states, has the same power at one blow, to wipe off the whole debt funded in favor of the creditor states, the principle is the same, for if the report be unjust as to the debtors, it is so as to the creditors.

But the gentlemen ask, what advantage is there in holding those balances hanging over their heads; I answer, I consider them as a security for the payment of the debt already funded. Believing as I do the settlement made by the commissioners, between the United States and the individual states, to be as just as the nature of the case and the difficulties attending it would admit of, I hope the resolution on your table will not prevail.

Mr. VARNUM. The resolution under consideration is for the extinguishment of the balances, due from several of the individual states, to the United States, as appears by a report of commissioners appointed to adjust and finally to settle the demands of the several states for services rendered and supplies furnished the United States in the late revolutionary war with Great-Britain. This report was made on the 5th day of December, 1793. The whole amount of the balances due from the debtor states, and which is now proposed to be extinguished, is 3 517 582 dollars. This resolution is supported on the ground, that the settlement was unjust, and consequently that the balances found by it were improper, and not due. And in fact, Sir, I cannot conceive of any other ground on which an extinguishment could be supported, for it is evident, that the debtor states are not deficient in ability to pay that which they justly owe; and if not deficient in ability, surely no either consideration can be sufficient to exonerate them from the payment: no principle either political or moral, can justify an individual or a state, in holding property justly due to another, without the consent of the individual or state to whom it is due. In order to establish the position that the settlement was unjust, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. Rodney) has produced a document from the comptroller of that state to shew, that Delaware did a part of the time in which the United States were engaged in the war, comply with the requisitions of congress.— And if it is granted that the statement is true, does that prove that the settlement was unjust? No, Sir, nor would any documents which can be produced, of the services rendered by that state, go to prove the fact, without contrasting them with the services rendered by the other states in the union; and gentlemen very well know this cannot be done, without a revision of all the document's of the services rendered, and supplies furnished, by each state in the union, during the whole of the war. Will congress undertake to do this? If they will not, the documents which the gentleman has referred to must go for nothing. In fact, sir, they prove nothing, relative to the question under consideration. Several other gentlemen have expatiated on the services rendered by the debtor states, to prove that the settlement was unjust: And, sir, I might with as much propriety go into a detail of the services rendered by the state which I have the honor, in part, to represent on this floor, to prove the reverse; but this might also be considered irrelative to the question before you: Yet as gentlemen have taken this ground, in justice to Massachusetts, I shall be permited generally to say, that she was second to no state in the union, in point of exertion for the general defence, during the whole of the war; her exertions in furnishing men and supplies were general, uniform and without a parallel: History does not, in my opinion, give you an instance, of any people, since the first formation of civil government, ever having paid, according to their numbers and wealth, in the same length of time, so great an amount, in specie value, as was paid, by the way of direct taxes, by the people of Massachusetts in the ten years the next subsequent to the year 1777. At the close of the war, towns and individuals were deeply involved in debt, which had grown out of their exertions to furnish supplies for your armies, and to hire soldiers to fight the battles of the country, at a time when the credit of the nation could not produce them. The pressure of these debts, and the exorbitant taxes which had been unavoidably imposed by the state, drove the people into an insurrection, which for a considerable time assumed an aspect which threatened the destruction of all the fair prospects which had been acquired by the revolution; but thanks to *Heaven* this insurrection happily subsided. But notwithstanding all their exertions, the assumption of part of the debt by the United States, and the payment of the balance found due on the settlement, in stock of the United States, yet after all the state were burthened with an unwieldy state debt, which grew entirely out of the transactions of the war; and for the gradual extinguishment of which, a heavy direct tax, has from that period to the present time, been annually imposed on the people, and must continue for years to come before the debt can be entirely extinguished. This being the case, while some of the debtor states have glided easily along without the imposition of a direct tax to the amount of a single cent, for the discharge of the expence of the war, during the many years which Massachusetts has laboured under this pressure of taxation, has induced gentlemen the best informed on the subject, to doubt whether the services of that state had all been taken into the account; but, sir, although the settlement was supposed to bear hard on that state, the people were determined to make the best of their situation, and not complain of a settlement which was made under so much solemnity, and as they conceived with the most upright intentions, so far as the perplexed state of the accounts would permit, to do equal justice to all the states.

The honorable Speaker in order, I presume, to inforce on the minds of the gentlemen of this House, the injustice of the settlement, has stated, that the commissioner of the great middle department, has, since the report was made, stated on the floor of Congress "that those balances ought to be extinguished, and if it were not done, that he would unfold a tale which would make the hair stand on end, or some strong expression of that kind."—Mr. Speaker did not mention the name of the commissioner which he said uttered this sentiment; but being so clearly designated, that every gentleman present must know the commissioner alluded to, there can be no harm in mentioning his name, I conceive it must be general Irwin. When I look at the report and find that general Irwin is the first commissioner who signed, it is difficult for me to reconcile the statement of the honorable Speaker with this document: and when I recur to a more recent transaction, I am confident there must have been some misunderstanding in regard to the general's declaration, (for I am sure the honorable Speaker would not intentionally misrepresent it.) General Irwin did not only sign the report of the commissioners, but there is at this time a letter in the possession of a gentleman of this House, written by general Irwin since the commencement of the present session of Congress, and to which his signature is subjoined, stating, that all possible pains was taken by the commissioners to do equal justice to all the states in that settlement.

Now, Sir, will this committee conclude, that general Irwin had, ten years ago, any frightful tale to develope which would evince the injustice of this settlement? or will they not rather conclude that his signature subjoined to the report, under the solemnity of an oath (for all the official transactions of the commissioners were done under that solemnity) together with his statement in the letter which I have mentioned, afford sufficient evidence that he has always considered the settlement a just one? Another objection to the justice of the settlement is, because the expence of the war was not apportioned among the states by the value of their lands, agreeable to an article in the confederation. It is an old adage that consent takes away error; and, Sir, it is true, that mode of settlement was adopted by the unanimous consent of all the states. When a recurrence is had to the history of the whole transaction, I believe it will be found that this objection has no weight. Sir, I am far from entertaining a wish, in the least degree, to depreciate the exertions of any state in the union in the revolutionary war. I know they all made great exertions. Yet, Sir, I presume it will not be derogating from the merit of any state to say, that the exertions of some of the states exceeded those of others. It is well known that in some of the states many of the citizens were inimical to the cause in which we were engaged, and did all in their power to assist the enemy in subduing our common country—this was a misfortune, although local in its operation, that was general in its effects, and it was generally lamented: Yet it did by no means detract from the merit of those citizens who were friendly in the same states; but it goes to shew, that those states where it did happen did not, nor could not do as much towards the common cause as those who had nothing of the kind to impede their exertions; and consequently the improbability of the settlement being unjust as it relates to those states which stand the most indebted to the United States.

The ordinance which passed the old Congress in 1787, authorising the settlement of the accounts of the several states, against the United States, for services rendered and supplies furnished during the war, makes as ample and liberal provision for an allowance of all the accounts exhibited, as could possibly be expected, or even asked, by any of the parties to the settlement: it was founded on the principles of mutual compromise, and by the unanimous consent of all the states. By the conditions of the settlement agreed upon by that ordinance, the public faith of each state was solemnly pledged to all the other states, and the public faith of the United States was solemnly pledged to each individual state, that the settlement, and proportion of the debt allotted to each state, by the commissioners thus mutually agreed upon and chosen by all the states, should be final and conclusive. Soon after the establishment of the present government in the year 1789, a law was passed by Congress for facilitating the settlement and for filling vacancies in the board agreeable to the principles of the ordinance of 1787, and so far as I have discovered by a recurrence to the journals, this law passed without any opposition. In 1790 Congress again assumed the consideration of the subject, and passed a law which recognized all the principles of the ordinance of 1787, and provided that a distribution of the whole expence should be made among the several states according to the first census under the present constitution. This law was also passed by the almost unanimous consent of the House, and in the Senate where the state sovereignties are more paticularly represented, it appears by the journals, to have passed without opposition. Thus, sir, from the first agreement of 1787 to the final close of the settlement, all the states were unanimous in the mode prescribed for settlement, and stood most solemnly bound to each other to abide by it; and the public faith of the nation was, by the several acts of congress on the subject, most solemnly pledged to carry it into effect.

Can the legislature then relinquish these balances, without a violation of plighted public faith? And yet will they undertake to do it? Sir, it is a fundamental principle in the government of all civilised nations to pay the most sacred regard to plighted public faith.— And sir, the friends of our government have derived much consolation from the idea, that the United States would never suffer their national character to be stained by a violation of this important national principle. Yet, sir, from what has taken place, it has been believed, that the United States would not be behind any nation on the earth in the preservation of this public virtue. But if the resolution on the table should be passed into a law, this valuable principle will receive a wound which may lead to fatal consequences. I must be permitted to doubt the power of congress to extinguish these balances without the concurrence of all the states. The settlement having been made under a solemn agreement of all the states, where will you find a power vested in congress to alienate the interest which any individual state has acquired in the balance in consequence of that agreement, and vest it in another state? No such power is expressed in the constitution, nor can I conceive it to be implied by any thing which is expressed in that instrument.

If then congress have no constitutional power to make the extinguishment, will not the transaction be considered an innovation on the rights of individual states, as well as a dereliction of the public faith?

A gentleman from New-York has said that the extinguishment could not be a violation of public faith, because Congress had already given up a part of the debt. It seems to me that the gentleman's conclusion does not naturally follow the premises which he has stated, for if it could, under any circumstances, be considered a dereliction of public faith to extinguish these balances, it cannot at this time be considered the less so, merely on the ground of the legislature having heretofore fallen into an error on the subject. The fact is, that Congress did, in 1799, pass a law, for remitting the balances, on condition, that each debtor state would pay into the treasury of the United States by a given period, the amount of the sums which had been assumed by the United States, of their respective state debts prior to the settlement. But, Sir, at the time of passing that law, and ever since I have considered it in the same point of light as I do the resolution before you, and therefore cannot admit that as a circumstance in favor of the resolution. That provision has now expired, without being embraced by any of the debtor states, except in that which has been done by the state of New-York, in fortifying her ports and harbors. If the state of Delaware had thought proper to have complied with this liberal provision, she might have been discharged from a debt of 600,000 dollars for 60,000 dollars, but it seems that she prefers a total extinction to a partial payment. If the balances should be extinguished on the principle that the settlement was unjust, which is the only ground taken in favor of their extinguishment, I am apprehensive that this is only to be a stepping stone to a more favorite object. I mean the extinguishment of the balances due to the creditor states on the settlement: for although these balances have been funded by the United States, it is well known, that the evidences of the debt in the possession of the creditor states are not transferable, so that Congress will have nothing to do to effect this part of the business, but to order payment to the creditor states on those balances to be stopped. And if this House shall consider the settlement so entirely unjust as has been stated by some gentlemen, and in consequence thereof give their vote for the extinguishment of the balances due from the debtor states, I cannot conceive why the same principle might not with the same propriety be extended to stop payment to the creditor states; nor should I be surprised, if the one should be carried, at seeing a resolution laid upon your table, before the close of the present session, for effecting the other. And will not the same parity of reasoning which has been adduced on this occasion lead to the extinguishment of all the debts of the nation? If 3,500,000 dollars due to the United States is to be wiped off on a mere statement on this floor, that the settlement was unjust, without the least particle of evidence to prove the fact, will a pretext ever be wanting for passing sentence against any class of your public debt? Sir, I have always been an admirer of the system of government established in the United States. I have thought it the best calculated of any government on earth, to perpetuate national faith, and secure individual rights. I have entertained exalted ideas of the wisdom and economy of the present administration, and I have consoled myself on the pleasing prospects of the future prosperity and happiness of our nation. But, Sir, I view the measure before you as calculated to veil those pleasing prospects, and excite fearful apprehensions for the honor, and fate of our country.

[*To be continued.*]

WASHINGTON CITY

FRIDAY, February 15.

(CIRCULAR.)

Madrid, 21st *Oct.* 1803.

Sir,

In consequence of instructions which I have this day received from Vice-Admiral Lord Nelson, commander in chief of his Majesty's fleet in the Mediterranean, I am to acquaint you that the ports of Genoa and Spezzia have been declared in a state of blockade, and you are hereby requested to communicate this information to all the Consuls or Vice-Consuls of neutral powers in the port of your residence, or its district, in order that they may give notice to the vessels of their respective flags.

All neutral vessels attempting to enter the ports of Genoa and Spezzia, after receipt of this notification, or found on the coast between Leghorn and Cape Delle Melie, will be stopped by his Majesty's squadron, and sent into port for adjudication.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient humble serv't
(Signed) JOHN HUNTER.

James Duff, Esq.
H. B. Majesty's Consul, Cadiz.

ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS REWARD.

The following tissue of falsehoods appears in the Boston Centinel of the 4th of February under the title of "*An Extract of a letter from a Member of Congress, dated Washington, 20th January, 1804.*"—The ascription of this article to a member of Congress, who should be under the sacred obligations of veracity, is a libel on the character of a representative of the people. As such every friend to truth and the dignity of the representative character is interested in drawing before the public for their censure the man, who has committed such an outrage. With this view the above reward is offered to the individual who shall give satisfactory proof of the forgerer of the above letter.

An Extract of a Letter from a Member of Congress, dated Washington, 20th January, 1804.

"I inclose you two bills now pending before the two Houses of Congress, which I wish may be immediately published in the newspapers at Boston, as one or the other of them will in all probability pass, in some shape or other, and I apprehend will be productive of important consequences not only to the commerce but to the peace of the United States.

"The zeal upon this occasion is of such burning heat, that it has thus produced two bills at the same time, one in each House for one and the same purpose;—the project is a deep laid one, and the ministerialists thought by the color of protecting American seamen to scare all opposition out of doors;—the fraud however is detected, and I hope will be exposed. Although both the bills pretend in their titles to be for the protection of American seamen and seamen of the United States, there is in fact not one word about American seamen in either of them, and yet when its frantic provisions has been attacked I wish you had seen the hornet's nest that burst down upon our heads. The real object is to protect foreign seamen against the authority of their own governments, and within their own jurisdictions and for this purpose to set the laws of nations at defiance. It is especially to protect British seamen deserting from the British service and contriving to get on board an American merchant vessel even within the British jurisdiction;—to protect a sailor who may desert from a man of war in the river Thames against impressment by his lawful commander. Judge of the principle and its inevitable consequences.

"As I am very confident that this will never be assented to by foreign governments and especially by that of Great Britain, I cannot possibly suppose these bills brought forward for any other purpose than that of leading to a war with England. There are many other circumstances which concur to confirm this belief. I think it therefore necessary to give this notice to you, and I wish it may be known to the commercial interest in general at Boston and the other parts of the state, that those of our fellow citizens who have their property afloat and exposed to the consequences which these measures may draw upon them, may adopt such precautions as individually their own prudence shall point out to secure themselves."

APPOINTMENTS made by the President during the recess, and confirmed by the Senate.

James Munroe, minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to the government of Great Britain, vice, Rufus King, resigned.

Tobias Lear, consul general of the United States for the city and kingdom of Algiers, and a commissioner to treat of peace, with the Bashaw of Tripoli, vice, James Leander Cathcart.

John M. Goetchius, of New York, consul for the port of Genoa.

Isaac Coxe Barnet, of New Jersey, commercial agent of the United States for the port of Havre de Grace, in France, vice Peter Dobell, resigned.

Levitt Harris of Pennsylvania, consul of the United States for St. Petersburg in Russia.

Thomas Rodney of Delaware, a judge of the Mississippi territory, vice, Seth Lewis, resigned.

Nathan Sanford of New York, attorney for the United States, for the district of New York.

Jared Mansfield of Connecticut, surveyor general of the lands of the United States North West of the Ohio, vice, Rufus Putnam, removed.

Isaac Briggs of Maryland, surveyor of the lands of the United States south of the state of Tennessee.

Edward Turner, of the Mississippi territory, register of the land office within the same for the lands lying west of Pearl river, in the county of Adams.

Charles Jones Jenkins of South Carolina, a commissioner of the United States under the act of Congress providing for the valuation of lands and dwelling houses, and for the enumeration of slaves for the 5th division of South Carolina.

Tench Coxe of Pennsylvania, purveyor of public supplies of the United States, vice, Israel Whelen.

Henry Warren of Massachusetts, collector of customs for the district of Plymouth in Massachusetts, and inspector of revenue for the port of Plymouth.

Isaac Ilsley of Massachusetts, collector for the district of Portland and Falmouth.

Samuel Ward of Massachusetts, naval officer for the district of Salem and Beverly.

Thomas Durfee, of Rhode Island, Inspector of Revenue and Surveyor for the port of Tiverton, in Rhode Island.

Abraham Bishop, of Connecticut, collector for the district of New Haven, in Connecticut.

Samuel Osgood, of New York, naval officer for the district of New York.

Callender Irvine, of New York, inspector of the revenue, and surveyor of the port of Buffalo creek, in New York.

Robert Lee, of New York, collector for the district of Niagara in New York, and inspector of revenue for the port of Niagara.

Jeremiah Bennet, jun. of New Jersey, collector for the district of Bridge Town in New Jersey, and inspector of revenue for the several ports, within the same district, vice, Eli Elmer removed.

Charles Gibson, of Maryland, inspector of the revenue and surveyor for the port of Easton in Maryland.

Thomas Dudley, of N. Carolina, now surveyor of Swansboro in North Carolina, to be inspector of the revenue for the same.

Brian Hellen, of North Carolina, collector for the district of Beaufort in North Carolina and inspector of revenue, for the port of Beaufort.

Joseph Turner, of Georgia, collector for the district of Brunswick in Georgia, and inspector of the revenue for the port of Brunswick.

Hore Brown Trist, of the Mississippi territory, collector for the district of Mississippi in the said territory, and inspector of revenue for the port of Fort Adams, vice, I. F. Carmichael, removed.

Appointments since made, by and with the advice, and consent of the Senate.

Francis Coffyn of Dunkirk in France, to be commercial agent of the United States at Dunkirk, vice Charles D. Cox, declined.

Jacob Ridgway of Pennsylvania, to be commercial agent of the United States at Antwerp, vacant.