

The Gazette.

PHILADELPHIA.

TUESDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 26.

MR. REGIS LEBLANC.

SIR,

When a foreigner, under whatever garb he may think proper to assume, either as an acknowledged character or not, takes upon himself, after the manner of Mr. Genet and other authorized agents of the French republic, to address or appeal to the people of the United States, in order to vindicate their unparalleled aggressions, it is of little consequence in what manner it is done, whether by a direct address, or in the form of a letter to an individual. As you have chosen the latter mode, and thought proper to make use of my name, as the mean of perverting the principles of existing differences between the two countries, I feel myself called on to reply to your letter, addressed to me through the Aurora of the 23d inst.

Your intention of destroying the veracity due to my letters, and those addressed to the Secretary of the Navy, I trust will meet with the contempt it merits. The treatment and sufferings of my countrymen, who have already returned from captivity, and of those who are daily expected, will substantiate the facts already before the public. Justice to myself, and the respect I conceive due to the public opinion, will induce me to enter fully into your letter; not from inclination to relate facts that are as well known to you as myself, or from any desire of convincing the party, who I suspect have you in tow, but to elucidate French principles.

In reply to the extract of a letter written to my friend in St. Bartholomew, which you notice in yours; I aver it to be a fact, from concurrent circumstances, it was my opinion, as well as that of my officers, we should be imprisoned. And after the delivery of my letter of the 6th Jan. to Mr. Desforneaux, which you quote, though not very correctly, my apprehensions were nearly realized—for, on my refusing to accept the command of the Retaliation, he threatened imprisonment, treated me cavalierly, and behaved in a very ungentlemanly manner.

You mentioned that my frankness produced a different effect from what I expected. This I positively deny. The change of sentiment originated from a steady refusal of accepting the schooner, unless I was compelled to do so; and that he would inform the Executive the precise situation in which I stood. Probably from political motives a change of sentiment took place, and he then treated me with rather more politeness, until the evening I left Guadeloupe. The treatment I then received you are no stranger to; I shall however mention it for the information of the public.

You say it has been publicly reported, that I was in close confinement 40 or 50 days—I am not accountable for idle reports, and my letters contradict every thing of the kind—you certainly could not have perused them, or you would not have noticed it. You appeal to me if I was not treated with politeness by captain St. Laurent and officers—I have already declared, that I received every attention from them, which I acknowledge with gratitude.

To captain St. Laurent, and not to Mr. Desforneaux, myself and officers were indebted for our liberty on board the different vessels; he assured me that he had received orders to send us on shore to be imprisoned with our crew.

After being twelve days detained on board, I obtained the liberty of residing on shore. "expressly ordered not to wear my uniform;" great merit no doubt ought to be given to Mr. Desforneaux for his mark of politeness: appeal to your own officers in this country, if they have not met with more liberal treatment.

You mention Mr. Desforneaux's attention and civilities to me, viz. invitations to dinner, lending money, &c. My reply to you, on being asked to dine with him, that I considered it merely as a compliment, and that unless I was permitted to appear in my uniform, I would not accept any invitations. This circumstance you communicated to his Secretary Mr. Bevaury. Did not a considerable time elapse before I received another invitation, with permission to wear my uniform. You no doubt must remember it was on the 6th of January, 6 days after the departure of Victor Hughes, and nearly a month after Mr. Desforneaux's taking possession of his government, and then, not till he had determined on my departure for the United States.

In consequence of his pressing solicitations, I received from him one hundred dollars, which I repaid you. From your mentioning this circumstance which has no kind of connection with the extract of my letter, on which you pretend to ground your address to me—I rather presume it is with an intention that the public should be informed, you also advanced me one hundred and fifty dollars, which I gratefully repaid you. You also mention, that he constantly assured me, he did not consider me as an officer of a nation with whom his country was at war—but as a friend and ally, and that his conduct proved his sincerity. Reassured I placed no faith in his assertions, as his conduct was not conformable to his declarations, and that I considered French intrigue, with him, as the ruling principle of action. Admitting for a moment Mr. Desforneaux's politeness, in the most extensive point you could wish, to myself and officers, can it be put in competition with the sufferings of 200 Americans? Their treatment will speak more forcibly than any declaration of yours or mine. On this head, I shall state facts—make no comments, and leave the public to draw their own conclusions.

pres. for at common law, libels against the government might be punished with fine and imprisonment at the discretion of the court, whereas the act limits the fine to two thousand dollars, and the imprisonment to two years; and it also allows the party accused to give the truth in evidence for his justification, which by the common law was expressly forbidden.

And lastly, it is answered, that had the constitution intended to prohibit Congress from legislating at all on the subject of the press, which is the construction whereon the objections to this law are founded, it would have used the same expressions as in that part of the clause which relates to religion, and religious tests; whereas the words are wholly different; "Congress," says the constitution, (amendment 2d) "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or the press." Here it is manifest that the constitution intended to prohibit Congress from legislating at all on the subject of religious establishments, and the prohibition is made in the most express terms. Had the same intention prevailed respecting the press, the same expressions would have been used, and Congress would have been "prohibited from passing any law respecting the press." They are not, however, "prohibited" from legislating at all on the subject, but merely from abridging the liberty of the press. It is evident they may legislate respecting the press, may pass laws for its regulation, and to punish those who pervert it into an engine of mischief, provided those laws do not "abridge" its "liberty." Its liberty, according to the well-known and universally admitted definition, consists in permission to publish, without any previous restraint upon the press, and not one to inflict punishment on wicked and malicious publications, would be a law to abridge the liberty of the press, and as such, unconstitutional.

The foregoing reasoning is submitted as vindicating the validity of the laws in question. Although the committee believe that each of the measures adopted by Congress during the last session, is susceptible of an analytical justification, on the principles of the constitution, and national policy, yet they prefer to rest their vindication on the true ground of considering them as parts of a general system of defence, adapted to a crisis of extraordinary difficulty and danger.

It cannot be denied that the power to declare war; to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; to suppress insurrections, and repel invasions, and also the power to defray the expense by loans or taxes, are vested in Congress. Unfortunately for the present generation of mankind, a contest has arisen and rages with unabated ferocity, which has desolated the fairest portions of Europe, and shaken the fabric of society through the civilized world. From the nature and effects of this contest, as developed in the experience of nations, melancholy inferences must be drawn, that it is insupportable of the restraints which have either designated the objects, limited the duration, or mitigated the horrors of national contentions. In the internal history of France, and in the conduct of her forces and partisans in the countries which have fallen under her power, the public councils of our country were required to discern the dangers which threatened the United States, and to guard not only against the usual consequences of war, but also against the effects of an unprecedented combination to establish new principles of social action, on the subversion of religion, morality, law and government.

Will it be said, that the raising of a small army, and an eventual provision for drawing into the public service a considerable proportion of the whole force of the country, was in such a crisis unwise, or imprudent? If such should be the assertion, let it be candidly considered, whether some of our fertile and flourishing States did not, six months since, present as alluring objects for the gratification of ambition or cupidity as the inhospitable climate of Egypt. What then appeared to be the comparative difficulties between invading America and subverting the British power in the East-Indies? If this was a professed, not real object, of the enterprise, let it be asked, if the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire was not really the friend of France, at the time when his unsuspecting dependencies were invaded; and whether the United States were not at the same time loaded with insults and assailed with hostility? If however, it be asserted, that the system of France is hostile only to despotic, or monarchical governments, and that our security arises from the form of our Constitution, let Switzerland, first divided and disarmed by perfidious seductions, now agonized by relentless power, illustrate the consequences of similar credulity. Is it necessary at this time to vindicate the naval armament; rather may not the inquiry be boldly made, whether the guardians of the public weal would not have deserved and received the reproaches of every patriotic American, if a contemptible naval force had been longer permitted to intercept our necessary supplies, destroy our principal source of revenue, and seize, at the entrance of our harbours and rivers, the product of our industry declined to our foreign markets? If such injuries were at all to be repelled, is not the restriction which confined captures by our ships solely to armed vessels of France a sufficient proof of our moderation?

If therefore naval and military preparations were necessary, a provision of fund to defray the consequent expenses was of course indispensable; a review of all the measures that have been adopted since the establishment of the government, will prove that Congress have not been unmindful of the wishes of the American people, to avoid an accumulation of the public debt; and the success which has attended these measures, affords conclusive evidence of the sincerity of their intentions. But to purchase sufficient quantities of military supplies, to establish a navy, and provide for all the contingencies

of an army, without recourse to new taxes and loans, was impracticable; both measures were in fact adopted—in devising a mode of taxation the convenience and ease of the least wealthy class of the people were consulted as much as possible, and although the expenses of armament have furnished a topic of complaint, it is found that the allowances are barely sufficient to ensure the execution of the law, even aided as they are by the disinterested and patriotic exertions of worthy citizens—besides it ought to be remembered that the expenses of organizing a new system, should not on any principle, be regarded as permanent burden on the public.

In authorizing a loan of money, Congress have not been inattentive to prevent a permanent debt; in this particular also the public opinion and interest have been consulted. On considering the law, as well as the manner in which it is proposed to be carried into execution, the Committee are well satisfied in finding any excess in the immediate charge upon the revenue, is likely to be compensated by the facility of redemption, which is secured to the government.

The Alien and Sedition acts, so called, form a part, and, in the opinion of the committee, an essential part of these precautionary and protective measures, adopted for our security. France appears to have an organized system of conduct towards foreign nations—to bring them within the sphere, and under the dominion of her influence and controul. It has been unremittingly pursued under all the changes of her internal polity. Her means are in wonderful coincidence with her ends:—Among these, and not least successful, is the direction and employment of the active and versatile talents of her citizens abroad, as emissaries and spies. With a numerous body of French citizens and other foreigners, and admonished by the passing scenes in other countries, as well as by aspects in our own knowing they had the power, and believing it to be their duty, Congress passed the law respecting Aliens, directing the dangerous and suspected, to be removed and leaving to the inoffensive and peaceable a safe asylum.

The principles of the sedition law, so called, are among the most ancient principles of our government. They have been ingrafted into statutes, or practised upon as maxims of the common law, according as occasion required. They were often and justly applied in the revolutionary war. It is not strange, that now they should be denounced as oppressive, when they have long been recognized in the jurisprudence of these States! The necessity that dictated these acts in the opinion of the committee still exists. So eccentric are the movements of the French government, we can form no opinion of their future designs towards our country. They may proceed from the tone of menace and insolence, to employ the arts of seduction, before they attempt us with their ultimate designs. Our safety consists in the wisdom of the public councils, a co-operation on the part of the people with the government, by supporting the measures provided for repelling aggressions, and an obedience to the social laws. After a particular and general review of the whole subject referred to their consideration, the committee see no ground for rescinding these acts of the Legislature. The complaints preferred by some of the petitioners may be fairly attributed to a diversity of sentiment naturally to be expected, among a people of various habits and education, widely dispersed over an extensive country—the innocent mis-conceptions of the American people will, however, yield to reflection and argument, and from them no danger is to be apprehended. In such of the petitions, as are conceived in a style of vehement and acrimonious remonstrance, the committee perceive too plain indications of the principles of that exotic system which convulses the civilized world. With this system, however organized, the public councils cannot safely parley, or temporize, whether it assumes the guise of patriotism to mislead the affections of the people—whether it be employed in forming projects of local and excentric ambition, or shall appear in the more generous form of open hostility, it ought to be regarded as the bane of public as well as private tranquility and order. Those to whom the management of public affairs is now confided, cannot be justified in yielding any established principles of law or government to the suggestions of moderate theory; their duty requires them to respect the lessons of experience, and transmit to posterity the civil and religious privileges which are the birthright of our country, and which it was the great object of our happy constitution to secure and perpetuate. Impressed with these sentiments, the Committee beg leave to report the following resolutions:

Resolved, That it is inexpedient to repeal the act passed the last session, intitled "An act concerning aliens." Resolved, That it is inexpedient to repeal the act passed the last session, intitled "An act in addition to the act intitled "An act for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States." Resolved, That it is inexpedient to repeal any of the laws respecting the navy, military establishment, or revenue of the United States.

IN pursuance of a resolve of the President and Managers of the Delaware and Schuylkill Canal Company, The Stockholders are hereby notified and required to pay ten dollars on each of their respective shares of stock, on or before the first day of March next, to the Treasurer of the Company at their office near the Bank of Pennsylvania. Extract from the minutes, GEORGE WORRALL, Sec'y. WILLIAM GOVETT, Treasurer. Jan. 25.

When a foreigner, under whatever garb he may think proper to assume, either as an acknowledged character or not, takes upon himself, after the manner of Mr. Genet and other authorized agents of the French republic, to address or appeal to the people of the United States, in order to vindicate their unparalleled aggressions, it is of little consequence in what manner it is done, whether by a direct address, or in the form of a letter to an individual. As you have chosen the latter mode, and thought proper to make use of my name, as the mean of perverting the principles of existing differences between the two countries, I feel myself called on to reply to your letter, addressed to me through the Aurora of the 23d inst.

Your intention of destroying the veracity due to my letters, and those addressed to the Secretary of the Navy, I trust will meet with the contempt it merits. The treatment and sufferings of my countrymen, who have already returned from captivity, and of those who are daily expected, will substantiate the facts already before the public. Justice to myself, and the respect I conceive due to the public opinion, will induce me to enter fully into your letter; not from inclination to relate facts that are as well known to you as myself, or from any desire of convincing the party, who I suspect have you in tow, but to elucidate French principles.

In reply to the extract of a letter written to my friend in St. Bartholomew, which you notice in yours; I aver it to be a fact, from concurrent circumstances, it was my opinion, as well as that of my officers, we should be imprisoned. And after the delivery of my letter of the 6th Jan. to Mr. Desforneaux, which you quote, though not very correctly, my apprehensions were nearly realized—for, on my refusing to accept the command of the Retaliation, he threatened imprisonment, treated me cavalierly, and behaved in a very ungentlemanly manner.

You mentioned that my frankness produced a different effect from what I expected. This I positively deny. The change of sentiment originated from a steady refusal of accepting the schooner, unless I was compelled to do so; and that he would inform the Executive the precise situation in which I stood. Probably from political motives a change of sentiment took place, and he then treated me with rather more politeness, until the evening I left Guadeloupe. The treatment I then received you are no stranger to; I shall however mention it for the information of the public.

You say it has been publicly reported, that I was in close confinement 40 or 50 days—I am not accountable for idle reports, and my letters contradict every thing of the kind—you certainly could not have perused them, or you would not have noticed it. You appeal to me if I was not treated with politeness by captain St. Laurent and officers—I have already declared, that I received every attention from them, which I acknowledge with gratitude.

To captain St. Laurent, and not to Mr. Desforneaux, myself and officers were indebted for our liberty on board the different vessels; he assured me that he had received orders to send us on shore to be imprisoned with our crew.

After being twelve days detained on board, I obtained the liberty of residing on shore. "expressly ordered not to wear my uniform;" great merit no doubt ought to be given to Mr. Desforneaux for his mark of politeness: appeal to your own officers in this country, if they have not met with more liberal treatment.

You mention Mr. Desforneaux's attention and civilities to me, viz. invitations to dinner, lending money, &c. My reply to you, on being asked to dine with him, that I considered it merely as a compliment, and that unless I was permitted to appear in my uniform, I would not accept any invitations. This circumstance you communicated to his Secretary Mr. Bevaury. Did not a considerable time elapse before I received another invitation, with permission to wear my uniform. You no doubt must remember it was on the 6th of January, 6 days after the departure of Victor Hughes, and nearly a month after Mr. Desforneaux's taking possession of his government, and then, not till he had determined on my departure for the United States.

In consequence of his pressing solicitations, I received from him one hundred dollars, which I repaid you. From your mentioning this circumstance which has no kind of connection with the extract of my letter, on which you pretend to ground your address to me—I rather presume it is with an intention that the public should be informed, you also advanced me one hundred and fifty dollars, which I gratefully repaid you. You also mention, that he constantly assured me, he did not consider me as an officer of a nation with whom his country was at war—but as a friend and ally, and that his conduct proved his sincerity. Reassured I placed no faith in his assertions, as his conduct was not conformable to his declarations, and that I considered French intrigue, with him, as the ruling principle of action. Admitting for a moment Mr. Desforneaux's politeness, in the most extensive point you could wish, to myself and officers, can it be put in competition with the sufferings of 200 Americans? Their treatment will speak more forcibly than any declaration of yours or mine. On this head, I shall state facts—make no comments, and leave the public to draw their own conclusions.

I shall now state a few facts that came immediately under my own observation whilst I remained in Guadeloupe. Victor Hughes was a prisoner nearly a month, and had left Guadeloupe 6 days previous to the liberation of the American masters and supercargoes; and it was then only effected by pressing solicitations—stating their miserable situation and that their present allowance was insufficient for them to exist on. This fact can be attested by several who have returned, and others who are daily expected.—The jailors who were in office under Hughes, and in the habit of exercising savage cruelties, were continued in office under Desforneaux; it is true that one of them received a reprimand for not releasing several masters of vessels out of a dungeon, when orders were given for that purpose. Can a reprimand be considered as a sufficient punishment for detaining respectable citizens in a dungeon 6 days after orders were given for their liberation? Capt. Bingham and Mr. Milnor received their paroles under the government of Victor Hughes, some time previous to the arrival of Desforneaux. The commissary of prisoners, after the confinement of Hughes, called at their several places of abode, and requested that they demean themselves peaceably and as prisoners, as Desforneaux had reprimanded him for letting any Americans out of prison, and that he had become responsible for those who were enlarged. Capt. Duer, and others of this city, are acquainted with the above circumstance. That many vessels were brought into Guadeloupe, after the arrival of Desforneaux all of which were condemned, as I have already stated in my former letters, a vessel from New-Bedford bound to Surinam accepted, whose trial was not decided. The condemnations and protests already received in the different insurance offices on the continent, will confirm this assertion. The officers and crew generally, imprisoned frequently; however, through the influence and solicitations of the owners and commanders of privateers, the captains were released. The evening I left Guadeloupe, the vessels that had the American citizens on board, were laying off and on before the town, I went to Desforneaux's; his secretary informed me he had received orders to procure a certificate from me, that all the Americans were treated well, and as friends, since his command. I replied, was much astonished at his demand, and would not comply with it, as it was contrary to the representations of the sufferings of the Americans, as related by themselves. I then went with the Secretary and yourself to Mr. Desforneaux, when a similar conversation passed; and also informed him, if he wished a certificate for myself and officers, since the departure of Hughes, I would give it; but not for the Americans that had been that day liberated; and if he wished for any other certificate, it would come, with more propriety from the persons immediately concerned; the consequence was, he in a violent passion, sent you on board to procure this certificate—and did you not return as you went, with a positive refusal, and we were immediately ordered to anchor. Were you not also informed after your return, of Desforneaux's conduct in consequence of my steady refusal—of his flying into the most extravagant paroxysm of rage—breaking his plate in several pieces, with his fist—flinging his fork into the table—stamping and raving, in the wildest manner possible—and abusing myself, the American people, and government, in the most opprobrious terms. Did you not inform me, that you were obliged to get his mother-in-law to appease his anger, previous to your speaking to him, and that you informed him, it would have no effect to procure a certificate by force, as they would protest against it, at the first port they arrived at. This information respecting yourself, was your own declaration, in the presence of Captain Babcock. I shall now, sir, take my final leave of you—the situation you have compelled me to assume, and the many appeals made to me, has rendered it necessary, to enter into the variety of subjects, contained in yours. It is my determination, not to be drawn into a paper controversy, as every fact is already before the public, and rest assured I shall avoid endless discussions. Yours, &c.

Wm. BAINBRIDGE.

States, and an act respecting quarantines and health laws. The President also informed the senate that he had approved and signed, an act making appropriations for the expense of carrying into effect certain treaties with certain tribes of nations of Indians, and an act allowing James Mathers compensation for his services, &c. as sergeant at arms of the senate. The two following bills were then read the third time and passed, viz. a bill to authorize the erection of a beacon on Boon Island, and a bill for the government of the navy of the United States. Mr. Harper from the committee of ways and means, reported a bill making additional appropriations for the year 1799, which was committed. On motion of Mr. Goodrich, the house went into a committee of the whole, on the report of a select committee, on the petitions praying for a repeal of the alien and sedition laws. The question being upon agreeing to the first resolution, declaring it to be inexpedient to repeal the alien law, Mr. Gallatin spoke at considerable length against its adoption. On his setting down the question was put and carried, 52 votes being in the affirmative. The next question was upon agreeing to the resolution declaring it to be inexpedient to repeal the sedition law. Mr. Nicholas spoke at length against agreeing to this resolution. At the conclusion of his speech, and a few observations having been made in favor of the committee's rising and reporting progress, by Messrs. McDowell and Livingston; and against it, and in favor of taking the question on the resolution, by Messrs. Bayard and Dayton, a question was taken on the committee's rising, and negatively, 51 to 42. The question on the resolution was then put and carried by exactly the same number of votes, by which the former question was carried. The question was put and carried on the last resolution, without a decision. The committee then rose, and the house took up the resolutions. The question being on concurring in the agreement of the committee of the whole to the first resolution. Mr. Livingston entered upon a defence of the sentiments which he delivered when the passage of this law was under consideration, which he laid had been much misrepresented, but after making some progress in his observations, the speaker declaring them unconnected with the question before the house, he sat down, and the first resolution was decided by yeas and nays, as follow:

YEAS. Messrs. Allen, Messrs. Holmes, Baer, Imlay, Bartlett, Lyman, Bayard, Macher, Brace, Matthews, Brooks, Morgan, Bullock, Morris, Champlin, Otis, Chapman, I. Parker, Cochran, Pinckney, Craik, Reed, Dana, Rutledge, Dennis, Schureman, Edmond, Sewall, Evans, Shepard, A. Foster, Sinnickson, D. Foster, N. Smith, J. Freeman, Sprague, Glen, Thatcher, Goodrich, Thomas, Gordon, Thompson, Griswold, Tillinghast, Grove, Van Allen, Harper, Wadsworth, Hartley, Waln, Hindman, J. Williams.

N A Y S. Messrs. Baldwin, Messrs. Heister, Bard, Holmes, Blount, Jones, Brent, Locke, Brown, Lyon, Cabell, Macon, T. Claiborne, M'Clenachan, W. Claiborne, M'Dowell, Clay, New, CLOPTON, Nicholas, Davis, J. Parker, Dawson, Skinner, Dent, S. Smith, Eggleston, W. Smith, Elmendorf, Sprigg, Findley, Stanford, Fowler, Sumpter, N. Freeman, A. Trigg, Gallatin, J. Trigg, Gillespie, Van Cortlandt, Gregg, Venable, Hanna, R. Williams, Harrison, Havens, 47.

Mr. McDowell then moved an adjournment which was negatively, 55 to 38. The question was then taken on the second resolution, upon which the yeas and nays were exactly the same as upon the first. The question on the third was concurred in, 61 votes being for it. Adjourned at half past five.

CITY DANCING ASSEMBLY. THE Subscribers are respectfully informed that the next Assembly will be held on Thursday the 7th of March. feb. 27 d7ymar

B A L L. MESSRS. BYRNE & QUEENET'S BALL, will be kept jointly, on Thursday next, the 28th of February, at O'Ellers' Hotel, feb. 27

Volunteer Grenadiers. THIS Corps is ordered to assemble at the House of Wm. Ogden, in Chestnut-street, at 6 o'clock on Saturday evening next, on business of importance. By command, G. K. HARRISON, Major. feb. 25.

CONGRESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Monday, Feb. 25. Mr. Gregg presented two petitions praying for a repeal of the alien and sedition laws, the one from Cumberland county, signed by 270 persons; the other from Mifflin county in Pennsylvania, signed by 314 persons. Mr. Gallatin presented another petition of the same kind from Chester county signed by 692 persons. Mr. Livingston one of a similar nature, signed by 2500 of the citizens of New-York. Mr. Heister one of the same kind from 1400 inhabitants of Berks county. Mr. Bayard one from the inhabitants of Newcastle county, state of Delaware, signed by between 7 and 800 persons. Mr. Bard and Mr. Brown each of them presented petitions to the same effect signed by a small number of persons. The whole were referred as usual. On motion of Mr. Livingston the petition presented some days ago from a number of alien Irishmen against the alien bill, was also referred, 44 to 35.

The President of the United States informed the house, that he had approved and signed an act fixing the pay of captains and commanders of ships and vessel of war, an act to authorize the purchase of timber for naval purposes, an act establishing docks, an act for augmenting the navy of the United

States, and an act respecting quarantines and health laws. The President also informed the senate that he had approved and signed, an act making appropriations for the expense of carrying into effect certain treaties with certain tribes of nations of Indians, and an act allowing James Mathers compensation for his services, &c. as sergeant at arms of the senate. The two following bills were then read the third time and passed, viz. a bill to authorize the erection of a beacon on Boon Island, and a bill for the government of the navy of the United States. Mr. Harper from the committee of ways and means, reported a bill making additional appropriations for the year 1799, which was committed. On motion of Mr. Goodrich, the house went into a committee of the whole, on the report of a select committee, on the petitions praying for a repeal of the alien and sedition laws. The question being upon agreeing to the first resolution, declaring it to be inexpedient to repeal the alien law, Mr. Gallatin spoke at considerable length against its adoption. On his setting down the question was put and carried, 52 votes being in the affirmative. The next question was upon agreeing to the resolution declaring it to be inexpedient to repeal the sedition law. Mr. Nicholas spoke at length against agreeing to this resolution. At the conclusion of his speech, and a few observations having been made in favor of the committee's rising and reporting progress, by Messrs. McDowell and Livingston; and against it, and in favor of taking the question on the resolution, by Messrs. Bayard and Dayton, a question was taken on the committee's rising, and negatively, 51 to 42. The question on the resolution was then put and carried by exactly the same number of votes, by which the former question was carried. The question was put and carried on the last resolution, without a decision. The committee then rose, and the house took up the resolutions. The question being on concurring in the agreement of the committee of the whole to the first resolution. Mr. Livingston entered upon a defence of the sentiments which he delivered when the passage of this law was under consideration, which he laid had been much misrepresented, but after making some progress in his observations, the speaker declaring them unconnected with the question before the house, he sat down, and the first resolution was decided by yeas and nays, as follow:

YEAS. Messrs. Allen, Messrs. Holmes, Baer, Imlay, Bartlett, Lyman, Bayard, Macher, Brace, Matthews, Brooks, Morgan, Bullock, Morris, Champlin, Otis, Chapman, I. Parker, Cochran, Pinckney, Craik, Reed, Dana, Rutledge, Dennis, Schureman, Edmond, Sewall, Evans, Shepard, A. Foster, Sinnickson, D. Foster, N. Smith, J. Freeman, Sprague, Glen, Thatcher, Goodrich, Thomas, Gordon, Thompson, Griswold, Tillinghast, Grove, Van Allen, Harper, Wadsworth, Hartley, Waln, Hindman, J. Williams.

N A Y S. Messrs. Baldwin, Messrs. Heister, Bard, Holmes, Blount, Jones, Brent, Locke, Brown, Lyon, Cabell, Macon, T. Claiborne, M'Clenachan, W. Claiborne, M'Dowell, Clay, New, CLOPTON, Nicholas, Davis, J. Parker, Dawson, Skinner, Dent, S. Smith, Eggleston, W. Smith, Elmendorf, Sprigg, Findley, Stanford, Fowler, Sumpter, N. Freeman, A. Trigg, Gallatin, J. Trigg, Gillespie, Van Cortlandt, Gregg, Venable, Hanna, R. Williams, Harrison, Havens, 47.

Mr. McDowell then moved an adjournment which was negatively, 55 to 38. The question was then taken on the second resolution, upon which the yeas and nays were exactly the same as upon the first. The question on the third was concurred in, 61 votes being for it. Adjourned at half past five.

CITY DANCING ASSEMBLY. THE Subscribers are respectfully informed that the next Assembly will be held on Thursday the 7th of March. feb. 27 d7ymar

B A L L. MESSRS. BYRNE & QUEENET'S BALL, will be kept jointly, on Thursday next, the 28th of February, at O'Ellers' Hotel, feb. 27

Volunteer Grenadiers. THIS Corps is ordered to assemble at the House of Wm. Ogden, in Chestnut-street, at 6 o'clock on Saturday evening next, on business of importance. By command, G. K. HARRISON, Major. feb. 25.