life beyond what perhaps had ever before been known in this country. Flour at that time we are told was ſold for fifteen and ſixteen dollars a barrell, which is now ſelling for ſix and ſeven dollars.—houſe rents we are alſo told were much higher at that time in Philadelphia than at the preſent time—theſe are ſome of the reaſons, which I preſume then induced the national legiſlature to increaſe the ſalaries of certain officers of the government for a limited time only—the enquiry then is, have the cauſes which gave riſe to the temporary augmentation of ſalaries in 1799 ceaſed to exiſt? If they have, ought not the effect alſo to ceaſe? I would aſk if it coſts the heads of departments as much to live in this city now, as it did in Philadelphia in 1799? Are houſe rents as high, or have they ever been as high in this city, as in Philadelphia? I apprehend it will not be pretended that this now is, or ever has been the caſe. I have been informed that houſe rents in moſt parts of this city, except juſt in the neighbourhood of the capitol, have (within twelve or eighteen months paſt) fallen forty or fifty per cent. and that within the ſame time, rents for houſes the neareſt to the capitol have fallen from twenty to twenty five per cent. Are proviſions as high now in this city, or in Philadelphia, or in any part of the country, as they were in 1799? Is flour now ſelling for fifteen and ſixteen dollars a barrell, and other articles of produce and of the firſt neceſſity, in the ſame proportion? Are the heads of departments, whoſe ſalaries we now propoſe to augment, in a ſituation, which obliges them to receive and entertain more company in this city than in Philadelphia? At a time then, when the prices of houſe rent, of proviſions and many articles of the firſt neceſſity, are reduced from what they were in 1799, ſome of them probably to nearly their ſtandard prices in 1789, yet in theſe times of economy, when the cry is to ſave the public money, we are about to give an inſtance of our love of economy, by increaſing the ſalaries of certain officers of our government.

One of my colleagues has aſſigned as one of his reaſons for the propoſed augmentation of ſalaries, that a war has recommenced in Europe, and that this war may produce the ſame effects in this country, in raiſing the price of produce and articles of the firſt neceſſity, which the laſt war produced. But will it not be prudent and proper for us to wait and know whether the ſame effects are produced by the preſent European war, before we undertake to increaſe ſalaries? Although my colleague does not now conſider the propoſed ſalaries to be too high, yet I find that in 1799, when houſe-rent and proviſions, I apprehend, were much higher than they now are, he voted againſt the temporary augmentation of ſalaries—againſt thoſe ſalaries which it is now the object of this bill permanently to eſtabliſh. He ſays alſo, that he has not heard any complaints againſt ſalaries in that part of Maſſachuſetts, in which he lives. No doubt my colleague is correct: but compare the ſalaries propoſed to be increaſed by this bill, with the ſalaries of other perſons in the government, with the pay of members of Congreſs, with the ſalaries of the higheſt ſtate officers, and they appear to be enormouſly high. In Maſſachuſetts the governor has a yearly ſalary of 2,666 dollars and ſixty ſix cents. The judges of the ſupreme court, who in holding courts in the ſeveral circuits, are obliged to be abſent from their families half the year or more, have each a permanent yearly ſalary ſomething ſhort I believe of 1,200 dollars, except the chief juſtice, who has ſomething more than that ſum. The treaſurer, ſecretary of the ſtate, and attorney general, each permanent ſalaries, I think, of 1000 dollars; and yet I have never underſtood, that there has been any difficulty in Maſſachuſetts in procuring ſuitable and proper perſons to fill theſe important offices. I believe, however, that for a few years paſt ſome temporary grants have been made by the ſtate to thoſe officers (excepting the governor) in addition to their fixed ſalaries.

The bill before the Houſe is intended to increaſe and make permanent the ſalaries of the officers therein mentioned—the law of 1799 was only temporary; by that law the ſalaries of certain officers were increaſed for ſpecial and ſufficient reaſons, which then exiſted; but now, when thoſe reaſons, or many of them no longer exiſt, we are about to augment ſalaries and render permanent thoſe, which were only limited and temporary.

Conſidering the increaſe and depreciation of money, ariſing from the increaſe of bank inſtitutions and other cauſes;—perhaps the ſalaries of the officers named in the bill, as at firſt eſtabliſhed in 1789 may now be conſidered as too low; but the great augmentation, which by this bill we propoſe to make to ſome of thoſe ſalaries, I cannot but conſider as too high for the preſent time, and I muſt therefore vote againſt the paſſage of the bill.

Mr. VARNUM. My two colleagues have expreſſed an opinion, in which I agree, that the ſalaries of the officers mentioned in this bill as fixed before the year 1799, are, under the exiſting ſtate of things, too low for the preſent time, but they have drawn different concluſions from this fact. I believe they are not now too high, and ſhall therefore vote in favor of the bill. For although I voted in 1799 againſt the bill for augmenting ſalaries, I believe there is a perfect conſiſtency in the vote I then gave and in that which I ſhall this day give. My colleague laſt up has ſtated that rents are fifty per cent. lower in this city than they were at Philadelphia in 1799. For ſuch an opinion I can find no data. In my mind the ſtatement is highly erroneous, and I believe the other ſtatements of the gentleman are equally erroneous. I wiſh he had brought forward the data on which he hazarded ſuch ſtatements. He further ſtates that proviſions are at preſent forty or fifty per cent. lower than they then were. This remark may, perhaps, be juſt in its application to bread, but it will apply to that article only; and this ariſes from circumſtances, of a temporary nature well known to every member of the Houſe—There were greater crops of wheat the ſummer before the laſt than were ever before known; and the ſurplus of thoſe crops now on hand has reduced the price. My colleague lives in the midſt of a country were one great ſtaple article, beef, is raiſed in *great* quantities. I will aſk him whether that article has been higher at any period ſince 1799 than it has been for three months paſt. You may go through all the other articles of living, and you will find them, on the average, to be about the ſame thing that they were in 1799. But will my colleague ſay that any kind of manual labour is now lower than it was at that time. He will not. He muſt acknowledge that the reverſe is the caſe in the country were he lives; and that a labouring man is there enabled to procure more for the occupation of his time then he could five years ago. Theſe being the facts, the concluſions of my colleague do not hold, when the principles on which he founds them, do not exiſt. I have reaſons which juſtify me for voting for the bill. I believe that a perſon in genteel life might entertain company in Philadelphia in the year 1799 as well for 3,500 dollars, as he can here at this time for 5000 dollars. If this be a fact, of which I have no doubt, the ſalaries allowed by this bill, bear only a proper proportion to thoſe that then exiſted.

My colleague obſerves that we are in favor of making this bill perpetual. But he will recollect that the other day a reſolution was introduced for making it temporary. Yet he voted againſt it, and though he now acknowledges that the ſalaries, as they ſtood before the year 1799, were too low, yet he does not make any ſpecific propoſition to increaſe them, but contents himſelf with voting againſt the whole bill.

My colleague has additional reaſons for voting againſt this bill inaſmuch as it is propped up, he ſays, by the act of 1799. I voted for the amendment, to which the gentleman refers, for this reaſon. When the laſt act on this ſubject paſſed, we heard it echoed and re-echoed through the newſpapers, that an economical, ſaving adminiſtration had raiſed their own ſalaries; and to prove this, a contraſt muſt be made in diſtinct columns between the ſalaries as they exiſted previouſly to the paſſage of the act of 1799, and as they then ſtood, and, in ſome diſtricts of the country the people were deceived and made to believe that this adminiſtration, inſtead of continuing, had raiſed the ſalaries. This, together with the calumny, induſtriouſly circulated, that ſecret ſervice money to a vaſt amount, was put into the hands of the Preſident, alarmed the people. To prevent the repetition of like miſrepreſentation, I voted for the amendment.

Mr. Varnum concluded his remarks by obſerving that he ſhould vote for the bill on the expreſs principle that it did not give the executive officers higher ſalaries in this place than they received in Philadelphia. In addition to this conſideration, is it probable, enquired Mr. Varnum, that gentlemen, competent to the diſcharge of the high duties of the firſt offices under the government, will ſerve as low here as they would in New-York, or Philadelphia? Will they have no regard to the proſpect of educating a riſing family? is this circumſtance no inducement to an individual to accept a lower compenſation, where the means of educating his children exiſt, than in a place where they are not to be found?

(To be continued.)

In the caſe of Joſeph Dowſon an Inſolvent Debtor.

ON the petition of Joſeph Dowſon, an inſolvent debtor confined in the Priſon of Waſhington county, for debt.—Notice is hereby given, that on Saturday the 24th inſtant, at the court room in the Capitol, at 10 o'clock, A. M. the oath of an inſolvent debtor will be adminiſtered to the ſaid Joſeph Dowſon agreeable to law and a truſtee appointed, unleſs ſufficient cauſe be ſhewn to the contrary.

It is ordered that this notice be publiſhed in the Waſhington Federaliſt and National Intelligencer, four times in each, previous to ſaid 24th inſtant.

By order of William Cranch, Eſq. aſſiſtant Judge of the Circuit Court of the Diſtrict of Columbia.

URIAH FORREST, Clk.

December 9—4tw

WASHINGTON CITY.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 12.

The amendment to the conſtitution, preſcribing the deſignation of the electoral votes for Preſident and Vice Preſident, has paſſed both Houſes by conſtitutional majorities. On this event we cordially congratulate the federal republicans of America, or, in other words, the great body of the people; for ſuch is the diſtinctive title pre-eminently merited by thoſe, who have, ſo far effected an object, which tends more efficaciouſly to perpetuate the Conſtitution than any act which has ever received the ſanction of Congreſs. It is theſe men, ſupported by the maſs of the nation, who alarmed at the threatening evils developed at the laſt Preſidential election, have urged the adoption of a meaſure which muſt be a death blow to faction, and which, by averting for ever the greateſt danger that a republican government can apprehend, has placed the liberties of their country, and the rampart that protects them on ground as ſtrong as the affection of the people for rational liberty.

This meaſure has progreſſed with the utmoſt deliberation. During a period of ſeven weeks it has, with intermiſſions, been before the national legiſlature; and an ample opportunity has been offered to its opponents to exhauſt their almoſt *inexhauſtible* powers of ſubtility and ſophiſtry. To the republican legiſlatures of the union their language is, *we will divide you by ſtratagem, if we cannot overcome you by force.* But the attempt has periſhed within the walls of the edifice in which it was made. State jealouſies, ſtate intereſts, ſtate hoſtility have been rung, in all the tones of diſmay! But where are theſe monſters to be found? They have been buried long ſince in the common and capacious grave, which has covered, if not with oblivion, at leaſt with harmleſneſs, all thoſe anti-republican meaſures that ſtarted into a momentary exiſtence at the will of our infatuated councils. Theſe ſpectres, it is true, occaſionally, riſe to the view of a diſtempered imagination; but they diſappear before the light of reaſon.

On the wiſdom, the virtue, the patriotiſm of the ſtate legiſlatures, we confidently rely. They cannot, they will not be deceived. Their country's intereſt is their own. The legitimate promoters of its happineſs, they will not incur that deep reſponſibility which a refuſal to obey the voice of the people, will inevitably produce. Their reaſon will go with their feeling, and in advancing the happineſs others they will find their own.

Extract of a letter from a reſpectable character in the Indiana territory, dated Nov. 22.

"I was lately at Detroit making arrangements for the conveyance of the mail.

It is a bad country for the mail to be carried through:—But I believe there is no better route by which it can go to the ſame place:—and in caſe the ſubject ſhould come before you; I would take leave to refer you to a report which I have made upon it to the Poſt-maſter General. It would I conceive be very impolitic to diſcontinue the route,—as it is the only channel of communication that the people there have with the reſt of the union, and almoſt the only particular evidence which they have of their belonging to it. Their preſent connection with the Indiana territory, is a moſt vexatious and diſcouraging one. They ſcarcely ever ſee the judges,—and almoſt all civil ſuits after being determined at Detroit are carried to port Vincennes. They are anxious for a ſeparate government:—and though they are but few in number, amounting I think to about 5000, they ought to have it:—for without it they cannot enjoy the advantages common to other American citizens.

Their peculiar ſituation in a political view likewiſe calls for it. It would tend to weaken Britiſh influence, and to ſtrengthen the population there. It would have a happy effect on the minds of the Indians, as a regular government organized and operating there would increaſe their reſpect for the United States. If wiſely adminiſtered, it would alſo conciliate the French, and in time create in them an attachment to the American republic. Nine tenths of the population conſiſt of theſe people,—but they have none of the feelings of Americans.

But perhaps, there is no part of our territory where greater circumſpection would be requiſite in the appointment of a chief magiſtrate and of other public officers.

He ſhould be a man attached to the people of America and to the government upon principle,—but without that ſectarian vehemence or narrow, national ſpirit, which excites alarm, and creates oppoſition where it ſhould be the ſtudy to conciliate eſteem. He ſhould be active in promoting public improvements and affording to the inhabitants a feeling of the benefits of government. They have now no roads, no bridges, no ſchools. Not one man in an hundred can ſpeak a word of Engliſh. This creates a wall of ſeparation which ſhould be broken down. A ſchool conducted by a Catholic who ſpeaks the Engliſh language ſhould be eſtabliſhed in every ſettlement. One at the river Reiſin,—one near Stoney creek,—one near the Wyandot town,—one between the river Rouge and the river Ecoſte, and one or two at Detroit will be ſufficient. Their land titles, which ſtand upon four different foundations, ought to be ſpeedily examined into and eſtabliſhed. More land ſhould be purchaſed from the Indians, and encouragement given to actual ſettlers upon more liberal terms than in any other part of the union. The country is not inviting:—but it is notwithſtanding a fine country for raiſing ſtock:—and it is of infinite importance to exhibit to the Indians by means of an increaſing population in that quarter, a monument at their own doors of the growing power of the United States, and to counteract any aims, which, in the fluctuation of political relations, may be grounded either on the jealouſy of the Engliſh ſettlers or the diſaffection of the French.

It depends, in ſhort, upon the meaſures of Congreſs, and upon the character and ſpirit of the government which may be eſtabliſhed there,—whether the territory on the lakes ſhall be a ſource of wealth and ſecurity, or a mere dead weight on the United States. Should it on the one hand, be placed under the guidance, of a quiet inactive chief magiſtrate who cares for nothing in his office but its powers and emoluments;—or on the other hand ſhould it be ſubjected to the rule of a noiſy demagogue, the ſlave of national prejudices,—who feels no ſentiments but ſelf-admiration, and knows no principle but that of bowing to the ſource of power and honor wherever it may exiſt;—in either caſe,—the people will continue to regard themſelves as ſubjects, inſtead of learning to feel and to act as citizens,——and will embrace the firſt opportunity of throwing off the yoke."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, December 9, 1803.

The Houſe reſumed the conſideration of the amendment to the conſtitution, received from the Senate, reſpecting the mode of electing a Preſident and Vice Preſident.

Mr. Hoge moved a recommitment, in order to obtain an amendment to the reſolution.

Motion loſt—Ayes 40—Noes 63.

The queſtion was then put on agreeing to the main reſolution.

Meſſrs. Smilie, Holland, Thomas, Jackſon, Stanton, and J. Randolph ſpoke in favor, and Meſſrs. Taggart, Thatcher, R. Griſwold, Dennis, Huger, and Euſtis, againſt it.

About ſeven o'clock a motion was made to adjourn, and loſt—Ayes 37.

When the FINAL QUESTION on agreeing to the AMENDMENT to the CONSTITUTION, as received from the Senate, without alteration, was taken by yeas and nays, which being called, the Speaker roſe, and obſerved,—the yeas are 83, the nays 42, the Speaker votes in the affirmative, the amendment is conſequently carried in the AFFIRMATIVE by a conſtitutional majority.

We are adviſed of an error in our paper of the 7th inſt. reſpecting the mention therein made of papers preſented to the Houſe of Repreſentatives on the election of Mr. Purviance. No petition was read againſt Mr. Purviance's election; the papers conſiſted of a copy of a notice and two depoſitions; in conſequence of there being no petition, it was repreſented as not in order to act on the papers, but at the particular requeſt of Mr. P. the neceſſity of a petition was diſpenſed with by the Houſe, and the papers referred to the committee of elections.

The following addreſs, is from the Legiſlature of Vermont, to the Preſident of the United States.

Weſtminſter, Nov. 11th, 1803.

SIR,

Though oppoſed to frequent addreſſes to thoſe who fill important ſtations in our government, yet there are times, when it would be improper to refrain from expreſſing our grateful acknowledgements to the ruler of the Univerſe, for the proſperous ſituation of our common country:—and an approbation of thoſe who guide the State. While we view the United States individually and collectively, rapidly increaſing in wealth and population—Secured in the uninterrupted enjoyment of life, liberty, and property, and almoſt without contention with any foreign nation—we cannot forbear congratulating you, Sir, on the happy effects of thoſe principles put in operation, which have ſo frequently appeared in your official communications.

The late ſuſpenſion of our right of depoſit at New Orleans, excited an univerſal ſpirit of indignation:—A ſpirit which muſt convince the world, that while we earneſtly deſire to maintain peace with the whole family of mankind, we will not tamely ſubmit to injury or inſult, from any nation on earth.

While we contemplate the acquiſition of an extenſive and fertile territory, with the free navigation of the river Miſſiſippi, we cannot but venerate that ſpirit of moderation and firmneſs, which among divided councils, finally enriched our country, without the effuſion of blood.

And it is with much ſatisfaction, we learn from the higheſt authority, that no new taxes will be requiſite for the completion of the payment for this valuable acquiſition.

Permit us then to tender to you, Sir, our warmeſt thanks, for the conſpicuous part you have taken in this important arrangement.

We gratefully contemplate thoſe humane and benevolent meaſures, which civilize our cruel ſavage neighbors, and learn them to exchange their hoſtile weapons for the implements of agriculture and houſhold manufactures.

We recognize with ſentiments of eſteem, that vigilance and parental care which has enlarged our territory, by a negociation with one of the friendly tribe of Indians.

From knowing that our marine force is diminiſhed, and that our trade is ſtill protected.—We obtain impoſing proof that vigilance and economy go hand in hand, in the management of our governmental affairs.

The flouriſhing ſtate of our treaſury demonſtrates our growing greatneſs, and muſt convince every good citizen that the indecent and villifying expreſſions too frequently uttered through the medium of the preſs, againſt the adminiſtrators of our government, muſt finally, with equal certainty as juſtice, revert on the authors.

Your advice to the Houſe of Repreſentatives reſpecting our conduct towards the contending powers of Europe, meets our higheſt approbation.

From our own feelings, as well as from the general knowledge we poſſeſs, of the ſentiment of our conſtituents, you may be aſſured that the hardy ſons of Vermont, though earneſtly engaged in their peaceable purſuits, will be ready to fly, on the call of their country, at the riſk of their lives, their fortunes, and domeſtic felicity, to maintain their rights as an independent nation, preferring every conſequence to inſult and habitual wrong.

Permit us to aſſure you of our moſt earneſt wiſh, that every poſſible happineſs may attend you through life, and that you may finally receive the plaudits of the great Judge of all.

By order of the Houſe,
ABEL SPENCER, *Speaker.*

NEW YORK, Dec. 8

Captain Richards, of the ſhip Holland, arrived at this port laſt evening in the ſhort paſſage of 35 days from Liverpool, with London papers to the 26 of October, incluſive and Liverpool papers to the 29th.

Though 18 days later than our former advices from London, very few public occurrences of importance had happened, that, time no attempt had been made to carry the projected invaſion of England into execution, though, (if poſſible) the hoſtile preparations were continued on both ſides with increaſed activity.

We are informed that an embargo was expected to be laid at Liverpool, on the 30th October (the day of captain Richards ſailing) on all veſſels in that port. The nation were in arms, expecting hourly a viſit from the French; no buſineſs was doing, manufactories were at a ſtand; and every appearance indicated a general apprehenſion that the ſituation of the country was drawing to an important criſis.

The Texel was blockaded by Sir Sidney Smith,

There was a duty of two ſhillings per bbl. on all American flour. A general embargo was hourly expected.

We obſerve that new diſturbances have broken out at the Cape of Good Hope, and that Government unable to reconcile the ſoldiery, (great numbers of whom have deſerted) had ſent a diſpatch to the Iſle of France, to repreſent the ſituation of the Cape to the Captain General of that Iſland. Proviſions are ſo ſcarce at the Cape, that the inhabitants and garriſon are put under allowance.

We learn from Madeira, that on the 9th October a conſiderable part of that iſland was inundated by a ſudden fall of water from the Mountains. Three hundred houſes were deſtroyed, and eight hundred lives loſt. All the veſſels in the harbour ſlipped their cables and put to ſea.

Philadelphia, December 8.

FROM NATCEZ, Nov. 17.

"The treaty has arrived, together with diſpatches for Gov. Claiborne. It is ſaid that the detachment leaves Fort Adams for New Orleans, in ten days from this."