power. Mr. F. asked, were not the members of this House selected and qualified for the discharge of this necessary duty? were they not appointed by as respectable authority as the judges? were they not under a solemn oath of office for the faithful discharge of this as well as every part of their high trust? and were they not protected by special privileges and protection during the discharge of their trust equally with the judges, and their stations as respectable as that of the judges? They are not only protected from civil actions, but are not subjected to impeachment for misbehaviour in office as the judges are. They are in their official capacity subjected only to the censure of public opinion. If this is true, it is improper, it is impolitic, for the members of this House to degrade their own character, it amounts to saying, they are not capable of discharging the trust they are solemnly bound to discharge, and ought not to have been invested with. He knew, however, that this was only introduced as an excuse for unwillingness. But the same gentleman adds, as a reason for opposing the resolution, that he is not acquainted with the history of the business. That is probably the case with him and others, especially such as had not a seat in the last session of Congress, or who resided at a great distance from the scene alluded to in the resolution; admitting this to be true, the best and the only regular way to become acquainted with the history of the case, is to carry the resolution into effect—to have a committee appointed with such power as would enable them to procure such information as that gentleman and every other member who is uninformed could depend on. The gentleman's objection in fact is one of the strongest arguments in favor of the resolution. The gentleman from South Carolina has however offered one other objection to the resolution which merits some notice. He has said that if a committee is appointed for the object proposed by the resolution, men of character and talents will not accept of appointments in the judiciary. The solidity of this objection will be best examined by the test of observation and experience. It has been already mentioned that several states have appointed their supreme judges for short periods, and that others have vested the legislature with the power of removing judges from office without impeachment, merely on their own opinion. Can the gentleman from South-Carolina say, can any member on this floor, where all the states are represented say, that these states are deficient in judges of respectability and talents? They cannot say so—there is no such complaint. The judiciary of New Jersey, where the judges are chosen but for seven years, is as respectable and the application of her laws as well brought home to the security and happiness of her citizens as they are in the states where judges are appointed for life. The same may be asserted with confidence of the state of Pennsylvania, before the revision of her constitution as they are since. There is this difference, however, where they have been appointed for limited periods there has been no impeachments or removals, and generally if not always, the judges were re-appointed and justice was well administered, but since they have been appointed for good behaviour there has, at least in Pennsylvania, been both, and more complaints of inattention, expence and delays in the administration of justice than had been formerly. Many of the judges, however, are very respectable and enjoy a high degree of confidence, but not more confidence than they did before the change of the constitution. There has been no attempt to remove or impeach the judges of the supreme court in that state.

To enquire into the conduct of the judges when confidence in them is evidently wanting is the only true way to secure the respectability of the judiciary. If that necessary confidence is withdrawn without cause, an official enquiry will restore confidence and the usefulness of the judges. This observation is supported by precedent and parliamentary usage. In that country from which precedents are so frequently sought, one precedent offers itself to recollection. In the year 1730 a committee of the British House of Commons was appointed to examine the jails. In the course of examination the committee discovered that Sir Robert Eyres, chief justice of the common pleas, a judge of very respectable character, was suspected, not of tyranny on the bench or of putting any man's life in jeopardy, but of having held an improper correspondence with a person confined for crime or misdemeanor, and this suspicion chiefly supported by anonymous letters. A committee of the House of Commons were appointed to make enquiry and it was found to the satisfaction of the committee and of the people, that the allegations on which the suspicion was founded were false, and the judge's character was vindicated and restored.

Mr. F. said this precedent applied well to the present case. If the judges mentioned in the resolution had done their duty their characters would be vindicated by the enquiry and the public confidence in their integrity restored; if they were guilty and not entitled to confidence they ought to be removed from office, and neither the one nor the other could be done unless the enquiry proposed was authorised.

He said that the enquiry was necessary to secure the purity, honor and usefulness of the judiciary department. If that House refused or neglected to exert the powers vested therein for securing public confidence in the judiciary; unprincipled men would find means of recommending themselves to appointments and would vitiate the streams where justice is expected to flow, and the citizens would be oppressed without the means or hopes of redress, and would feel the effects of tyrannical power in the administration of a government which in its other departments was the greatest and best of any in the world. Let proper enquiries be made where they are necessary—let the character of judges unjustly charged be vindicated and the vicious and unworthy be removed, and improper characters will cease to intrude themselves, their friends will not dare to recommend them, and Congress will have confidence that the laws which they pass will be applied agreeably to their genuine principles, to the protection and ease of the citizens; if we do not provide for this, we had better cease to make laws.

If virtuous men are appointed and the vicious discouraged, Congress may from particular circumstances be called on to make enquiries, but very rarely indeed to be employed in impeachments, (no men of real virtue and talents would refuse a seat on the bench for fear of enquiry or impeachment.) He said that the judges of the supreme court in the state he had the honor of representing though they differed in political opinions, administered justice with such purity and diligence, that though some of them had been long in office they enjoyed the confidence of the citizens, were in no danger of impeachment or removal by vote, and he believed would not shrink from enquiry if necessary. The more extensive the confidence of the citizens that was reposed in the judiciary the easier it would be to supply vacancies with men of character and talents. He said that among several other observations which occurred to his mind, with offering which he would not now detain the House, he had once thought of stating other charges against the official conduct of these judges of which he had been well informed, but on reflection he declined mentioning them and thought it most for the public good to insist on the appointment demanded by a member on the responsibility of his own official character, and as a matter of right, and would do nothing that might impair the weight of the precedent that he hoped would be set by agreeing to the resolution as it stood.

Mr. F. said that having so long engaged the attention of the House he would conclude by observing, that as the case now stood it is proper for all the members to vote for the resolution, those that believed as he did, that there was a want of necessary confidence in those judges and that this want of confidence was occasioned by their unauthorised and oppressive conduct were obliged in conscience to vote for the enquiry, and every member who believed the judges to have done their duty, and that the public confidence is withdrawn from them without cause, are bound in duty to vote for the resolution in order that the judges may have an opportunity to vindicate their character, that confidence in them being restored they may become useful to the public, therefore in every light he could view it, he was convinced it was his duty to vote for the resolution and would act accordingly.

(To be continued.)

A LIST OF LETTERS

Remaining in the Post Office at Washington city, on the 1st day of Jan. 1804.

A

John Jacob Astor, esq. David Allen, Mr. Angrard, Peter Abbott, Mr. Appleton, William Allison, care of Robert Hamilton.

B.

Joseph Bryan, 2. William A. Burwell, Esq. 2 Robert Barton, 2, Capt. Robert Bailey, Miss Renose Brown, Isaac Brigs, Esq. George Bills, John Ballerss, Esq. Doctor William Baker, Mr. John N. Barron, John Brown, William Bard Esq. Charles Bennett, Benjamin Boots, Nicholas Boon. Jacob Band, Jun. Henry Bradley, Captain George W. Balch, Mr. William Baker, care of Mr. Lowry, Capt. Thomas Bitton, Augustus Baldwin, Esq. John C. Baum, Esq. Lieut. Barchin, Major James Bruff, James W. Bryson, Mr. Lewis Beckwith.

C.

George Washington P. Custis, Esq. 2, Isaac Cowdrey, 2, Major Richard Claiborne, 2, Mrs. Betsy Cook, James Coyles, Thomas Cumming Esq. Citizen William Chapman, William Clarke, William Campbell, Esq. Joseph Clark, 2. Capt. Hugh G. Campbell, James L. Clouney, Mr. Whipple Crew, Rev. Bishop John Caurea, Daniel Calley, care of William O'Brien, James Colman, Francis Clarke. Thomas P. Chisselle, Esq. Right Rev. Doctor Claggett, James Connor.

D.

Mr. John Donnell, Lieut. Dent, Mr. Decheare, Mr. Daniel Derrance, Mr. George Delany, care of Mr Fennell General Davies, Josephes Donaghy.

E.

William Eaton, Esq. 4, W. B. Elwyn, Esq. Triplet S. Eites.

F.

Anthony Farniss, Joshua Farnham, Patrick Frazier, Winna Fletcher, Ignatius Farrol, Monsieur Francis Fabre, M'Carty Fitzhugh.

G.

Theodore Gaillard, Esq. 9. Lieut. Edmund P. Gaines, 2, Joseph Graves, Doctor Thomas Gampell, Monsieur Generez, William Green, 2, Mr. George L. Gray, William Godby, Nathan Goodhole, John Gillaspy.

H.

Samuel Hoar, 2. Capt. Charles Hyde, 3. James Hume, Esq. 2, Major I. E. Houston, 2, Capt. John Hand, Miss Kitty Hughes, Patrick Hany, Solomon Harrison, Mrs. Mary Hammon, Mr. James Hunter, Abijah Hunt, Andrew Hunter, John A. Houseman, Francis Henderson, Esq. Nathaniel Heyward, Esq. William Holmes, Mr. Richard Harrison, 2, Daniel Hodgeskin, Mr. John Hankart, John Harris, James Huey, E. Hart, Esq. Col. Elnathan Haskell, Daniel E. Huger, Esq.

J.

Walter Irvine, 2. Lieut William C. Jenckes, 2, Jacob Jon, Esq. John Ioor, Fanny Johnston, Charles Jouett, Esq. Robert W. Jones, Esq. David January, Mrs. Island.

K.

Roger Kissuck, 2, Alexander Kennedy, Ephraim Kerby, Rev. Samuel Knox, William Kemp, Henry Kurtz, George Kirkland.

L.

Theodorick Lov, Esq. 2, George Lynham, Jacob Loudonslay, General H. Lee, 2, Rev. James Laird, John T. Lindsey, Lewis Leroy, John Lynue, Honorable Thomas Laurence, Mrs. Sarah Lewis, Messrs. Lear & Co.

M.

Henry Myrerer, 2, Mrs. Ann Macubin, John Mace, Henry L. Martin, John M'Clan, Samuel Mitchell, James M'Cleary, John M'Nish, Esq. George M'Allister, Leo M'Daniel, Mrs. Ann H. Magruder, Notley Maddox, Messrs. H. and I. P. Marshalls.

N.

Robert Newman, Samuel Nicholson, Esq. Austin Nicholls, Esq.

O.

Henry Oswald, James Oldham, George Oxlade, John Ormrod, 2.

P.

Lawson Pearson, 2, Robert Piper, Thomas L. Paterson, J. S. Potts, Messrs. Patton, Leslie & Co. Lieut. Samuel Poule, Messrs. Isaac and David Pollock James Pendleton.

R.

John Rutledge, Esq. Alexander F. Rose, Esq. William Robertson, Doctor Samuel Robinson, William Ryan, John Richards, Esq. William S. Reid, Joseph Reed, Stephen Ravenel, Daniel Roney.

S.

John Shuttuck, 3, Robert Swartout, John Shyren, Capt. Thomas Swain, Thomas Smyth, jun. G. H. Smith, Thomas B. Shediner, Lieut. Joseph G. Swift, Capt. Gorsham Sturges, Mrs. Sunday, Levin Sothorin, S. Agathy Shediner, John Cleve Simmes, Benjamin Shacklott, Collop Smith, John Swank.

T.

William H. Thom, 2, Oba S. Timberlake, John Turner, Solomon Taylor, William Timmer, Charles C. Byrd Thomson, Garrard Tracy, Alexander Thomson, Jonathan Tilley, Miss Charlotte Thornton at Col. Washington's.

U.

John Underwood.

W.

John Woodward, Leonard Wheeler, Charles Wayman, John Walter, Esq. J. M. White, Eli Whitney, Esq. George Wray Esq, George Winset.

PATENT MACHINE

For boring Holes in Rocks under water or in any situation and blasting them.

THE subscriber having purchased the patent right from Jean Baptiste Aveilhe, the original inventor, for the counties of Frederick, Shenandoah, Jefferson, Berkely, Augusta, Rockingham, Hampshire, Hardy and Bottetourt in the state of Virginia, will dispose of it to any person or company for any particular object. The model may be seen at any time, and terms made known by

A. LINDO, Fred. Co. Vir.

Winchester Jan. 18—wtf

Ten Dollars Reward.

DESERTED from on board the frigate New York, on the 12th instant, JAMES MANLEY, a seaman about 5 feet 7. GARRET MARTEN, a German, about 5 feet 9. WILLIAM COMEFORD, about 5 feet 6 or 7 inches high. Whoever will apprehend said deserters & deliver them to captain John Cassin superintendant of the Navy Yard, Washington, shall receive the above reward and all reasonable charges.

Jan. 16—3t

For the NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER

The late reference to a committee of Congress of a petition presented two or three years ago, for a bridge over Potomac river, somewhere between the mouth of the Eastern Branch, and George Town, excited no alarm among those whose interest would be most affected by it; because it was not believed that such a petition could find a respectable advocate in either House of Congress. But within the last two or three days, some of the petitioners have appeared to exult in the certainty of success—one, indeed, has gone so far as to advise his friend to sell without delay his property in George Town—and names of high authority are quoted as favorers of this project. A few observations therefore on the subject may not be improper.

Many years ago the people of Boston and Charlestown, united to throw a bridge across the river that separates these two towns. No injury was apprehended to the navigation, as their bridge like the one now in projection, was to have a draw in it for the passage of ships, and those therefore who held property above the bridge in the towns, were as desirous of its erection, as the more fortunate owners of property below it. But mark the result! Of the few large vessels that attempted to pass the draw, none escaped without injury, and one or two were sunk: all attempts to pass the bridge, were soon abandoned; and the owners of the wharves and other property above it, discovered too late that they were ruined.

The river here is wider and more turbulent than that between Boston and Charles town: Our gusts of wind are as sudden; and our current is at times infinitely more violent. Of course a large vessel would be less governable here, than at Boston, in the delicate and dangerous operation of passing the draw—After one or two unsuccessful efforts no more ships would attempt to pass the bridge, and the property depending for its value on the navigation above it, would be as effectually destroyed as if nature had closed the river.

Against a project thus pregnant with mischief it cannot be needful to multiply objections—for that would imply, that apprehensions were seriously entertained, that Congress would deliberately commit the grossest, and most palpable injustice, and that too without a motive. No such apprehensions are entertained, and I will not therefore dwell upon the danger of filing up the river by stoppages of trees and collections of mud about the pillars of the bridge—nor of the danger to the navigation below, as well as above by the overthrow of the bridge itself by the ice towards spring, sometimes borne along with a force that twenty times the strength of a wooden bridge, could not for a moment resist.

It was a matter of surprise and must forever remain a matter of regret, that a petition should be presented to Congress, by American citizens, praying for the destruction of their neighbours property, for the chance of benefitting their own. Charity will suppose, that many of the petitioners, were themselves ignorant of the evils certainly to follow a compliance with their petition. But it is on record, and cannot be forgotten that Congress have been solicited to commit an act of open flagrant injustice. It is for congress by their marked disapprobation of this petition, to assert their own dignity, and to check the growth of that kind of spirit in the district, which could dictate the insult. A people without political rights are apt to forget that there are moral duties. The citizens of Columbia cannot be too soon instructed, that though congress have the power of exclusive legislation, they have no more right than inclination, to violate private property. Unless we are taught this lesson, congress may soon expect to have their tables crouded with petitions for the division amongst the *humble petitioners*, of the unwieldy estates of Robert Peter, D. Carroll, and other wealthy men. The reason assigned may be as in the case before us, public convenience, or public good, and it will not be difficult to shew, that a million of dollars in the hands of fifty men, will probably produce more enterprise, more improvement in the city, and more public good than twice that sum remaining in the hands of an individual.

A CITIZEN OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION:

The office of the Washington Association and United States Insurance company is removed to the corner of square No. 226 fronting on the President's square and Pennsylvania Avenue.

THOMAS HERTY, Sec'y P. T.

Jan. 18—tf.

WASHINGTON CITY

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18.

BRIDGE OVER THE POTOMAC.

A performance will be seen by the reader in the paper of this day under the signature of a "CITIZEN OF COLUMBIA," in hostility to the project of a Bridge over the Potomac opposite the city, as prayed for by a number of its respectable citizens. Had the spirit of this performance comported with the importance of the subject, the few observations, now to be offered, would have been spared, under a full conviction that there is too much good sense in the legislature of the union, not to perceive the general interest, and too much spirit not to adopt the best means for its promotion. The writer of *those* remarks does not conceal the fact that he is a citizen of George-Town; the writer of *these* remarks acknowledges himself to be a citizen of Washington. The *opinions* of both may, therefore, be presumed, to be interested, and to merit but little notice. To the facts and reasons adduced by each exclusive regard should be paid. I shall, first, consider, the objections urged against the bridge, and then some of the arguments that recommend it.

It is said the commercial interests of George-town will be injured by it. The declaration is altogether gratuitous, except so far as the effects of a bridge in the vicinity of Boston are considered as applicable to George-town, if a bridge shall be thrown over the Potomac.—But is there any weight in this remark? Is it logical, from a single fact, which may or may not be true, to deduce a general inference, absolutely at variance with a great number of other facts? It is far from unusual to throw bridges over navigable streams; and in most cases in which they have been erected, they have *aided*, instead of injuring the channel. Such, it is confidently believed, will be the effect of this bridge, if properly constructed.

But, even granting that the interests of George-town may be affected by it has Washington no interests? There may be half a dozen sea vessels that annually enter the port of George-town. Is it reasonable that a slight inconvenience incurred by these should frustrate a measure on which the interests of the union, equally with those of the city, depend? Are we to be told that the little interests of a town, containing a population, whose progress must depend upon that of the city, shall put down those of a place, destined to vie in numbers and in wealth with the largest cities on the continent? To all the empassioned assertions of this nature contained in the performance of the Citizen, it is a conclusive answer that the union and the city have rights as well as George-town, and that the denial of these rights to which they are entitled is as invasive of justice as it would be to divest them of rights actually enjoyed.

The citizens of Washington request permission to erect a bridge over the Potomac, because it gives them direct intercourse with Alexandria, and the southern country, instead of being compelled, as at present, to go the circuitous route by George-town, by which about six miles are lost, besides the inconvenience of crossing a river, often obstructed by ice, and sometimes very turbulent, in boats not affording the best accommodation. From this direct and easy intercourse great advantage will accrue to the city. At present, owing to the low situation of trade in Washington, the citizens are obliged to go to Alexandria or George-town for a considerable portion of their articles of consumption. From the superior commercial importance of Alexandria, the market there furnishes a more varied assortment of goods at cheaper rates than at George-town. This arises from the former carrying on a very extensive, while the latter carries on a very limited trade with Europe and the West-Indies.

The citizens of Washington also ask permission to erect this bridge, from the beneficial operation of the measure as well on the general, as on their local interests. The place, at which it is contemplated to erect the bridge, will fall in with the main post line that passes through the United States, by which a considerable distance, at present travelled, and a proportionate expence, will be saved to the government of the United States. The measure will, therefore, be of eminent use to every man who travels this road; and it will be of like use to every person who writes a letter in the quick progress of which to its place of destination he is interested; and this is presumed to be the case with the whole commercial and political world. It is a fact that, at present, the mail travels a retrograde course, and produces a delay and expence proportionate to the distance passed over.

These views might be greatly amplified; but it is confidently believed that