

Forts in such places as they should deem most proper, and which would in the mean time enable the executive to preserve the neutrality embraced by the United States, and protect the harbors of the state from insult.

In January last I received a letter from Governor Moultrie of South-Carolina, in which he informs me that no commissioners could possibly proceed from that state to meet the commissioners of the state of North-Carolina to extend the boundary line between the two states, until they can meet on more equal ground, as the act of Assembly prohibits the commissioners of this state from infringing the 25 Sec: of the bill of rights, which expressly says in what manner the boundary line between the two states shall be ascertained. He likewise assures me that the legislature of South-Carolina ardently wishes all differences between the two states to be settled in an amicable manner, and for this purpose will appoint commissioners to settle every dispute respecting territory so soon as this state shall appoint commissioners with full powers to discuss and settle the claims of each state, at the same time he refers me to some proceedings on this head between the then two provinces in the year 1771 and 1772. The papers which he refers to I have not been able to receive any information upon from the secretary's office, as the secretary informs me that he had made a thorough search and could not find them.

On receiving information of the extent and fatality of the pestilential fever which prevailed in the city of Philadelphia, and fearing from the intercourse between this state and that city, that the disease might be brought in and spread among the citizens of this state, unless some steps were taken to prevent it: I thought proper to issue a Proclamation requiring the persons vested by law with powers to prevent the introduction of infectious diseases, to pursue such measures as might most effectually prevent the same.

From the resolutions which the inhabitants of some of the sea port towns thought it was necessary to enter into to prevent the introduction of the disease, it appears that the law for that purpose was defective and did not fully answer the purpose for which it was intended. I would therefore wish to call the attention of the legislature to that law, that it might be so amended as effectually to prevent the introduction of infectious diseases into this state.

The commissioners for settling the accounts of the respective states, with the United States have made their report to the President, I have not as yet received a copy of it, nor has it been made public, I presume the President intends laying it in the first instance before the Congress, after which copies will be forwarded to the different states.

By the advice of the council of state, I appointed and commissioned John Haywood Esq. one of the Judges of the supreme court protem. in the room of Judge Spencer deceased. In the month of August I received a letter from him declining at that time the acceptance of that appointment, it was then so late that the council could not be called so as to make another appointment, soon enough for the person appointed to go the circuit, I therefore declined calling them. They likewise advised me to appoint and commission Col. William Waters Brigadier General pro tem. for the district of Hillsborough, which appointment had become vacant by General Mebane's having been elected and commissioned one of the representatives from this state to the Congress of the United States. Col. Waters has accepted of the appointment.

I do myself the honor to lay before you, a letter from the Lieutenant Governor of the state of Massachusetts, respecting a suit commenced in the supreme court of the United States, by an individual against that state, the speech of the late Governor Hancock to the general court of Massachusetts, and their proceedings on that subject.

Having received information that some threats were thrown out by the crew of the privateer that they would by force take the money out of the marshal's hands, I thought it expedient to give orders to Major Wright, that if he thought it was probable that such an occurrence might take place, or if the marshal should call upon him for one, to order out a guard for its protection—and also wrote to the marshal that if he thought it necessary he should apply to Major Wright for a guard.

My private secretary will lay before you the public dispatches received in the course of the year, the letter book and the journal of the proceedings of the council of state, likewise two copies of the laws passed at the last session of Congress and two copies of the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

I have the honor to be with respect,
Gentlemen,
Your most obedient Servant,
RICHARD DOBBS SPAIGHT.
Fayetteville, Dec. 4, 1793.

From a Petersburg Paper, (republished by request)

North-Carolina, Dec. 15th, 1793.

MR. PRENTIS,

Your paper of the 6th December, 1793, No. 428, contains a publication styled, "An examination into the late proceedings in Congress respecting the official conduct of the Secretary of the Treasury."

The writer of that paper is either an angry man destitute of candor and information, or some speculator in the funds, who has adopted this base method of diverting the censure of the public from his own character.

If he had wished to avoid this imputation, in mentioning that Mr. S—dg—k, had brought forward early in the last session, a bill to authorize a loan of two millions of dollars, &c. for the payments to the Bank; he would have added, that Mr. St—le of North-Carolina moved to strike out the whole section on the principle that loans had been attended with the most pernicious consequences.

And that though the motion to strike out failed, it brought on a debate which terminated in giving the bill an entire new shape.

I never in my own name, or any other name, held a farthing in the funds, or Bank Stocks in the United States, nor did I ever have a note discounted at any Bank in the United States, and I defy your dastardly scribbler to prove his assertion.

At some times it would be treating such publications with too much respect to notice them, at other times silence would seem to give credit and currency to their falsehoods. I am therefore constrained in justification to myself, to say that your paragraphist is a Liar, and I call upon you to publish this letter to shew my detestation of such calumniators.

The falsity of his charge against me, will I hope, induce liberal minded people to suspend their censure of other characters, who in all probability, are as innocent as myself.

JOHN STEELE.

For the GAZETTE of the UNITED STATES.

MR. FENNO,

YOUR British apologist either blinded by zeal for his favorite nation, or deeming himself secure from his anonymous position; has ventured to brave the public with another communication, evidently calculated to misrepresent and deceive.

After noticing the guarantee of Great Britain to the truce between Portugal and Algiers, which had been suggested as one evidence of her agency in making the truce he endeavours to evade the force of that evidence by the following assertions:

"But it is known that the latter fact comes from the same source as the former, a source which is not only questionable, but which derived its information from doubtful authority—whereas the intelligence of a contradictory nature is not only more recent, but comes from higher authority, and denies the agency of that nation or the guarantee."

These assertions are deceptive and incorrect in the following particulars. The intelligence of a contradictory nature, relied upon by him, is not more recent, than the intelligence which he rejects. The intelligence relied upon, bears date the 7th of October 1793. The intelligence rejected, bears date the 12th, and is confirmed the 21st and 22d of the same month. The intelligence relied upon, does not deny the agency of Great Britain positively, nor the guarantee in any degree. It states that strong reasons induce the writer to believe, that Great Britain had no agency in making the truce. It says nothing of the guarantee.

The chief circumstance from which this belief is inferred, is, that the person said to have concluded the treaty, was not supposed at that time to have been in the Bri-

tish service, the reason assigned is, that he had not for a considerable time received any instructions from the British court. He had however been in the British service for some time preceding the truce, and was then resident in Algiers. He must have been employed by some power, because thro' his agency the truce has taken effect, and it is no where asserted that he was employed by Portugal.

This belief therefore at best is founded upon supposititious circumstances, & ought not to contradict other evidence stating a fact positively, particularly when it shall be recollected that there will be no incompatibility in the evidence, if it be admitted that the British could have given him private instructions for the special purpose of negotiating the truce.

The source of the information seems in the mind of the zealous apologist, to have stamped it with indelible authenticity, whereas the source of the opposing intelligence is deemed questionable. The source of the former is a British garrison; the source of the latter is Lisbon. The channel through which the latter has been communicated is by express, from the proper officer of the government of the United States resident at this time at Lisbon.

The apologist ventures to compliment the government of the United States and its officer, with communicating questionable intelligence and from doubtful authority.

The apologist further remarks, "The refusal of a convoy is part of the same story with the former, and depends upon the same authority. Another letter in town declares that the improper manner in which it was asked was the sole cause of any difficulty; see a letter published in this paper on Wednesday last."

Here he endeavours to call to his aid a letter in town, and a letter in the paper, to discredit official communications forwarded by express: But he must admit that the source of these letters is at least questionable; for his own zeal & cunning might have dictated the measure of writing them himself.

The anonymous scribbler makes this remark:

"There are not wanting those who wish to plunge this country into a war with Great Britain."

If the allusion be intended to include the writer of the letter to the merchants of Petersburg, it is unfounded and illiberal. No man more ardently deprecates a state of war than the writer of that letter. Peace is written in the front of his political bible. Offensive war cannot consist with the principles of any true republican, because he consults the happiness and interest of the great mass of people, and they furnish the blood and treasure necessarily expended in every war. But he can never be deterred from exercising an acknowledged national right, from an apprehension that the ill humour and injustice of Great Britain may prompt her to war; because he would prefer the extreme possible fate, to a servile and inglorious dependence upon Great Britain, or any other power under Heaven.

It is hoped that the calm and the candid, will attend to facts, and however painful the result, they will be compelled to infer, that there are not wanting in America, perhaps even in her legislative and executive councils, those, who intoxicated with speculative regards for the British government: miscalculating their own political importance, and hoping some permanent distinction between themselves and the great mass of people, are ready to furnish apologies for every act of insolence and injustice, which that nation may commit towards the United States, and even act upon them as new incentives to court her disdainful alliance: And those, who having established a paper tyranny in the United States, separated themselves in interest from the great body of people, viewing the people therefore as their natural enemies, and fearing the efforts which will be directed against their paper usurpations zealously strive to find an asylum for themselves against their own countrymen, by throwing the United States into the arms or even at the feet of Great Britain.

January 9th. 1794.

TO BE SOLD,

THE Fount of LONG PRIMER on which the Gazette of the United States was lately printed. The Fount will weigh about Three Hundred Pounds. The price is Twenty Cents per pound.

Enquire of the EDITOR.

December 16.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Tuesday, Jan. 7, 1794.

Sundry petitions were read and referred.

A motion to refer to a select committee the petition of certain persons in the public offices for an augmentation of their salaries, was negatived.

The motion laid on the table yesterday, by Mr. Parker, respecting the defence of the Ports and Harbors of the United States, and an augmentation of the Arms and Military Stores, was taken into consideration; and after a few observations, the latter part of the motion referring to arms and military stores, was withdrawn—the former part was referred to the committee on the Algerine business.

Mr. Trumbull of the committee appointed to draft and report Rules and Regulations for the Government of the Proceedings of the House, bro't in a report, which was read and laid on the table.

A message was received from the President of the United States, suggesting the propriety of appointing a person under the direction of the War Department, to superintend the Receiving, Safe-keeping and Issuing of Supplies. Also, communicating a Statement of the Expenditures to the end of the year 1793, from the sum of ten thousand dollars appropriated for paying the contingent charges of Government.

On motion, Voted that the estimate of appropriation be taken up on Thursday next.

The memorial of Stephen Sayre, was read a second time.

Mr. Goodhue moved that it be referred to the Secretary of State. Another motion was made for a reference to a Select Committee, this motion failed; that for a reference to the Secretary of State, prevailed.

The Report of the Committee on Rules and Regulations, was ordered to be printed for the use of the house.

In committee of the whole on the bill received from the Senate, making an alteration in the Flag of the United States—Mr. Trumbull in the chair.

Mr. Goodhue said, he hoped the bill would not pass—he considered it as a trifling business—the flag is as the coat to a ship by which she is known, and ought not to be changed without some sufficient and weighty reasons—he did not think that the addition of a new state to the Union a sufficient reason for such a change—he saw no end to the business—Kentucky and Vermont were virtually represented in the declaration of Independence by the 13 States.

Mr. Clark said he considered the subject as very unimportant, and he hoped the bill would be disagreed to without much debate—If either of the new states wish to be designated by a star in the field of the flag, he had no objection, if it could be done by drawing a line thro' the star, which designates New-Jersey, and assigning one half of it to one of the new states.

Mr. Lyman was in favor of the bill—he said there were innocent prejudices often entertained by individuals and bodies of men, which it was not good policy to counteract—he did not however consider the present subject as frivolous—he thot' the wish of the new states as expressed by the bill, just and reasonable—they have a right to be considered on this occasion—and as a compliance with their reasonable expectation can take place without any great difficulty, he hoped the bill would pass.

Mr. Madison was in favor of the bill—he supposed however, that some permanent provision was proper to regulate the symbol of the Union, and that such alterations should take place, as the circumstances and changes of the Union, by the addition of new states should render proper.

Mr. Thatcher objected to the bill, he saw no necessity for it, and he did not at present know that the people of Kentucky and Vermont desired it—the United States he remarked, were not increased, by dividing one state into two, any more than a state was by adding new counties to it—he said that there would be the same propriety in designating counties on the flag.

Mr. Niles and Mr. Greenup both expressed their wish that the bill should pass—it had originated with their Senators, and they had no doubt that it would be highly agreeable to their constituents.