining these claims will be the work of years. What is the consequence? Will the present repeal of the internal taxes interfere with the doing substantial justice to our merchants? Suppose these taxes are removed, are not the products of the country increasing, and are not our resources increasing with our population? The truth is whenever your treasury wants a fresh supply of resources, the people will submit to what their representatives desire. Are we to legislate for succeeding ages? No. We are to suffer our successors to act for themselves; and I have no doubt either of their ability or their inclination to do justice.

From a review of the whole subject, I see nothing to shake the confidence of the public, or to alarm the merchants. I conceive that the repeal of the Internal taxes to-morrow would not be in the least injurious to the mercantile claims. When these, however, are brought forward on their substantial merits, I have no doubt they will be heard, and provided for.

The gentleman from South-Carolina asks, if the internal taxes are repealed, from what source the 160,000 dollars for naval purposes will be drawn? I will inform that gentleman that it will be derived from an unexhausted appropriation, and that the money is now on hand.

The gentleman has insinuated the existence of a disposition that the navy should be crushed. I know of no such intention. I believe true policy dictates that a prudent course should be pursued by this country for the protection of commerce; and that we should take a middle course between no navy, and a widely extended one.

Mr. John C. Smith wished to save time, and would therefore decline entering into a discussion of the merits of the mercantile claims. He would merely observe, that a refusal to take up the subject at this time would be considered as an entire refusal to attend to it. He could not help congratulating the gentleman from Massachusetts (Dr. Eustis) on at last finding a reason for voting in favor of the repeal of the Internal taxes. But though that reason may be satisfactory to him I must say, it is not so to me. It is, however, to be regretted that the honorable gentleman had not sooner discovered it, as it might have influenced his vote on a former occasion.

Mr. Dana. If I understood the honorable member from New-York, he admitted the propriety of making some indemnity; and if so, I could not understand why he dwelt so elaborately upon the minutiæ of detail, to shew why we ought not to indemnify. Nor can I yet understand him, unless his object be to let the subject sleep, and to say that the longer it is delayed, the less the chance of reparation.

The gentleman says property insured cannot be recovered. But is that gentleman, coming as he does from the first commercial city in the union, yet to learn that in the case of a loss, the insurer stands precisely in the place of the insured? Is he so ignorant of this fact as not to know that the underwriter in such circumstances becomes entitled to the same indemnity with him who is underwritten?

With regard to the analogy attempted between the British treaty and the French convention, it is totally incorrect. For in the British treaty we had insisted upon the claims of our merchants to reparation by Britain or her subjects; whereas in the French convention, we have renounced all claim. Nor were the remarks of the honorable member more fortunate respecting the operations under the British treaty; for he must know that our merchants had in many cases received compensation under it.

One confession has been made, which I did not expect would be avowed so early, either by the gentleman from Massachusetts or the gentleman from New-York—a confession that is founded on the principle that the house, before examining the important details which ought to regulate their decision, are so placed by the God of the executive ministry, that certain taxes, recommended to be abrogated, must be repealed. You must repeal them. The public clamour is excited, and you must obey it. I did not suppose it would so soon have been avowed, that we are under the absolute rule of executive influence, and that to obey it we are compelled to perjure our understandings.

The gentleman considers himself as instructed by the will of his constituents. Forlorn indeed is our situation if we are so bound down. If other gentlemen are so instructed, for myself I disclaim such degrading fetters; I disclaim the ignominious insinuation of acting either under ministerial influence, or under popular instructions; and I can only say I consider the confession of the honorable members from Massachusetts and New-York the more precious, as coming from gentlemen so well acquainted with ministerial mysteries.

Mr. Bayard. The honorable gentleman from Massachusetts has thanked me for the candour of my avowal that I am opposed to the repeal of these taxes.—But I do not wish to be thanked for more than I really said. It is true, that I do not think this the proper time to repeal all of those taxes, because I do not know that government may not want them.

Gentlemen charge us with an undue attachment to these taxes. But why do we wish them? They bring no money to us, or to our friends. We participate not, or expect to participate in the loaves and fishes. We expect no offices. We know that in a few days there may not be even a deputy-postmaster on our side to share them. Why then can gentlemen attribute to us a wish to support taxes to feed their creatures, or to pamper their luxurious appetites. No, sir, these are not our motives. We are anxious to preserve them whilst they appear to us necessary to support the credit of the government; because we are convinced that on it depends not only our present welfare, but that of future times. But the moment gentlemen, by fair calculation, shew us that we can do without these taxes, that moment I will agree to take them off, and all others that they shew to be unnecessary.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has broached a new species of ethics.—He says, if the amount of claims shall be small, we may pay, but if large we cannot. But I will tell that gentleman I have never acknowledged such a principle of morality. I believe if the merchants have a just demand for one dollar, we must pay it; and if they have a just demand for one hundred million, we must pay that too.—Nor can I too forcibly express my astonishment at an opposite principle avowed in this house.

The gentleman says you want evidence, and therefore ought not to act. But can *you* examine each distinct case? If the subject goes to a select committee and they shall be allowed years to decide, still they will have to establish some principle; for instance that a certain description of vessels was captured unjustly by the French; that the injured merchants had a moral claim on the French government for reparation; that the United States had bartered away their rights, and that government in consequence is bound to indemnify. If the house decide that the government is bound to relieve in one case, are they not bound to afford relief in all similar cases? Will you not then be obliged to make a general provision that all claims so circumstanced shall be allowed? Here are a great mass of claims; some made now, and some not likely to be made for years. What more then can you now do than decide the principle which shall be applied to them?

My opinion as to indemnity is, that whoever had a valid claim against the French government, which the United States extinguished, has a demand against the United States which she must satisfy. Put the case to its consequence; will gentlemen tell me whether, according to any principle of morality, where you have taken from your citizens all chance of recovery, you are not bound to indemnify for that of which you have deprived them? Where the French government was not bound to pay before the convention, you are not now bound to pay. So in the case of war you are not bound. But where the claim on the French government was perfect, and you destroyed that claim, your obligation to pay cannot be evaded. I wish to know if the establishment of this principle requires facts?

With respect to the circumstances of particular cases this House cannot act. On those numerous grades of credibility that will be attached to the various claims that shall be made, you cannot decide. To effect this you must establish some competent tribunal. You can establish the principle; but the details could not be settled by congress, even if their attention were exclusively directed to that subject, in three years. Having decided the principle, it will be proper to leave the application of it to your courts of law.

Mr. Bacon hoped that a great deal of time would not be spent in exploring the secret motives of individual members. He supposed they should all stand or fall on their own consciences. He hoped, therefore, they should have the question.

Mr. S. Smith. I am against the proposition of the gentlemen from Connecticut, because to act now upon it will be in direct opposition to the uniform order of the House. If our attention is thus to be withdrawn from every important object before us, I do not know how we are possibly to progress with the public business. I know of no case, where a particular subject has been referred to a select committee, and it has afterwards been taken up in the House, while it remained with the committee. I should have understood the motion, if it had been to discharge the select committee, and to refer the subject to a committee of the whole.

As gentlemen, however, have taken so wide a range in the field of debate, I hope their course will produce a saving of time, and that we shall not have their speeches over again on repealing the internal taxes.

It is not my purpose at this time to enter into a discussion of the claims of our merchants, because I think this is not the proper occasion. But I will tell gentlemen, that if they were disposed to destroy those claims, they could not have pursued a plan more effectually calculated to do it. Had such been my intention, I would have offered a resolution so broad and vague as to alarm the whole community as to the amount of indemnity. I would have endeavoured to throw the censure attached to their losses on the present administration. I would have opposed their claims to the wish of the nation to repeal the internal taxes. All these steps I would have taken to frustrate any indemnity; and they are just the steps taken by gentlemen, who profess so strong a regard for the merchants. Let me tell those gentlemen, until they shall pursue a far different plan, we must doubt whether they are in earnest to pay the merchants for their losses.

If the public business is to be thus perpetually procrastinated, I hope the gentlemen with whom I act will be firm enough, after rejecting this motion, to pursue the other business even to a late hour.

The yeas and nays were then taken on Mr. Griswold's motion, to postpone taking up the bill on Internal taxes till to-morrow, in order to take up his resolution on French spoliations; and were as follow:—yeas 33—nays 54.

Yeas—Messrs. J. A. Bayard, M. Cutler, S. W. Dana, J. Davenport, J. Dennis, A. Foster, C. Goddard, R. Griswold, W. B. Grove, S. Hastings, J. Hemphill, A. Henderson, W. H. Hill, B. Huger, T. Lowndes, E. Mattoon, L. R. Morris, T. Morris, J. Peirce, T. Plater, N. Read, J. Rutledge, J. C. Smith, J. Stanley, B. Tallmage, S. Tenney, T. Tillinghast, G. B. Upham, K. K. Van Rensselaer, P. Wadsworth, B. Walker, L. Williams, H. Woods. 33.

Nays—Messrs. W. Alston, J. Archer, J. Bacon, T. Bailey, P. Bishop, R. Brown, W. Butler, S. J. Cabell, T. Claiborne, M. Clay, J. Clopton, J. Condit, R. Cutts, T. T. Davis, J. Dawson, W. Dickson, L. Elmendorf, E. Elmer, W. Eustis, J. Fowler, E. Gray, A. Gregg, J. A. Hanna, J. Heister, W. Helms, J. Holland, D. Holmes, G. Jackson, C. Johnson, M. Leib, J. Milledge, S. L. Mitchill, T. Moore, A. New, T. Newton, jun. J. Randolph, jun. J. Smilie, I. Smith, J. Smith, (of New-York) J. Smith, (of Virginia) Josi. Smith, H. Southard, R. Stanford, J. Stanton, jun. J. Stewart, D. Thomas, P. R. Thompson, A. Trigg, J. Trigg, P. Van Cortlandt, J. P. V. Ness, J. B. Varnum, I. Van Horne, R. Williams. 54.

Previous to the call of the yeas and nays, general S. Smith desired to be excused from voting as he was interested in the question.

The above debate closed at 3 o'clock, when the House went into committee of the whole on the bill for repealing the Internal taxes:

Mr. Varnum in the chair.

Mr. Dennis moved to strike out of the 1st section all the words between "spirits" and "paper." He said his object was to discriminate between the tax on *stills and distilled spirits*, and all the other internal taxes. He believed the collection of the tax on stills and distilled spirits more difficult and expensive, than that on the other objects of internal taxation. He was far from giving into the opinion that we must keep up the same number of officers to collect a part as the whole of these taxes. He believed that all the taxes, excepting those on stills and distilled spirits, may be collected, without any of the officers at present employed in the collection of the internal revenue. The collection may be entirely turned over to the collectors of the customs and the deputy post-masters. In case his amendment did not prevail, Mr. Dennis said he did not know how he should afterwards vote.—The collection of the tax upon stills has been said to be productive of a system of espionage hateful to a free people. This objection did not apply to the other articles. He was of opinion, that in the collection of the duties upon stills, in order to prevent frauds upon the revenue, it was necessary to enter into regulations so complex as to render the tax very obnoxious—regulations so complicated that few are competent to the understanding of them. He believed it was this which had rendered that tax so unpopular, if it really was unpopular. On the other hand, he believed that all the other internal taxes could be collected for five per cent.

Mr. Dennis said he did not hesitate to say, that if it should be found that the government were possessed of more means then were required to support public credit and defray the expences of government, the taxes on brown sugar, salt, coffee, molasses, &c. should be reduced, instead of taking off the taxes on pleasurable carriages, sales at auction, &c.; as the former were principally drawn from the poor, while the latter were paid by the rich and luxurious.—It was a fact well known that brown sugar, coffee, bohea tea, salt, and molasses were necessaries of life, and that there was scarcely a person in the community, however low his circumstances, that did not consume a portion of them.

Mr. Huger enquired whether the amendment could not be divided so as to take a distinct question upon each article.

The Chairman said it could.

The question was then taken on striking out,

Refined Sugar; and lost—Ayes 24.

On striking out *Licences to Retailers*; and lost without a division.

On striking out *Sales at Auction*; and lost—Ayes 25.

On striking out *Pleasurable Carriages*; and lost—Ayes 22.

On striking out *stamped vellum, parchment and paper*; and lost—Ayes 14—Noes 52.

Several amendments were then made by Mr. Randolph affecting the details of the bill, which were ordered to be printed, and then the House adjourned.

Office of Intelligence.

THE dispersed situation of those who are established in the City of Washington, renders intercourse and communication difficult and embarrassing, not only to themselves but to those who visit it, whether on business or for the purpose of settling. A variety of domestic and familiar facts are necessary to be acquired, and yet the acquisition of them sometimes costs more labor, attention and expence, than matters of higher consequence. Hence in particular, many persons of moderate resources have greatly suffered, being under the immediate necessity of engaging in measures, and at the same time unprepared with the requisite information. It is on this account that the subscriber has been induced to offer to the patronage of the public an office of Intelligence. In this office, those who reside in George Town, Alexandria, or the City of Washington, may at any time be informed of real property in any of those places either improved or unimproved entered here for sale; for which entries he keeps a regular set of books. Those who approve of this design in this particular, are requested to transmit him a designation of their property, and terms for the information of applicants. Persons who have houses to rent, and those being desirous of hiring houses will here find a greater mass of intelligence on that subject than they can derive from any other source. He has opened also, a set of books where persons desirous of employing others in any capacity whatever may soon learn of those who will be willing to serve them, and the latter, on the other hand, will be enabled to learn of those, who wish to employ them. Strangers arriving at the metropolis may apply here for almost any kind of information whether in private or public business; and information will either be given or seasonably procured for them; horses and carriages will be received on commission for private sale, and personal property of any description whatever; bills of sale and other instruments of writing will be correctly and handsomely executed. The public must be well assured than an institution of this kind cannot prove generally useful without general encouragement.—That general encouragement the subscriber pledges himself to exert himself to deserve. Some charge will be made for every real information imparted, but as exorbitancy is always disgraceful, and the nature of such an institution requires moderation, he holds himself bound to give no dissatisfaction on that score.

THOMAS Y. SPROGELL.

Pennsylvania Avenue, opposite the buildings,
December 7th, 1801.

A Negro Man for sale, who has been accustomed to driving a carriage, and taking care of horses.

Two Negro Boys are wanting, about the age of from twelve to fifteen, for which a generous price will be given. They are to continue in the city of Washington.

A handsome top Chair and harness for sale.
Lots may be had on Pennsylvania Avenue, ground rent, in excellent situations.
Furnished Apartments may be had.
December 9. wtf
N. B.—A carriage and horses for sale.

WASHINGTON CITY.

WEDNESDAY, March 24, 1802.

[We have extracted the following important document from the Paris Journal des Debats, of the 17th of January. It establishes the fact, that Spain has ceded Louisiana to the French.]

Madrid, 16*th December*, 1801.

TREATY,

Signed at Madrid, 21st March, 1801, by the Prince of Peace and Lucien Bonaparte.

The First Consul of the French republic and his Catholic Majesty, desirous of permanently determining the states which the son of the Infant of Parma shall receive, as an equivalent for the Dutchy of Parma, have agreed to the following articles, and have named as plenipotentiaries, by the First Consul, Lucien Bonaparte, Ambassador from the French republic, and by his Catholic Majesty, the Prince of Peace, who have determined on the following articles:

Art. I. The reigning Duke of Parma forever renounces both for himself and heirs, the Dutchy of Parma, with all its dependencies, in favour of the French republic; the renunciation of which shall be guaranteed by his Catholic Majesty. The Grand Duchy of Tuscany, which the Grand Duke also renounces, the cession of which is guaranteed by the Emperor of Germany, shall be given to the son of the Duke of Parma, as an indemnification for the countries ceded by the Infant, his father, and in consequence of a treaty which had been previously concluded between his Catholic Majesty and the French Republic.

II. The Prince of Parma shall repair to Florence where he shall be acknowledged as sovereign of all the possessions appertaining to the Grand Duchy, and shall receive from the hands of the constituted authorities, the keys of the forts and the oath of fidelity which they owe him in his character of sovereign.

The authority of the First Consul will contribute to the peaceable execution of these acts.

III. The Prince shall be acknowledged King of Tuscany, with all the honors appertaining to his rank; the First Consul will acknowledge and will have him treated as such by the other powers. The arrangements necessary for this purpose shall be made previous to his taking possession.

IV. That part of the Isle of Elbe which belongs to Tuscany, and is dependent on that state, shall remain in the power of the French Republic, and the First Consul shall give as an indemnity for it, to the King of Tuscany, the country of Piombino, which appertains to the King of Naples.

V. As this treaty derives its origin from that which has been concluded by the First Consul with his Catholic Majesty, by which the King cedes to France the possession of Louisiana, the contracting parties agree to execute the articles of the anterior treaty; and to employ their respective power in the adjustment of the differences therein mentioned.

VI. As the new house, which is thus established in Tuscany, is of the family of Spain, these states shall be forever the property of Spain, and there shall be called to the throne an Infant of that family. If the reigning King or his children shall not have heirs, the sons of the reigning King of Spain shall succeed to these estates.

VII. The First Consul, and his Catholic Majesty, agree to obtain for the reigning Duke of Parma, in consideration of the renunciation he has made in favour of his son, just indemnities, either in possessions or revenues.

VIII. The present treaty shall be ratified and exchanged in three weeks.

(Signed) Lucien Bonaparte.
Prince of Peace.

It appears from the late debate in the Legislature on the judiciary, that the Journal of the Convention that formed the Constitution of the United States is lodged in the office of the Secretary of State, and that it is open to the inspection of the members of the Legislature. We accordingly find several propositions made in the Convention, with the fate they received, noticed in the above debate.

Whether the journal is open to the inspection of any citizen we know not. But even if it should be, it is obvious that but a small portion of the community could from local considerations avail themselves of the privilege.

It is respectfully submitted to Congress, whether it is not just and expedient that an advantage, which at present accrues to one part of the community, should be extended to all.

It is understood that this record throws important light upon the true spirit and meaning of the constitution; and it must be apparent to all that any correct construction given to the provisions of the instrument must be derived from a view of *all the proceedings* of the Convention in the successive stages of deliberation, and not from a *detached part*, which may countenance inferences hostile to the general tenor of the journal.