creditors dispersed
nion. The Bankrupt
ng all its checks, had
y frauds. How much
therefore, would the
his bill, where all these
ved?
replied to the obser-
oddard, by remarking
y left to the discretion
ive such notice to the
law fit, who might
e, or within two years,
raud, deny all the be-
the debtor, who might
perjury. He agreed
n that under the Bank-
ds had been committed.
de. He had been no
law, or one of those
ut as most of the states
ons on this subject, he
ct, viewing it as a state,
ilar provisions extend-

said he could not agree
t, as he did not view
iple of the bill with that
had been expressed by
He had always con-
edge that in countries,
e, the love of property
e over that of freedom.
principle once resorted
appeared to be ected
of course. He could
ffect on the time of our
-considering us as hav-
rigin from England—
ion of personal liberty
ebt. By them it was
freedom of the person
infringed but in cases
d the breaking of
for offences against
of the realm. These
en confirmed under
essor, and again adopt-
na Charta [the words
Mitchill here quoted.]
slature of that country
a violation of this stipu-
ever was, he believed,
d to a spirit of com-
a sacra James, which
with one accord, to
for liberty. Tracing
its first stage, the legisla-
ry, and in imitation,
d from the process of
on to the period of ul-
ent, in a series of vio-
at principles of Magna
came necessary for the
fere to remove the e-
pon their measures, first
person of the debtor
lavery, and secondly to
rom his debts.
said he had been thus
reference to England,
d been adopted there
mutandis to this coun-

t into a detailed specifi-
asons for the original
ill, which we regret our
t from the occasional
ce breaking the chain
mmunicated to us, con-
xpression of the opinion,
fidence was too short,
uld be determined to
, he would propose a

peaker) was in favor of
ng, as he did not think
ed for a decision. Not-
that had been said,
not lightly to violate
individuals. Most of
lvent laws; and their
his subject might per-
om the systems of the
which they lived. As
lieved that no govern-
t any man keep proper-
d of right to another.
an insolvent debtor,
is carriage, while his
be begging bread in
not this show the ne-
? All that could be
to liberate the person of
ere was no great dan-
of the creditor. It was
of Americans to seize
t was necessary for his

ntertained doubts whe-
gislating for this district,
erty that lay in the seve-
ose, for instance, that a
deed for property in an
hile in that state the
sold under execution on
there. Which would

appeared to him to place
e territory in a very dif-
from the citizens in the
In other cases Congress
lly—Here exclusively.
t pass a law that shall af-
y in another state. If
ake to pass a law that
roperty, there may be
n and clashing of juris-
ncluded by moving that
should rise, and ask leave

ut a division; and leave

tlandt presented a peti-
l Lewis, of the state of

New-York, stating that he has a recipe for the cure of the bite of a mad dog; praying Congress to investigate the merits of his discovery, and to allow him a suitable reward.

Referred to a select committee of five.

Mr. Newton offered a resolution, directing the Secretary of the Navy to report to the House the situation of the Timber deposited in the Navy Yard for building ships of war, and whether in order to preserve the same, it should not be covered with sheds.

Agreed to.

Mr. Newton presented a petition from sundry inhabitants of Norfolk and Portsmouth, praying that the Bankrupt law may be amended.

Referred to a select Committee of seven.

Mr. Varnum moved that the same Committee should be instructed to enquire into the expediency of repealing the Bankrupt law.

Mr. Newton considered the Committee already raised as competent to the enquiry without any express instruction.

Mr. Griswold thought this motion incompatible with the prayer of the petition from Norfolk and Portsmouth—the one being in favor of an amendment, and the other in favor of a repeal, of the Bankrupt Act. After it shall appear that it is not susceptible of amendment, it may be proper to agitate the question of repeal.

Mr. Varnum thought there was no impropriety in submitting both propositions to the same Committee, who will enquire into the merits of the law and the propriety of continuing it. It appeared to him that it was not calculated to protect the happiness of the citizens of the United States. It opened the door to the greatest frauds and inequalities imaginable. He hoped the subject would be taken up seriously, and expressed his opinion that the law was considered by both political sides as injurious.

Mr. Griswold replied, and insisted that the arguments of the gentleman proved the impropriety of referring both points to the same Committee. If the gentleman is against a continuance of the law, let it be referred to a Committee of the whole, who will be the most proper organ for expressing the sense of the House on that principle.

The question was then taken on Mr. Varnum's motion, which was carried—Ayes—45. Noes—25.

TUESDAY, Jan. 4, 1803.

Mr. Hemphill presented a memorial from the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Philadelphia, praying that the acts imposing additional duties on foreign tonnage and merchandize imported in foreign vessels may not be repealed.

Referred to the committee of Commerce and Manufactures.

The Speaker laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, enclosing a statement of the duties and drawbacks on goods, wares and merchandize imported into, and exported from the United States during the years 1799, 1800, and 1801.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, *Mr. John C. Smith* in the chair, on the bill for the relief of insolvent debtors within the district of Columbia.

Mr. Nicholson said, that when this section was under consideration yesterday, a number of gentlemen had declared themselves decidedly against the principle of it. He therefore moved to strike out the section, though he should vote against it.

On this motion the question was immediately taken, and carried in the affirmative by a large majority—Ayes 50.

When on motion of Mr. Nicholson the committee rose, the House refused their permission to sit again, and recommitted the bill to the committee who introduced it.

The House went into a committee of the whole, Mr. *Dawson* in the chair, on the bill making a partial appropriation for the naval service during the year 1803. The bill appropriates 100,000 dollars.

The committee having gone through the bill, reported it without amendment to the House, who immediately took it up, and ordered it to be engrossed for a third reading to-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole—*Mr. Dawson* in the chair—on the bill making appropriations for the military establishment of the United States for the year 1803, who filled up the several blanks and reported it with an amendment to the House, who concurred therein, and ordered it to be engrossed for a third reading to-morrow.

Mr. Moore, presented a petition from certain inhabitants on Broad river, stating that they have been for some time past, without any regular administration of justice, and praying to be annexed to the state of South Carolina.

Referred to a select committee of three.

Mr. Dawson called up his resolutions respecting post roads, which, on motion of Mr. Gregg, were referred to a committee of the whole House on Monday next.

Mr. Griswold observed that there was one subject noticed in the President's message, on which the House had taken no order. It was very important that the legislature should possess all the information that it was in the power of the heads of department to furnish. He then read that part of the message that relates to the cession of Louisiana to the French; and said that for the purpose of obtaining all the information proper at that time to be given, he made the following motion:

Resolved, That the President of the U. States, be requested to direct the proper officer, to lay before this House, copies of such official documents as have been received by this government, announcing the cession of Louisiana to France, together with a report explaining the stipulations, circumstances, and conditions under which that province is to be delivered up—unless such documents and report will, in the opinion of the President, divulge to the House particular transactions not proper at this time to be communicated.

Mr. Griswold considered it respectful to save the President from a request to furnish papers that may be improper at this time. The subject, however, was vastly important; and the cession of the province might require from the legislature some further protection of that frontier.

Mr. Smilie hoped the resolution would lie on the table at least till to-morrow.

Mr. S. Smith asked the gentleman from Connecticut to explain the difference between his resolution, and that offered at the beginning of the session by the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Randolph.)

Mr. Griswold replied, that if the gentleman from Maryland would give himself the trouble of reading the resolution offered by the gentleman from Virginia, he would perceive the difference. That related to the shutting of the port of New Orleans by Spain—and the other to the cession of the province to France. If the gentleman thought there were any delicate subjects connected with the resolution, he had no objection to its resting until to-morrow.

WASHINGTON CITY.

WEDNESDAY, January 5, 1803.

On Saturday, *New-Year's* Day, the President was waited upon by Diplomatic characters, the officers of the Government, the members of the legislature, and the citizens generally.—There were also present a large number of ladies.

A MEETING of the Inhabitants of the City and County of Washington, is requested at Lovel's Hotel in Pennsylvania Avenue, on Friday next at 4 o'clock precisely, on matters of importance.

Daniel Carroll of Dudn.
William Thornton,
Abraham Boyd,
Corn. Coningham,
Isaac Peirce,
Benjamin More,
Thomas Corcoran,
Robert Brent,

FOR THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

The late attack made by the Honorable John Rutledge upon Mr. Ellery a Senator of the United States from the State of Rhode Island, has for some time been the theme of private abuse, and the subject of public attention. The malignant passions of party spirit have colored the tale to suit their own political complexion, while the chivalric notions of high blooded honor have consigned to cowardice a man whose integrity was never doubted, and whose sentiments of propriety and genteel deportment can never be questioned by those who are acquainted with the circumstances of the transaction. But without attempting to convince persons whose prejudices are already enlisted upon one side or the other, the following statement of facts is submitted to the public with a full confidence that the sober sense of the community will form a correct decision on the subject of controversy. The only question now referred to the judgment of the public is, whether Mr. Ellery conducted as a good member of society and as a gentleman in refusing the challenge of Mr. Rutledge, and whether the latter can be justified in his attack upon the former. The cause of this rencounter is well known. It is unnecessary to state that it originated from a supposed agency which Mr. Ellery had in the publication of certain letters addressed to the President of the United States, with the signature of Nicholas Jeffroy, and of which it has been said Mr. Rutledge is the author. This is a subject nigher Mr. Rutledge's feelings and more interesting to his reputation: It shall not at this time receive a discussion, but the public may soon expect a more ample and a more satisfactory statement of facts on the authorship of those letters than has yet been presented. In the mean while they are requested to read with attention and impartiality the subsequent narration.

On Friday the 24th day of December, Mr. Ellery left the city of Washington for the purpose of spending Christmass with a friend who resided at Port Tobacco. On the following Sunday, while dining at this friend's house in company with a number of ladies and gentlemen, a servant belonging to the family informed him that a person at the door wished to speak with him. He immediately went to the door and found the person standing at the threshold. Though his countenance appeared familiar to Mr. Ellery, his name could not at the moment be recollected. He informed Mr. Ellery that he had quitted Washington in haste, and had brought away letters which he requested Mr. Ellery to take back with him on his return. The man seemed hurried. His name was required; he answered, "Mr. Morris of the House of Representatives." It was then perceived that the person who before was unknown was the honorable Lewis R. Morris of Vermont. At the request of Mr. Ellery he walked into a vacant room. He then said to Mr. Ellery, "Sir, my business is of another nature," and, after mentioning something respecting the Senate which could not be understood from the hesitating manner in which it was delivered, further said—"Mr. Rutledge expects you to give him the satisfaction of a gentleman." As Mr. Rutledge could have no motive for challenging Mr. Ellery which had not existed for months previous to this period, the latter must have been at a loss to conjecture the reason why this particular time was selected for the purpose. The extraordinary manner, and the appearance of Mr. Morris at this juncture, with such a proposal, led Mr. Ellery to enquire of Mr. Morris where Rutledge was, Mr. Morris replied "*at hand sir.*" As Rutledge might be then waiting at the door, and had certainly given himself and his honorable friend much trouble in travelling upwards of forty miles to invite a man to the field whom he well knew could not accept of the invitation, an immediate answer seemed absolutely indispensible, more especially as the weather was rainy and very cold. Mr. Ellery accordingly told the honorable Lewis R. Morris that he had a friend in the dining room more acquainted with the subject than himself, and whom he would request to return a proper answer to the proposal. Mr. Morris said, "Doctor Newman I suppose." Mr. Ellery replied "Mr. Newman is my friend." Mr. Newman was then called by Mr. Ellery, and after a few moments conversation the former waited on the honorable Lewis R. Morris with answer "that it was the opinion of Mr. Ellery's friends, and his own opinion, that Mr. Ellery ought not to meet Mr. Rutledge." Mr. Morris retired, and Mr. Newman joined his friends. Mr. Morris called the next morning at the seat of Mr. Newman; after a short conversation the latter went to Mr. Ellery's bed side, and informed him that Mr. Morris was below, and wished to know his reasons for declining a meeting with Mr. Rutledge, that he had remarked to Mr. Morris the impropriety of the request, but if Mr. Ellery consented to assign reasons, no objection would be made on his part. Though Mr. Ellery had given an absolute refusal to meet Mr. Rutledge, and though he thoroughly comprehended the intention of the honorable John Rutledge in this *second* application, Mr. Ellery desired his friend to tell the honorable Lewis R. Morris that he could not accept of Mr. Rutledge's proposal, that he considered himself under the protection of the Senate, and should proceed in a different manner, that he should return to Washington when his visit was completed, and take the advice of his friends as to the proper manner of bringing the whole affair before Congress, and that he conceived this would be the most effectual method of placing the character of each in its proper light. On Monday evening Mr. Ellery called at the stage-office at Port-Tobacco, and secured his seat in the mail stage for Washington. Tuesday morning, about sunrise, the stage started. The only passengers were an elderly lady and Mr. Ellery. It was understood by a conversation between the driver and a black boy taken up on the road, that the two gentlemen, Rutledge and Morris, had gone on, having started half an hour before the sun had risen; and when the stage arrived at the inn where breakfast is prepared, they were standing in the porch. Mr. Ellery passed by them into the bar room, and requested the landlord to place his breakfast in a separate room. Mr. Ellery was accordingly desired to walk into the one in which he sat on his way from Washington, and which was in the front part of the house. The windows were open—Mr. Ellery seated himself by one of them, having in full view the two honorable members who frequently eyed him with a look of some uncharitable design. What Mr. Ellery's suspicions must have been, is not difficult of conjecture. He could have no doubt whether their "intents were wicked or charitable." Followed from Washington, waylaid on his return, unarmed, and unattended by a friend, and recollecting the frequent menaces against his life, he could not but expect that his pursuer, whom he considered guilty of one meanness, would stoop to the commission of another. He sat down to his breakfast—the table being properly spread, the landlord was told there would be no further occasion of his attendance; he withdrew; and while Mr. Ellery had the cup in his hand and at his lips, Rutledge rushed into the room, and before the former could fairly raise his eyes, struck him with a club on the forehead. The blow was repeated before Mr. Ellery could clear himself from the table, and a third received as he seized Rutledge. Being in some measure stunned, the exertions of Mr. Ellery were not altogether on the defensive; Rutledge was instantaneously forced across the room and thrown upon a table with his head pressed to the wall. Immediately on this Mr. Ellery was seized by Mr. Symmes the tavern-keeper, and taken from Rutledge, who taking an advantage of his extrication and the presence of his friends, (who evidently sallied into the room for the purpose of saving him) again struck Mr. Ellery with the club; Rutledge was instantly thrown by Mr. Ellery to another side of the room, and upon another table, with his head again forced to the wall. In this situation Mr. Ellery, undoubtedly judging from what had passed, that he should not be permitted by Morris and the persons present to disable Rutledge, and having no disposition to beat even him whose life at the moment might have been justly sacrificed to the principle of self-preservation, turned to Morris and reproached him for countenancing an assault upon a member of the same legislative body to which he belonged, going, as he well knew, to the Senate, with the intention of laying before it every thing relating to the difference. The gentleman answered that "*he was out of it,*" but did not step forward to prevent farther violence. During this time, Rutledge, while pressed to the wall, and the blood running down his cheek, frequently cried out, "*pull his nose, pull his ears,*" and tried to scratch Mr. Ellery's face. But as he could do no material injury, very little attention was paid to him on the part of Mr. Ellery, who, while holding him in that situation enquired whether any civil magistrate resided in the village, and was answered that none lived within sixteen miles of the place. Mr. Ellery then observed to the gentlemen, who were all strangers to him, and who appeared at a loss in what manner to conduct, that he was a senator of the United States on his way to the capitol, and that the other two persons were representatives, who had followed him from Washington, way-laid him on his return, and fallen upon him without any weapons for his defence, and without a friend to protect him. Rutledge during this time remaining in the same unpleasant posture, Morris with the mixed emotions of anger and chagrin exclaimed, "Why don't you let him go." To this address Mr. Ellery made no reply; but still held Rutledge, breathless through fear, shame, and guilt. At length one of the spectators said to the landlord, "had we not better part them;" to which he would not assent until he spoke to Mr. Rutledge, who promised that he w[...]
not renew the attack. They th[...]
Mr. Ellery by the shoulders and [...]
Rutledge at liberty, who, whe[...]
the room under the escor[...]
vented his wrath a[...]
in language too [...]
peated.—It [...]
ledge [...]
led [...]

fa[...]
tha[...]
his [...]
had co[...]
of comp[...]
under every[...]
extorting fr[...]
of fear, som[...]
judgment w[...]
scheme was [...]
doubt, when[...]
this same ho[...]
Saturday eveni[...]
sault went slily [...]
Mr. Ellery in the [...]
and enquired whether [...]
of the members of congr[...]
at the same place, but of [...]
the house.

I would now enquire of t[...]
disposed to censure Mr. Elle[...]
ing to meet Mr. Rutledge, w[...]
honorable for one man to chal[...]
ther whose principles are oppo[...]
elling, who believes that in civi[...]
the law is the only arbiter of disputes between individuals, and that the rules of natural justice will not authorize a person to hazard his own life for a trifling cause, nor to shed the blood of his fellow man but for the purpose of self preservation, or to prevent the destruction of others? Is it honorable for a man who possesses his eye sight in perfection and who knows the art of shooting a pistol with accuracy, to challenge another whose vision is defective, and who has no skill in the use of fire arms? But admitting the justice of settling private quarrels at the point of the bayonet, admitting that Mr. Ellery is as great a duellist as Mr. Rutledge, the character of the latter must in the opinion of the former, and in that of his friends, have been so far implicated by the subject of the forged letters, that until the stain was wiped away, he could not justify himself by the laws of honor, in granting to Mr. Rutledge what is called the satisfaction of a gentleman.

Twenty Dollars Reward

WILL be paid for the delivery of a small black TRUNK, containing wearing apparel for a gentleman. It was lost between Denis Tavern and Elkridge landing from the Coaches on Friday last. If delivered at Mr. Stilles Hotel in the city of Washington.

Dec. 22. 3t.