

B E R L I N, October 4.

On Saturday last the marriage of her Royal Highness Princess Wilhelmina of Prussia with his Serene Highness the Hereditary Prince of Orange, was solemnized with the same state as that of His Royal Highness the Duke of York with the Princess Frederica of Prussia.

The Duke of York, with his consort the Princess Frederica, is making preparations for his departure on the 8th current, for England, and will take Brunswick and Hanover in his way.

M. de Moustier, the Minister of France at Berlin, arrived at Paris on the evening of the 15th ult. He does not appear solicitous to succeed M. de Montmorin; it is, however, thought that he will be persuaded to accept the department for Foreign Affairs.

L O N D O N, October 18.

Baron Trenck is again at liberty; but he has been obliged to sign a new promise to live quietly, to behave loyally, and not to travel without assigning a reason, nor without having obtained permission for that purpose.

The East-India company are going to build three more stacks of warehouses.

Advices from the Continent mention, that a General Congress is proposed to be holden at Aix-la-Chapelle, to discuss the present situation of France.

M. de Verac, formerly Ambassador from France at Soleure, has resigned his office. The King has not yet appointed any person to succeed him.

We are likewise assured, that M. de Tallyrand, Ambassador from France at Naples, has also resigned.

If Louis the Sixteenth should not now make the best of Kings, the fault must be his own, as the discipline he has experienced in his person and family, with the thorough reformation in Church and State, must have, in a great measure, effaced those prejudices with which every royal mind is but too well furnished, till instructed by the precepts of the law, and the firmness of the people. The methods of governing a spirited, populous, and extensive empire, are so plainly laid out, that it is next to impossible that either the King or his Ministers can mistake the road. There are also spiritual advantages secured to Monarch; for by being deprived of his own will in all public acts, he must necessarily avoid those crimes which a deviation from the rules of known justice are perpetually accumulating on the exercise of arbitrary power. The maxim, "that the King can do no wrong," is a reality in France—He whose wings are clipped cannot fly over the constitution.

OCTOBER 25.

The States General have ordered their ambassador to congratulate the French King on his acceptance of the constitution.

The Count d'Artois and the other illustrious French refugees, are amply provided for by certain foreign powers: even from Paris, sums of money are said to be remitted to them.

In the new legislature of France the business is to be transacted, as in the last, by committees. This was determined on Sunday last.

It is a curious fact related by travellers, that the plague is seldom equally destructive to the various nations who reside in the city of Constantinople. Of the Turks, Jews, Armenians and Greeks, who form the principal inhabitants, the carnage is chiefly confined to the first description of people, while few in comparison, of the others, fall victims to its fury.

It may appear extraordinary, that the burial ground around Constantinople extends now in every direction 14 miles. So great for some years have been the ravages committed on the human species.

M. Bailly finding his health affected, and perceiving that he can no longer dedicate his time to the sciences, has expressed a wish to resign his situation as Mayor of Paris; but at the pressing and reiterated instances of the municipality, he has been prevailed upon to withdraw his resignation for the present; he has, however, stipulated that he shall retire in November.

P O R T S M O U T H, (N. H.) Nov. 23.

Subscriptions are now handing about this town for erecting a THEATRE, and entertaining the inhabitants with theatrical exhibitions during the winter season. We hear the subscription fills fast.

W O R C E S T E R, December 8.

We hear from Rockingham, in the state of Vermont, that Colonel Enoch Hale of that town, who planned and executed the building of a bridge over Connecticut River, at Bellows's falls, has planned and began the work of cutting a canal for the purpose of building mills, and for the building of locks, to carry boats by said falls, which would save much expence to those persons that carry loading up and down said river. If this work should prove successful, it is to be wished that some enterprising person might undertake, and carry into effect, the building of locks at the other falls below.



CONGRESS.

P H I L A D E L P H I A.

H O U S E O F R E P R E S E N T A T I V E S,
M O N D A Y, D E C E M B E R 1 2, 1 7 9 1.

Debate on the amendments proposed by the Senate to the Representation Bill.

THE first amendment was to increase the ratio to 33 thousand—which being read,

Mr. Gerry observed that the bill had passed both the committee of the whole, and the house, by a large majority. The principle, as he was informed, on which the amendment had taken place in the Senate, was to reduce the fractions which would result from the ratio proposed by the house—but he said this difficulty had been fully considered in the house. The representation, every body knows, is now unequal—and it must be submitted to for two years longer—and now it is proposed, at that period, to deprive the people of that representation to which they are entitled by the Constitution!

He thought that it was extraordinary that after the ratio proposed in the bill had been agreed to by the house, by so large a majority, a proposition to alter it should have been agitated and carried in the Senate. Till some better reason than he had heard assigned should be offered, he should be against concurring with the Senate—he moved therefore that the house disagree to the amendment of the Senate.—The motion was seconded by Mr. White.

Mr. Livermore was in favor of agreeing to the amendment—he enlarged on the inequality in the representation from the great fractional numbers which would result from the ratio of 30,000. He was fully of opinion that the public business could be full as well transacted by 105 members, the number which would be produced by a ratio of 33,000, as by 112 or 113, the number arising from the ratio of 30,000.

Mr. Benson said there was one idea which, if it had been considered in time, might have been adopted, and would perhaps have given very general satisfaction, and that is, that the representatives of the United States shall amount to a certain number, according to the whole number of the people, say one to 30,000—this would have given a surplus number which might have been assigned to those states that have the largest fractional numbers. He had formerly, he said, voted for 30,000, but as the principle of equality was more particularly attended to in the amendment, he should now vote for the ratio proposed by the Senate. He observed, some states are stationary, the increased representation of the larger states, when once established, never will be receded from—this ought to be taken into serious consideration.

Mr. Madison observed, that the idea of diminishing the fractional parts appears to be the only reason for the alteration proposed by the Senate. The aggregate of these fractions only has been taken into consideration; but, said he, if the fractions of any particular states will be augmented by the amendment, which would be the case, he conceived that the argument amounted to no good reason for agreeing to it—and this, he said, would evidently be the fact.

Mr. Williamson was opposed to a concurrence—he observed, in general, that the operation of the amendment was to diminish the fractions to the Eastward, and increase those to the Southward. The southern states, he said, had suffered so much under the harrow of speculation, that he hoped no measures would be adopted to lessen the means of information to the people of those states, by denying them that proportion in the representation to which they are entitled—He regretted that some of the southern states were not fully represented at this time in the Senate—he tho't it probable that a different decision in that case would have taken place.

Mr. White observed that the amendment would operate generally against the larger states.

Mr. Sedgwick differed from those opposed to the amendment; in his statements respecting the fractional parts to be produced by 33,000—he said they were fewer on the whole than would result from any other number between 30 and 40 thousand, and those numbers both included; and this, said he, figures would demonstrate. Hence he deduced a greater degree of equality, and relative justice between the several parts of the Union. He disclaimed all local motives, and suggested the propriety of gentlemen forbearing any imputations of that kind, as totally alien from the subject.

Mr. Boudinot defended the amendment, and observed that the Senate were in the legal exer-

cise of their office when they passed it, and had most undoubtedly a right so to do.

He read several calculations to shew that the aggregate of the fractions would be reduced upwards of 90 thousand, by a ratio of 33 thousand, and that the fractions in every state, except one, would be diminished also by it—He adverted to the circumstance of the southern states deriving so great an advantage from the representatives they are entitled to by reason of their possessing slaves; and though he would not do any thing which would interfere with the Constitution on that point, he said every dictate of justice and equality was opposed to giving an unnecessary and undue advantage to the southern states in this matter.

Mr. Findley said he had expected to hear something new on the subject, to induce an alteration in the opinion of the house, but had heard nothing. Fractions, said he, were fully considered before, both in the house and in the committee. This he considered as one of the lesser matters pertaining to the subject. He said the best way would have been to have settled the ratio without knowing the numbers of the people in the several states—tho' that could not be done, as the numbers are known, yet he said he had made it the rule of his conduct in voting. The principle being established, there will be no room for combinations, nor any ground for complaints and reproaches respecting either southern or northern interests. He was for adhering to the principle as that contemplated in the Constitution—and this he conceived the house had done—and he hoped they would not depart from it; and as to fractions, in competition with that principle, he considered them of very little consequence.—He did not deny but a smaller number of representatives would be competent to doing the public business; but dispatch of public business, and a republican representation of the people, he conceived were distinct things—he therefore should have been in favor of a larger representation.

He controverted the right of the Senate to decide for the house in regard to this question—it was not, he said, a question of right and privilege—it appertains principally to the representative body.

He then considered the question as it respected the Senate—and he thought that a large representation was necessary as a barrier to the influence of that body—nor do I, said he, think this as an unreasonable jealousy, when the constitution of human nature is considered. The constitution of the United States is express on the subject, and now is the time when the people ought to enjoy the advantages of the representation of one to thirty thousand.

Another consideration to induce a large representation, he deduced from the accumulation of money capitals in the United States, which, said he, have been increased beyond all parallel—the influence of these capitals will find its way into the house. He hoped no alteration would be made in the determination of the majority of the members.

Mr. Goodhue said, the difference between the result of the two ratios was so small, that he did not conceive it would constitute a sufficient reason for disagreeing to the amendment; he stated that the difference between the Southern and Northern states, on the ratio of 30,000, was beyond all reason in favor of the Southern states; whereas the difference on that of 33,000 was very small indeed, in favor of the Northern states—which evidently demonstrated that the principle of equality was involved in agreeing to the amendment of the Senate.

Mr. Hillhouse stated various particulars to shew the inequality of the representation by 30,000, particularly as it respects the smaller states—He said he rejoiced that the Senate had given their opinion on the subject, they had a right to do it—they are the representatives of the people, and on this question are probably more impartial judges than this House.

Mr. Gerry still supported his motion for a disagreement—he stated a case to shew that in the ordinary course of population, a state at the next enumeration, which now contains 330,000, will then have a much larger fraction, by a ratio of 33,000, than any now contemplated.

He supposed the Senate had a different interest in this business from that of the House—The larger states not being represented in the Senate, and the representation of those states which are stationary, or nearly so, being full—is the reason of this proposed amendment.

Mr. Ames observed, that he thought the only question was to consider whether the bill, as sent from this House, was a proper one—for as to a smaller or larger representation, he considered all debate on that precluded, as the only difference was between 105 and 113.

He then entered into a consideration of the bill as it respects equality—he asserted that the bill was not only improper as unequal but was also unconstitutional—To shew the inequality of the bill, he observed that Virginia, with 630,000 inhabitants, would have as many members as six of the smaller states, whose aggregate numbers