

Mr. Ames made a number of remarks to elucidate the statements and to shew the unequal operation of the bill, and the fairness of the other plan.

After which he proceeded to shew that the States of Kentucky, Georgia, and Rhode-Island would have the most cause to complain of fractions or unrepresented numbers. But he said the fractions of those three States amounted to the fractional number of one only of the seven States to which a member would be added. If no nearer approach could be made towards an exactly equal proportion, no just objection could be urged against the plan on the part of Rhode-Island, Georgia, or Kentucky; for they would see the case could not be remedied. He then urged the equal operation of the plan between States having equal numbers, and contrasted the bill and the amendment which had been proposed in the House.

From aggregate loss and gain on the two modes of apportionment in the foregoing statements, see the comparison more particularly between particular States, viz.

Virginia has 21 members. The loss, that is, the excess of her numbers over 30,000, is	546
Massachusetts has 15	
New-Hampshire 4	
One to be added to each.	
The loss to those two States on 19 members is	47147
or nearly as 90 to 1.	

Members 21  
On the other hand, the gain on 21 members, or numbers short of 30,000 for a member, is, for New-Hampshire and Massachusetts only,

New-York has 11 members—loss, or excess of numbers over 30,000 for one member, is	12848
North-Carolina, 11 members—loss	1584
	23552

Whereas the gain to North-Carolina by adding a member, will be only

The difference between the loss and gain, or the balance against the bill, is

Maryland has nine members—her lost numbers by the bill,

Connecticut has seven members—lost numbers by the bill are, 26841

Vermont has two—lost numbers by the bill are,

25533

Difference against the bill is

By adding a member to Connecticut and Vermont, the numbers gained will be

Balance against the bill is

37733

The question is—will the amendment, adding one member to Massachusetts, and one to New-Hampshire, cure the error?—The answer appears by the statement, that Virginia will be as fully represented, according to numbers, as those two States, having a difference of 13389, or within two-fifths of a member. In 42 members, that fractional inequality is scarcely an error.

In like manner, by adding a member to North-Carolina, the error or inequality compared with New-York is equal to a fourth part the number for one member—whereas, by the bill, Massachusetts and New-Hampshire will lose almost two members, and Virginia will gain two; a difference little short of four members.

Mr. Dayton said that if the vote which was about to be taken, were merely to determine what should be the ratio of representation, he should have been contented, he said, to have remained in his seat, and to have given a silent vote upon the occasion; but to him it appeared to involve in it a question and a principle of infinitely higher moment.

Two of the members from Virginia, Mr. Dayton observed, had candidly admitted the inequalities complained of in the apportionment prescribed by the bill sent up to the Senate, and had acknowledged the advantages to be given to their State over every other: they did not, he said, contradict the calculations, nor combat the arguments which had been offered against it, but they boldly claimed and exacted those advantages as a right. This being the case, the question was in reality no longer, whether 30 or 33000 should be the rule of apportionment, but whether the legislature of the Union were in future to frame their acts with a view to the particular and almost exclusive advantage of Virginia, and to bend and accommodate their laws to the interests and will of the people or representatives of that State.

It was now also to be determined, Mr. Dayton further observed, whether Pennsylvania was hereafter destined to hold in her hands, as she had been in some measure used to do, the political balance of the States, to be the umpire in our disputes, and the centre of our union.—Judging, he said, from the votes upon record relating to this business, and from some other circumstances, she was no longer intended or qualified to hold that important station. The ancient prophecy, he said, seemed to be verifying among a people for whom he had never considered it as intended. The favour of this country, the political Shiloh, was now among us, and universally known and acknowledged, and the sceptre was about to depart from Judah. These, he added, were the well known preparatives to the summons which was soon to follow for their assembling at the New-Jerusalem. He concluded with saying, that not Pennsylvania alone, but far the greatest part of the union would have reason to repent the determination against the amendment of the Senate, and of adherence to the original bill. He, for his own part, believed that such a determination not only struck at the existence of the State sovereignties, but reached to the very vitals of the general government, and that it must eventually produce either a general consolidation of the union into one national mass, or an absolute separation of its members.

Mr. Venable supposed that a Virginian was possessed of equal rights with other men; if this be a government of compact, he has equal rights with other men; but is it a reason, that because Virginia has relinquished a part of her rights when this compact was forming, that she should

not now hold what she has not resigned? The dispute on the ratio of representation does not affect Virginia; for whatever ratio may be adopted, her representation must always be complete: whether this be a consolidated or federal government, Virginia will have her full proportion in every case except one, that is, in case she should be reduced to a less number than one member; so that, upon whatever grounds we take it, whether fractional or constitutional, the result will be nearly the same. Calculations therefore are out of the question, and after all the arguments of northern and southern interests, of the differences between small States and large States, the comparison is brought to Virginia and Delaware, and the question to strike off seven members from the five large States, and add to the seven smaller ones—Thus is one-sixteenth of the whole representation of the union to be deducted unconstitutionally from one part, & given away to another, which has already more than a just proportion in the government: for although it is contended that we should not argue from the proportion the small States bear in the Senate, yet I hold it fair, in speaking of a government of representation, to take the whole into view, and not to be governed by such partial comparisons. Under this consideration I say, that every man in Virginia, as represented in the two branches of the legislature, is to a man in Delaware only as one to eleven and one half, and in the election of a President only as one to one and an half. This is an advantage enjoyed by individuals in the smaller States more than by those in the larger, and this advantage would be still increased by an adoption of the amendment of the Senate: Is it therefore just to increase this inequality? Is it fair that a man living in the neighbourhood of another, with only the boundary line of a State between them, should be represented only in the proportion of one to eleven and an half? I contend that the principle which comes the nearest to hold out equal rights to every man, is the most proper one, and one that I will always contend for as a citizen of the United States, and as a citizen of Virginia. I shall never wish to encroach upon the constitution, but I will be equally against destroying the balance between the rights which the people have delegated, and those they have retained.

Take the subject in any point of view, the five large States will send, suppose 81 members, to the House of Representatives, and 10 to the Senate, whilst the nine smaller States will have 31 members in this House, and 18 in the Senate; so that the majority of the representation in the one is overpowered in the other, and taking the whole aggregate of the inhabitants of the United States, if divided into the majority contained in those five large States, and the minority in the nine smaller ones, it appears that the minority of the people can dictate to the majority in elections, &c. &c.

Government is formed by an association of the people upon principles of equality, and whilst we admit the argument of sovereignty retained to the States in Senate, let us not lose sight of justice, right, and equity. He concluded by declaring himself of the same opinion as formerly, in favor of the bill; and as there were no reasons offered by the Senate, or for them, that could induce him to change, consequently he could not recede from his opinion. (To be continued.)

MONDAY, JANUARY 2.

Read third time and passed, the bill for extending the time limited for settling the accounts between the United States and individual States.

Mr. Findley presented the petition of William Hassell, praying compensation as store keeper to the military hospital of the United States; read and referred to the Secretary of War.

Mr. Seney presented the petition of Emanuel Ebbs, praying payment of arrearages of pay; read and referred to the Secretary of War.

Mr. Ames presented the memorial of Benjamin Lincoln, in behalf of himself, Cyrus Griffin, and David Humphreys, Commissioners for settling a treaty with the Indians South West of the River Ohio—praying a settlement of their account, and payment of the balance due to them for their services—read and referred to the Secretary of War, to examine and report.

A message was received from the President of the United States, by Mr. Secretary Lear, communicating a statement of the disposition of the sums expended from the 10,000 dollars appropriated for contingent expences of government.

In committee of the whole, on the bill relative to the election of a President, and Vice-President, &c. Mr. Muhlenberg in the chair.

The 9th section under consideration—A motion had been made to strike out the President of the Senate pro tempore, and Speaker of the House of Representatives, &c.

The question being divided, the vote on the President of the Senate pro tempore, was put and negatived—on the Speaker of the House of Representatives was also negatived—The 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th sections were discussed and agreed to.—The committee then rose and reported the

bill with the amendments to the House—The House took the same into consideration—the first amendment was not adopted—the second amendment was to insert legislature instead of authority, which was agreed to.

Mr. Williamson, in the House, renewed the motion to strike out of the 9th section, "the President of the Senate pro tempore and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, &c."—This motion was divided—On the question for striking out President of the Senate pro tempore, the Yeas and Nays were as follow:

YEAS.

Messrs. Ashe, Baldwin, Brown, Findley, Fitzsimons, Giles, Griffin, Jacobs, Lee, Macon, Madison, Muhlenberg, Page, Parker, Seney, Sterrit, Sturges, Sumpter, Thatcher, Venable, Wayne, White, Williamson, Wyllis—24.

NAYS.

Messrs. Ames, Barnwell, Boudinot, Benson, S. Bourne, B. Bourne, Clark, Gerry, Gilman, Goodhue, Gordon, Grove, Heister, Key, Learned, Livermore, Murray, Niles, Schoonmaker, I. Smith, J. Smith, W. Smith, Sylvester, Treadwell, Tucker, Wadsworth, Ward—27.

On striking out "the Speaker of the House of Representatives," the Yeas and Nays were as follow:

YEAS.

Messrs. Ashe, Baldwin, Brown, Findley, Fitzsimons, Gerry, Giles, Griffin, Jacobs, Lee, Macon, Madison, Muhlenberg, Page, Parker, Seney, Sterrit, Sturges, Sumpter, Treadwell, Thatcher, Venable, Wayne, White, Williamson, Wyllis—26.

NAYS.

Messrs. Ames, Barnwell, Benson, Boudinot, S. Bourne, B. Bourne, Clark, Goodhue, Gordon, Grove, Heister, Key, Kitchell, Learned, Livermore, Murray, Niles, Schoonmaker, J. Smith, I. Smith, W. Smith, Sylvester, Tucker, Wadsworth, Ward—25.

A clause was added to the bill, on motion of Mr. Tucker, providing for the choice of a President of the Senate pro tempore, in case of vacancies in the office of President and Vice-President.

The bill was then laid on the table, and the House adjourned.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 3.

Mr. Bourne of the committee of enrolment informed the House that they had laid before the President of the United States, for his approbation, the bill, entitled an act for carrying into effect a contract between the United States and the State of Pennsylvania.

The message received yesterday from the President of the United States, with its accompanying statement were read—by which it appears that upwards of 8000 dollars of the sum appropriated for the contingent expences of government, remain in the Treasury, subject to the future orders of the President of the United States.

Sundry petitions for compensations and pensions, were read and referred to the Secretary of War.

Mr. Lawrence presented the petition of John Stagg, principal Clerk to the Secretary of War, praying an augmentation of his salary; read and referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. Lawrence, Giles and Learned.

A message was received from the President of the United States by Mr. Secretary Lear, informing the House that he had this day approved and signed the act for carrying into effect the contract between the United States and the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. J. Smith, of the committee to whom were recommended the 17th and 18th sections of the Post-Office Bill, reported two clauses in lieu of those sections, which they proposed should be struck out.—The 17th and 18th sections were expunged agreeable to the report, and the clauses reported, agreed to.

The 16th section was also struck out, and the 15th section altered.

Mr. Fitzsimons proposed a section making it the duty of the post-master general to advertise for proposals to carry the mail, either in stages or on horse-back, through the United States—this proposition was agreed to, after striking out the words in italic.

A second proposition offered by the same gentlemen, to authorize the stages which carry the mail, to carry passengers on the post roads, occasioned considerable debate—which arose from the circumstance of certain persons in the States of Maryland and Virginia enjoying under their State laws, an exclusive right to transport passengers thro' those States.—The House adjourned without coming to a decision.

NEW CITY OF WASHINGTON.

The following description is annexed to the plan of the City of Washington, in the district of Columbia, as sent to Congress by the President some days ago.

Plan of the City intended for the permanent seat of the Government of the United States, projected agreeably to the direction of the President of the United States, in pursuance of an Act of Congress, passed on the 16th of July, 1790, "establishing the permanent seat on the banks of the Potowmack"—By PETER CHARLES L'ENFANT.

Observations explanatory of the plan.

I. THE positions for the several grand edifices, and for the several grand squares or areas of different shapes as they are laid down, were first determined on the most advantageous ground, commanding the most extensive prospects, and the better susceptible of such improvements as the various interests of the several objects may require.

II. Lines or avenues of direct communication have been devised to connect the separate and most distant objects with the principals, and to preserve through the whole a reciprocity of sight at the same time. Attention has been paid to the passing of those leading avenues over the most favorable ground for prospect and convenience.

III. North and south lines, intersected by others running due east and west, make the distri-