

LONDON, October 23.

A letter from the Hague, of October 14, says, "Respecting the late sea-engagement between the Russians and the Turks, we learn that they met in stormy weather; that the Turkish commander having had notice of the signing of the preliminaries, retired; but being followed by the Russians, and several Turkish ships being damaged by the storm, they fled to Constantinople, and occasioned great alarm in that capital; but no ships fell into the hands of the Russians."

"We learn from the rendezvous of the French Princes and their party, on the frontiers of Germany, that the news of the King's having formally accepted the French Constitution, has caused great sensations among them, inasmuch that they hardly know what to resolve upon: nay, it is even said to have thrown such a damp upon their intended plans, as to make it doubtful if they will put them in execution, and its effects in the different courts of Europe, must occasion some alteration in the proceedings of the aristocratic party."

The liberal and handsome conduct of Lord Petre, on a late occasion, and the general behaviour of the whole body of Roman Catholics, must speedily root out every prejudice that has been entertained against them. The Ministers of their profession shew no ill-will to the Ministers of the Established Church, but appear to be, as we think they really are, zealous to promote unity in the nation, and to forward every thing that may tend to morality and good order.

From Glasgow we understand, that trade has been very brisk there the last 18 months. The exports of muslins, and other Scots and English manufactures, of late to America, has been very great, so that wages, in all branches, have been rising. About ten cotton-mills have been erected, or begun to be erected, in the neighbourhood of Glasgow; and above a dozen of blast-furnaces have been erected in the west of Scotland. Neither is the improvements in manufactures confined to the west of Scotland; for, at Aberdeen, Dundee, &c. in the north, they have lately erected several cotton and lint-mills to go by water. In short, never was Scotland in so prosperous a state; yet, from the great advance of rents, the turning many small farms into large ones, the emigration to America has been greater this year than at any period since the year 1774.

EDICT published by the Supreme Council of Castile, on the 10th of September, against the Circulation of Writings which have a Tendency to propagate the Principles of the French Constitution.

"The King, informed of the distribution of certain writings full of falsehood and dangerous maxims, capable of disturbing the tranquility and of endangering the fidelity of his subjects had sent circular letters, the 5th of January, 1790, to prohibit the entry of these libels, to encourage informers, and to give the utmost latitude, both in discovering and punishing such atrocities. These precautions have produced the salutary effect which his Majesty's Council had expected.

"The King is again assured, that attempts are making to introduce and diffuse throughout his dominions similar writings from France, containing seditious principles, contrary to the fidelity due to his sovereign power, to public tranquility, and the prosperity of his faithful subjects; his majesty has recourse a second time, to the same precautions, which were before sufficient to prevent the evil: he has renewed the prohibition of those writings in his States, and ordered that every person who shall find or seize in the hands of any person such productions, either printed or written, shall be obliged to give them up to the tribunals, rendering an account of the motives which excited them, if they know or are acquainted with them, on failure of which they shall be proceeded against, as well as other delinquents for the crime of disobedience: that the tribunals shall be obliged to transmit to the supreme council, all the writings which may have been presented or denounced to them, or which they may have seized; and to proceed in this respect with all the vigilance and activity required in such important cases.

"The execution of the Edict is recommended to the pastoral and monarchical zeal of the Most Reverend Archbishops, Bishops, Prelates, as well secular as regular, throughout the kingdom of Spain."

FOR THE GAZETTE OF THE UNITED STATES.

TO THE RESPONDENT.

ON reading your piece, I take it that a man who is not of your opinion, is an aristocrat. I have an opinion too—may I be allowed to call those who deny it, aristocrats. In this affair, I take Dean Swift for an authority—Orthodoxy is my Doxy, Heterodoxy is another man's Doxy—therefore you and I are in the right; we hate aristocrats—we would tar and feather for the sake of

POLITICAL TOLERATION.



CONGRESS.

PHILADELPHIA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1791.

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

SOME debate having taken place, respecting the regularity of a resolution moved by Mr. Benson, for apportioning among the different states (according to their respective numbers) the whole number of Representatives, produced by the gross amount of the aggregate population of the United States;—

Mr. Sedgwick moved, to amend the Senate's amendment, by inserting two members for the state of Delaware, instead of one.

In favor of this motion it was observed, that the injury, arising from unrepresented fractions of population, is more severely felt by the smaller, than by the larger states, as in the case of the state of Delaware, to which the bill allowed but one representative for 59,000 inhabitants, whilst the larger states would be much better represented, as their fractions would be divided among a greater number of representatives—By the amendment proposed to the Constitution, a latitude, it was said, was given to Congress in this particular, allowing them either to apply the ratio to the aggregate amount of the general population, and then to apportion the representation to the different states, as nearly as they could approach the ratio once established—or to apply the ratio to the population of each state; and if in case of applying the ratio to the aggregate number of the inhabitants of the United States, the number of representatives was found to be exactly one hundred, it appeared doubtful whether Congress could well avoid adopting the former mode: otherwise it would be impossible to apportion the representation to the population with exact precision; even if the United States were to be divided into districts of thirty thousand inhabitants each, there would still remain a fraction, and inequality some where or other, must be the consequence:—

In the bill, it was said, a manifest inequality appeared, as it allowed Virginia to elect twenty-one representatives, whereas, according to the proportion which her population bears to that of the United States in general, she is entitled only to nineteen: the constitution has said, that "representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several states, according to their respective numbers:" but if taxation were to be apportioned in the same manner as the representation is by the bill, the inequality would be striking, and such as never would be submitted to:—Rhode-Island, for instance, being represented by two members, would have to pay 60,000 dollars, whilst Delaware, having but a single representative, would pay only 30,000, although the difference of population is so small between those two states—Rhode-Island having only about 68,000 inhabitants, whilst 59,000 are found in the state of Delaware.—the time may come, when the safety and good order of government will require the imposition of direct taxes: but how can any such taxes be laid, without a new census, and a just apportionment of the representation? before these steps could be taken, the measure might be too late; and it would be unwise in the present Congress to pass any law, that may at a future day, deprive the House of one of its constitutional powers, the power of laying direct taxes.—It was further observed, that the Constitution itself did not seem to exact so rigid an observance of the ratio, as to require that any state should be deprived of a representative merely on account of a trifling deficiency in the number of inhabitants; it appeared visibly to contemplate such deficiency, and that there might be states whose entire population would not amount to the ratio that might be fixed on: still it had provided that such states should not remain unrepresented; but that, however small the population may be, "each state shall have at least one representative:"—the convention themselves, who framed the Constitution, were not such scrupulous observers of trifling fractional differences, when they apportioned the representation; for altho, by the estimate of population, which was the ground of the apportionment, the state of New-Jersey, was, strictly speaking, entitled only to three members;—yet, as she had a large fraction remaining, she was allowed four.

In opposition to the proposed amendment, it was said, that the constitution never contemplated a minute attention to fractions; that the weight given to the smaller states, in the senate, was a

concession, to compensate for any inequality that they might be subject to in the other branch of the legislature; that the constitution points out the apportionment according to their respective numbers of the several states; that to allow a representative to be chosen by a less number than thirty thousand, would be an open violation of the express words of the constitution; even if it were not unconstitutional, yet it never could, as a permanent rule, answer the purpose for which it was intended. The same difficulty would again recur on other occasions; for if it were laid down as a rule, that an additional member should be allowed only for a fraction above 50 per cent. it might happen, that there would be found in one state a fraction of 15,001 inhabitants, and in another the precise number of 15,000. Suppose the state of Delaware to be in the latter predicament, she would have a representation of only one member for forty-five thousand inhabitants, whilst another state, whose fraction were 15,001, would be represented in the ratio of one member for less than thirty thousand.

The constitution directs, that taxation shall be apportioned among the individuals in the several states, whereas representation is to be apportioned to classes of thirty thousand in each state, and this according to a census first actually taken: hence as the one apportionment was intended to operate upon states, and the other upon individual citizens, any difference in the apportionment could never curtail the authority of the government with respect to taxation. As to the inequality, said to arise from one large state having as many representatives as six smaller states, any argument drawn from that circumstance must lose its force, when it was considered, that the six lesser states, sending twelve members into the senate, possess three-sevenths of the whole governmental influence of that body (which is much more considerable than that of the house of representatives) whereas the large state, having only two members, can possess but 1-14th part of the senatorial influence: this circumstance operates to the disadvantage of the largest state, and in favor of the smaller ones, which have therefore no reason to complain of an inequality that exists but in idea; or if it does exist at all, bears heavier on the larger state, to which a small advantage in the House of Representatives can hardly be deemed a sufficient compensation for the loss it must necessarily suffer in the Senate, the proposed amendment would but increase that inequality, by giving a greater portion of influence to the smaller states, which already possess more than their due share of it, and derive this advantage from the very circumstance which is complained of as productive of inequality in the House of Representatives. On a former occasion a proposition had been made to correct that supposed inequality, by allowing the state of Delaware two members in the house; it was made at a time when no local interests could be supposed to influence the decision; and it was then declared to be unconstitutional, unless that state should be found to contain sixty thousand inhabitants.

The question being taken on Mr. Sedgwick's amendment, was lost.

The question was then put, on agreeing to the Senate's amendment, and passed also in the negative: after which, the committee rose and reported accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 21.

The committee of enrollment, presented to the Speaker an enrolled bill, "making appropriations for the support of government for the year 1792." The Speaker signed the same, and it was presented to the President of the United States, for his approbation.

A report from a select committee, to whom was referred the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, on the petition of Comfort Sands and others, was read, and made the order of the day for Friday next.

The committee appointed, reported a bill for carrying into effect the contract for the purchase of a tract of land bordering on Lake Erie; which was read a first time.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole (Mr. W. Smith in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the post-office bill.

After having proceeded through all the remainder of the bill, except the 8th, the 22d, and twenty-third sections (respecting the carriage of newspapers) which were postponed for future consideration, the committee rose and reported progress. Adjourned.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 22.

A bill for carrying into effect a contract between the United States and the State of Pennsylvania, was read a second time, and referred to a committee of the whole house, to-morrow.

Mr. Goodhue presented the petition of Lawrence Furlong, praying compensation for services as a pilot in the navy of the United States during the late war, which was read and referred to the Secretary of the Treasury.