Congreſs of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Wedneſday, January 5, 1803.

Motion of Mr. Randolph to refer the reſolutions of Mr. Griſwold calling for official documents reſpecting the ceſſion of Louiſiana, to a committee of the whole on the ſtate of the union.

[DEBATE CONTINUED.]

Mr. Dana ſaid that he did not know, nor had he heard from any quarter that there was any negociation depending reſpecting the ceſſion of Louiſiana, The preſident has informed us of the fact. All that the reſolution aſks are official documents reſpecting the ceſſion, with the ſtipulations, circumſtances and conditions under which it is to be delivered up. He could not ſee the impropriety of ſuch a requeſt. But if the preſident deem it improper to furniſh the information, we do not aſſert our right to demand it. There are too views in which this information may be important; that which may throw light on the boundaries of the province as ceded; and another, whether the province is to be ceded to the French in the condition it ſhall be in when actually delivered up, or whether ſubject to the conditions in which it was held according to treaty by Spain. This is important information to guide our deliberations; information not depending upon an exiſting negociation, but upon a negociation decided.

Mr. Griſwold called for the taking of the yeas and nays.

Mr Smilie was in favor of the wideſt publicity in every caſe where it would not prove injurious; and there were, in his opinion, very few caſes in which it ought not to take place. He could not, however, withhold one remark; that gentlemen ſhould object to the mode now propoſed, a mode ſimilar to that adopted in like caſes, greatly ſurpriſed him. [He here quoted the proceedings of the houſe on a call for papers in the caſe of the Britiſh treaty.] That caſe furniſhed a precedent, by which it appeared that a motion for information was referred to a committee of the whole for a more full diſcuſſion.

Mr. Davis obſerved, that as he lived in that diſtrict of country moſt materially affected by the ſubject before the houſe, he thought it proper to expreſs his opinion on the motion. He ſaid he did not know what reaſon could be aſſigned for the motion, but that expreſſed by the gentleman from Virginia to go into a committee of the whole in private, to propoſe certain reſolutions that required ſecrecy.

Mr. Davis ſaid it had been his purpoſe yeſterday to have ſubmitted certain reſolutions, which he ſhould have done, but for the motion of the gentleman from Connecticut calling for information; after it was made he was willing to wait until all information was obtained that could be furniſhed. Suppoſe we go into a committee of the whole, what light can we expect from their deliberations? We can gain nothing. But let the call for information prevail; let us draw from the preſident ſuch information as he may think it proper to give; and let us then refer that information to a committee of the whole, and they will be able to deliberate wiſely—What uſe can it be to take a ſtep from which no benefit can be derived? As to the call on the preſident, he will not give us any thing that is improper. How does the gentleman from Virginia know what light this information may throw on the ſubject? Is he prepared to ſay it will throw no light on this ſubject? If he is, Mr. D. ſaid he himſelf was not. He might have ways of acquiring the ſecrets of the cabinet; but for himſelf he had no ſuch opportunities. Mr. Davis concluded by declaring himſelf againſt the motion.

Mr. Randolph was compelled again reluctantly to treſpaſs on the indulgence of the houſe, to aſſure them and the gentleman from Kentucky, that his motion did not comprehend a refuſal to agree to the call for information made by the gentleman from Connecticut. After going into committee, they might, perhaps, either by a unanimous vote, or by that of a majority, agree to the reſolution. Benefit might ariſe, and no miſchief poſſibly could, from going into a committee of the whole.

Mr. Huger muſt acknowledge that he could not underſtand the object of thoſe who were for refuſing this information. If they had any objection to aſking the information, let them inform us what it is. And if they have no objection why go into a committee of the whole; which if gone into, muſt be with cloſed doors. The queſtion alluded to in the Britiſh treaty was very different from this. In that caſe one part of the houſe thought they had a right to demand the information of the executive, and that he was bound to deliver it; while the other part of the houſe neither acknowledged the right to demand, nor the obligation to obey. The preſent caſe was entirely different. We aſk nothing but what the executive ſhall think proper to furniſh; we are as cautious as we can poſſibly be; we even go ſo far as to put words in the preſident's mouth if he ſhall think there is any impropriety in giving the information. Gentlemen certainly have confidence in the executive, that he will tell us if the informatihn is improper to be furniſhed.

Mr. Huger could not but expreſs his ſurpriſe that the houſe had received no official documents on this important ſubject. He could not comprehend why congreſs ſhould not know the contents of the convention. If proper, we ought to have theſe documents; and if not proper, we ought to have a reaſon for it. The country was in a ſtate of ſerious alarm; and it might have a bad effect if ſomething was not immediately done, and a diſpoſition exhibited to act in caſe it ſhould prove neceſſary.

Mr. Smilie ſaid the gentleman from South-Carolina (Mr. Huger) was incorrect, when he ſtated that in the caſe of the Britiſh treaty, one ſet of gentlemen had contended for the right of the houſe to demand papers. If this had been ſo, the reſolution then propoſed would have been preremptory; whereas the fact was that it was qualified by an exception of ſuch papers as the preſident might conſider it improper to furniſh. [Mr. Smilie here quoted the journals, which confirmed his remark.]

Mr. Gregg ſaid it would be allowed that this was an important reſolution, which related to an important ſubject. This was, he believed, the firſt inſtance in which a reſolution allowed to be important, had been refuſed a reference to a committee of the whole. On this principle his vote would be decided. If the motion did not prevail, he ſhould then move that the reſolution ſhould be printed before it was acted upon.

Mr. Griſwould would not object to the reference if the object were to obtain a more full diſcuſſion of the reſolution. He was generally in favor of ſuch references, as the diſcuſſion was conducted in a committee of the whole on a freer ſcale than in the houſe. On this principle it was that the call for papers reſpecting the Britiſh treaty was referred to a committee of the whole. But it had not been referred to a committee of the whole on the ſtate of the Union.

He, however, underſtood the object of gentlemen to be to refer the reſolution to a committee of the whole, for the purpoſe of diſcuſſing it with cloſed doors. If that were the object, he ſhould oppoſe it. For he would ſay nothing of ſecrecy could ariſe out of the diſcuſſion of this reſolution. He did not wiſh that a reſolution, ſo important, ſhould be referred to a ſecret committee. If gentlemen mean to deny us this information, let them deny it in public. Let them not do it in a ſecret committee. Surely they can have no ſuch unworthy motives.

As to the caſe of 1796 under the Britiſh treaty, the ground of oppoſition was this. It was claimed that the houſe had a right to decide upon a treaty, and to eſtabliſh this point papers were called for. And on the deciſion of the queſtion, on the granting or refuſing the application, depended the eſtabliſhment of the right of the houſe to participate in the treaty making power. This right was denied by thoſe who voted againſt the call. But in this caſe there was no difference as to the power of the houſe. The preſident in his meſſage had expreſsly ſtated that the ceſſion would have weight in the deliberations of the legiſlature. This then being a caſe in which it is proper to legiſlate, ſhall we go to work blindfold, without having all the information poſſeſſed by the executive, that it is proper we ſhould poſſeſs? What do we know reſpecting the ceſſion? Though made for more than one year, we have no information, except that contained in the meſſage which barely mentions the fact. For theſe reaſons Mr. Griſwold hoped the motion would not prevail, as its avowed object was not for a more full diſcuſſion, but for the purpoſe of going into a ſecret committee. If gentlemen mean to deny us the information we aſk, let the denial be public; and if they grant it, there is no reaſon againſt their doing it publicly.

Mr. Randolph. The gentleman from Connecticut tells us that this ſubject is referred to in the meſſage of the preſident, and that on it we are called by him to legiſlate. That ſubject has been referred to a committee of the whole; and yet he ſays it is improper to refer this reſolution to the ſame committee. This may be logic; but I confeſs, if it is, I do not underſtand it. He ſays if the object of reference be for a more ample diſcuſſion he will be in favor of it; but not ſo, if it be to ſend it to a ſecret committee. Does the gentlemen mean to inſinuate that the debates of this body are for the entertainment of the ladies who honor us with their preſence; or that as ſoon as our doors are ſhut, our ears alſo are ſhut to all uſeful and neceſſary information? If the doors ſhall be cloſed, cannot we ſtill agree to the reſolution? However gentlemen may perſiſt in the courſe they have taken, I ſhall not permit the warmth of their remarks, or that of my own feelings, to betray me into a debate on points which the houſe have determined ſhall be diſcuſſed with cloſed doors. For my own part, I am ready to declare that I have arguments to advance, that it is not my wiſh to advance with open doors.

Mr. Bacon ſaid the reſolution ſimply called for information reſpecting the ceſſion of the province of Louiſiana to the French. He did not ſee the end to be anſwered by committing it. Is there any doubt that we ſhall not ſtand in need of information when we come to diſcuſs points connected with this ſubject? It appeared to him they would. He was therefore againſt the reference,

Mr. S. Smith. The gentleman from Connecticut has candidly admitted that it is cuſtomary in ſuch caſes to make a reference, that he is not in favor of the reference being made to a committee with ſhut doors; but if the object were to obtain a free diſcuſſion, he would not object to it. He is told that a full and free diſcuſſion cannot be had without ſuch a reference, and yet he perſiſts in his hoſtility to the motion. He had been told ſo by the mover, and common ſenſe would have told him ſo at firſt; yet he is for taking advantage of the mover, and for ſhutting out the arguments he has to urge. The gentleman is miſtaken in his ſtatement of the motives of the different ſides of the houſe in the diſcuſſion on a call for papers in 1796, when he repreſents one ſide as claiming a right to participate in the treaty making power. He recollected it had been charged upon them, but they had denied it. We contended, ſaid general Smith, that when a treaty was formed appropriating a large ſum of money, we had a right to appropriate or not appropriate the money; but we never aſſumed the right to ſay whether the treaty was concluded or not. Afterwards, gentlemen themſelves, if he recollected right, moved a reſolution that it was expedient to carry the treaty into effect, by which they did admit the right of the houſe. Mr. Smith ſaid he had no previous knowledge of what the gentleman from Virginia meant by his motion; he might perhaps wiſh to amend the reſolution; but when he ſays he has arguments that he can not urge without ſhut doors, he truſted that indulgence would be allowed him, or there would be a denial of juſtice.

Mr. Dana ſaid there was a magic of language to thoſe unaccuſtomed to parliamentary language, in the houſe reſolving itſelf into a committee, and that committee returning itſelf back into the houſe, both compoſed of the ſame members, that made the proceedings of public bodies appear ridiculous. But there were ſubſtantial benefits derived from the obſervance of theſe forms. There was a fuller & freer diſcuſſion, every member ſpoke as often as he choſe, & they enjoyed the ſpeaker's advice. There were beſides two diſcuſſions and deciſions inſtead of one. He admitted, therefore, the propriety of ſuch procedure in all caſes where there was an important principle involved. But in this inſtance there was no important principle to diſcuſs. There was an important principle involved in the famous queſtion of 1796. It was, therefore, right to refer it to a committee of the whole. He did not know what principle was to be diſcuſſed on this reference, unleſs it was the want of information. This he moſt ſenſibly felt; and thoſe gentlemen who alſo felt it might, he thought, be indulged by thoſe who poſſeſs all information on the ſubject. If any gentleman, however, will ſay that any important principle is involved in the reſolution, he was ready to go into a committee of the whole, though not with cloſed doors.

The queſtion was then taken by yeas and nays on Mr. Randolph's motion to refer the reſolution of Mr. Griſwold to a committee of the whole on the ſtate of the union, and carried—Yeas 49; Nays 39—as follow:

YEAS—Meſſrs. Alſton, Archer, Brent, Brown, Butler, Claiborne, Clay, Clopton, Condit, Cutts, Dawſon, Elmendorf, Elmer, Euſtis, Gray, Gregg, Hanna, J. Heiſter, Hoge, Holland, Holmes, Jackſon, Leib, Meriwether, Mitchell, Moore, New, Newton, jun. Nicholſon, Randolph, jun. Smilie, J. Smith, N. Y. J. Smith, Virg. Joſiah Smith, S. Smith, Southard, Stanford, Stanton, jun. Stewart, Taliaferro, jun. Thomas, Thompſon, A. Trigg, J. Trigg, Van Cortlandt, Varnum, Van Horne, Wynns.—49.

NAYS—Meſſrs. Bacon, Biſhop, Boude, Campbell, Cutler, Dana, Davenport, Davis, Dennis, Dickſon, Goddard, Griſwold, Grove, Haſtings, Helms, Hemphill, Henderſon, Huger, Hunt, Lowndes, Mattoon, L. R. Morris, T. Morris, Mott, Perkins, Plater, Read, Rutledge, Shepard, J. C. Smith, Stanley, Tallmage, Tenney, Thatcher, Tillinghaſt, Upham, Wadſworth, L. Williams, Woods.—39.

On motion of Mr. Griſwold, the houſe immediately went into committee of the whole on the ſtate of the union.

Mr. John C. Smith in the chair.

Mr. Randolph roſe and obſerved that he held in his hands certain reſolutions connected with the meſſage of the preſident relative to the late proceedings at New-Orleans, the diſcuſſion of which had been ordered to be carried on with cloſed doors. He aſked the deciſion of the queſtion, whether previouſly to offering his reſolutions, the doors ought not to be cloſed. The reſolutions he meant to ſubmit grew out of the meſſage. If the houſe, however, inſiſted upon their being then read, he had no indiſpoſition to read them.

The chairman conſidered the committee as incompetent to clearing the galleries. He thought it muſt be the act of the houſe.

Mr. Dawſon enquired if the ſame rules that applied to the houſe did not alſo apply to the committee of the whole.

Mr. Randolph called for the reading of the preſident's meſſage reſpecting New-Orleans.

Mr. Griſwold ſaid there was other buſineſs not requiring ſecrecy referred to the committee.

Mr. Randold repeated his call for the reading of the preſident's meſſage.

The chairman aſked what meſſage?

Mr. Randolph replied the confidential meſſage.

Mr. Griſwold ſaid that could not be read with open doors.

The chairman ſaid the doors could not be cloſed without an order of the houſe.

Mr. S. Smith obſerved that it had been cuſtomary to clear the gallaries before the houſe went into committee. To ſave time, he would move that the committee ſhould riſe, in order to obtain an order to of the houſe to that effect.

Mr. Griſwold hoped the committee would not riſe. The buſineſs he had propoſed was of a public, not of a ſecret nature. It was alſo of a preſſing nature, and ought not to be poſtponed for any other buſineſs.

Mr. Dana hoped, indeed, for the honor of the houſe, they would not exhibit the ſpectacle of waſting time in going into committee and then coming out of it without doing any thing; but would proceed to the public buſineſs.

Mr. Rutledge. The gentleman from Virginia holds in his hands reſolutions that require ſecrecy. After deciding on the motion of the gentleman from Connecticut, he will not be precluded from offering theſe reſolutions.

Mr. Euſtis ſaid if the houſe had reſolved itſelf into a committee for the expreſs purpoſe of taking into conſideration the reſolution of the gentleman from Connecticut, it would be proper to give it the preference over any other buſineſs; and in that caſe, he ſhould have been as ready at this moment as at any other to offer his objections to it. But if it were underſtood that the houſe had reſolved itſelf generally into a committee on the ſtate of the union, one gentleman from Virginia having made a motion, and another gentleman from Connecticut having afterwards made another motion, that made by the laſt gentleman, being junior in point of time ought to be laſt attended to. The other gentleman's motion was firſt in courſe; and if the gentleman who offered it deſired the galleries to be cleared, he had an undoubted right to an order to that effect.

Mr. Macon (ſpeaker) remarked that a committee of the whole houſe was one committee, and a committee of the whole houſe on the ſtate of the union another committee. They were diſtinct committees. The laſt was never formed for ſpecial purpoſes. He did not recollect that this had ever been done. Whereas the other committee was always formed for a ſpecial purpoſe. The difficulty in this caſe had ariſen from referring the confidential meſſage to a committee of the whole on the ſtate of the Union. He believed it would be well to riſe and ſeparate the two ſubjects that had been referred to the committee on the ſtate of the Union.

Mr. Griſwold did not underſtand what the gentleman from Maſſachuſetts meant by priority of motion. The chairman has determined that the motion of the gentleman from Virginia was not in order, as it could not be ſubmitted in a public committee. After this diſpoſition of that motion, none remained before the committee other than his own. In point of priority, he roſe, therefore, to have his reſolution then decided upon. With regard to the propoſition of the honorable ſpeaker, he did not ſee any reaſon for it. Was it not as well to decide on this reſolution in this committee as in any other committee? Why then riſe for the purpoſe of referring it to a ſecret committee?

Mr. S. Smith ſaid the gentleman from Maſſachuſetts meant by his remarks that the meſſage of the preſident had precedence. The gentleman from Connecticut was only now urging what had been decided againſt him in the houſe. He thinks he has now an advantage and preſſes it.

Mr. Smith ſaid he had not a doubt that the gentleman from South-Carolina (Mr. Rutledge) is very ſincere in his opinion, that if we will agree to ſubmit all power to them, they will indulge us by agreeing to certain ſubordinate points. But gentlemen will excuſe us. We have already taken great pains to diveſt them of power, and we are not yet diſpoſed to return it into their hands.

We are of opinion that the meſſage ought to be diſcuſſed with cloſed doors; that is the intention of the motion; let us not take advantage of thoſe who have arguments to offer which they wiſh not to ſubmit with open doors; let the committee riſe and the galleries be cleared.

Mr. Dana in one point fully agreed with the gentleman from Maryland. They had taken great pains to get power. But he regretted that any political party alluſion whatever had been made on this ſubject. He had ſuppoſed it ſo important, ſo deeply intereſting to all America, that he had hoped all ſpirit of party would have ſlept during our deliberations on it; and that we ſhould have ſhewn that we entertained but one ſentiment, and were ready, if neceſſary, to extend one arm in defence of our invaded rights.

Mr. L. R. Morris expreſſed his diſagreement with the ſpeaker on a point of order.

When the queſtion was taken on the riſing of the committee, and carried in the affirmative—Ayes 49—Noes 37.

The committee accordingly roſe, and the chairman reported that they had come to no reſolution.

A motion was made to adjourn, on which Mr. Griſwold called the yeas and nays; which were, yeas 38—Nays 51, as follow:

YEAS—Meſſrs. Bailey, Brent, Brown, Butler, Condit, Cutts, Davis, Dawſon, Dickſon, Elmendorf, Gregg, Hanna, Heiſter, Helms, Hoge, Holland, Holmes, Jackſon, Leib, Meriwether, Mitchill, Moore, New, Newton, J. Smith, N. Y. J. Smith, Virg. Joſiah Smith, S. Smith, Southard, Stanford, Staunton, Stewart, Thomas, Thompſon, A. Trigg, Van Cortlandt, Van Horne, and Wynns—38.

NAYS—Meſſrs. Alſton, Archer, Bacon, Biſhop, Boude, Campbell, Claiborne, Clay, Clopton, Cutler, Dana, Davenport, Dennis, Elmer, Euſtis, Goddard, Gray, Griſwold, Grove, Haſtings, Hemphill, Henderſon, Huger, Hunt, Lowndes, Mattoon, L. R. Morris, T. Morris, Mott, Nicholſon, Perkins, Plater, Randolph, Read, Rutledge, Shepard, Smilie, J. C. Smith, Stanley, Stratton, Taliaferro, Tallmage, Tenney, Thatcher, Tillinghaſt, J. Trigg, Upham, Varnum, Wadſworth, L. Williams, and Woods—51.

The galleries were then cleared by a vote of the houſe—Ayes 41—Noes 41; the ſpeaker voting in the affirmative.

Friday, January 7.

The galleries were cleared about half paſt 11 o'clock, when the houſe again reſolved itſelf into a committee of the whole, on the meſſage of the preſident of the 22d and 30th ultimo, and the documents tranſmitted therewith—Mr. Varnum in the chair.

Mr. Randolph's motion made on the 5th inſt. with cloſed doors, was read as follows:

Reſolved, That this houſe receive with great ſenſibility the information of a diſpoſition in certain officers of the Spaniſh government at New-Orleans, to obſtruct the navigation of the river Miſſiſippi, *as* ſecured to the United States by the moſt ſolemn ſtipulations:

That, adhering to that humane and wiſe policy which ought ever to characterize a free people, and by which the United States have always profeſſed to be governed; willing, at the ſame time, to aſcribe this breach of compact to the unauthoriſed miſconduct of certain individuals, rather than to a want of good faith on the part of his Catholic majeſty; and relying with perfect confidence on the vigilance and wiſdom of the executive, they will wait the iſſue of ſuch meaſures as that department of the government ſhall have purſued for aſſerting the rights and *vindicating* the injuries of the United States:—Holding it to be their duty, at the ſame time, to expreſs their unalterable determination to maintain the boundaries, and the rights of navigation and commerce through the river Miſſiſippi, as eſtabliſhed by exiſting treaties.

On which a debate of conſiderable duration enſued; during which various propoſitions to amend were offered, ſome verbal, and others implicating principle, all of which were finally rejected, except the introduction of the word *as* in the firſt ſection of the motion.

The committee roſe and reported that they had come to the foregoing reſolution.

On which the debate was reſumed.

The firſt ſection of the motion was agreed to.

On the ſecond ſection being read,

A motion was made to amend it by ſtriking out the word *vindicating*, and inſerting the word *redreſſing* in room thereof.

Diſagreed to.

Mr. Griſwold moved to ſtrike out the following words:

"And relying with perfect confidence on the vigilance and wiſdom of the executive, they will wait the iſſue of ſuch meaſures as that department of the government ſhall have purſued for aſſerting the rights and vindicating the injuries of the United States.

Which was loſt. Yeas 30—Nays 53—

The ſecond ſection was then agreed to; when the houſe reconſidered their vote of agreement.

Mr. Griſwold then called for a diviſion of the queſtion on the ſecond ſection, by firſt taking the queſtion on the following part.

"That adhering to that humane and wiſe policy which ought ever to characterize a free people, and by which the United States have always profeſſed to be governed; willing, at the ſame time, to aſcribe this breach of compact to the unauthoriſed miſconduct of certain individuals, rather than to a want of good faith on the part of his Catholic majeſty."—

This diviſion was objected to as not in order.

The ſpeaker decided that it was in order.

On which Mr. Taliaferro appealed to the houſe, who decided that it was in order.

The ſaid member of the ſection was agreed to unanimouſly:

The third member of the ſecond ſection being read, as follows:

"Holding it to be their duty, at the ſame time. to expreſs their unalterable determination to maintain the boundaries, and the rights of navigation and commerce through the river Miſſiſippi, as eſtabliſhed by exiſting treaties."

Mr. Griſwold moved to ſtrike out the words "exiſting treaties," and inſert the word "treaty," with a view to refer to our treaty with Spain excluſively

Paſſed in the negative.

The ſaid third member was then unanimouſly agreed to.

The queſtion was then taken on agreeing to the whole of the ſecond ſection of the motion, and carried—Yeas 50—Noes 25.

Reſolved, That the injunction of ſecrecy, ſo far as relates to the foregoing reſolution and the proceedings of the houſe on the meſſage from the preſident of the 22d and 30th, be taken off.

When the houſe adjourned about 5 o'clock.

TRINIDAD, December 4.

By letters from a gentleman of this town at preſent at Demerara, it appears that the Britiſh flag was ſtill flying there on the 20th ult. no Dutch troops having arrived either there or at Surrinam, to relieve the Britiſh forces in thoſe colonies.

Arrived, ſch'r Admiral Harvey, Charleſton; ſch'r. Pomona, Wall, Baltimore; ſhip Hunter, Alexander.

FRANKFORT, [K.] December 15.

Another Revolutionary Patriot's gone!

Died ſuddenly, on Saturday evening laſt, at the houſe of Mr. Brackett Owens, Shelby county, of an apoplectic fit, general Benjamin Logan, at an advanced age. We feel inadequate to do him juſtice by newſpaper eulogy, ſuffice it to ſay he was a patriot of '76, and uniform in his devotion to the cauſe of liberty. He took an early and active part in our revolutionary conteſt, was one of the firſt adventurers to Kentucky, and one of her moſt able and zealous defenders againſt a ſavage and barbarous enemy—principally on him, for a long time hung the deſtinies of the country. At any time the loſs of ſuch a man would be ſeverely felt—but more particularly at this moment, when it is yet uncertain whether we may not be obliged to reſort to arms, to enforce our rights of commerce. At ſuch a criſis, much might have been expected from his talents, activity and courage. In his private character, none excelled him, of unimpeachable integrity, and a nice ſenſe of honor, he was ſincere in his profeſſions of friendſhip, charitable, and of unbounded hoſpitality, a good neighbor, tender and affectionate huſband and parent. He has left a long liſt of friends and relatives to deplore his loſs.

Monday laſt the legiſlature paſſed the following reſolution, unanimouſly—

"*Reſolved*, That the members of the general aſſembly wear mourning, in token of that high regard and reſpect, which the people of Kentucky entertain for the memory of general *Benjamin Logan*, the firm defender of his country."

NEW-YORK, January 7.

A fire broke out on Wedneſday evening, about 8 o'clock, in a barn on the north ſide of Staten Iſland, which was totally conſumed, together with a valuable mare worth 200 dollars, 3 cows, and a large ſtock of poulty. A negro girl, belonging to Mr. A. Banker, who lived within 100 yards of the barn, has been apprehended on a charge of having committed this crime, according to her own confeſſion.

January 8.

Capt. Worth, from Lisbon, is the bearer of diſpatches for our government.

The ſhip Hare, arrived yeſterday, left Liſbon on the 2d of December, at which time an Engliſh packet had juſt entered that port in 5 days from Falmouth, without bringing any news of importance.

We underſtand that a merchant in this city has requeſted his correſpondent in Portſmouth, to diſtribute 500 dollars amongſt the unfortunate of that town---An act worthy of a noble and generous mind.

Entered, ſhips Hare, Worth, Liſbon, 35 days; Mary, Crocker, Amſterdam, 63; ſch'rs Two Friends, Huſſey, Bordeaux, 52; Rebecca, Denniſon, Frederickſburg, 14; Appomattox, Collins, do. 10; Sukey and Polly, Wheeler, Savannah, 9; Paragon, Jackſon, Norfolk, 1 1-2; Margaret Tingey, Palmer, do. 2.

Cleared, ſch'r Roebuck, Dawſon, St. Thomas; ſloop Two Friends, Wood, Charleſton.

Ship Atlas, Wilſon, is arrived at Liſbon.

Brig Rockland, King, at Aux-Cayes.

Brig Abigail, Williams, at Bordeaux.

Schooner Lion, Faur, of Philadelphia, at Aux-Cayes.

Arrived, ſhip Hare, Worth, 35 days from Liſbon. Dec. 23, lat. 26, 46, long. 52, ſpoke ſch'r Nancy, out 12 days from Alexandria, bound to Cayenne. American produce at Liſbon was low.

Ship Mary, Crocker, 63 days from Amſterdam. In lat. 25, 30, long. 70, ſpoke the Engliſh ſhip Lovely Laſs, from Liverpool, bound to Savannah, out 28 days. January 1, in lat. 36, long. 74, ſpoke the ſhip Betſy, from London, bound to Charleſton, out 70 days.

Sailed on Wedneſday morning with a fine wind from the North-Weſt,

Ship Iris, Skinner, for London
American Eagle, Merry, Belfaſt
Canada, Harvey, Greenock
Brig Ann, Rogers, Leghorn
Wealthy Ann, Boyd, Cadiz
Tiger, ——, Weſt-Indies
Schooner Lioneſs, Smith, for Charleſton, and ſeveral others.

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 10.

Yeſterday arrived, ſch'r Nancy, Jeffery, 17 days from Guadaloupe, and 14 from St. Thomas. Left at Guadaloupe, ſeveral American veſſels, among them were the brig Philip, ——, of Baltimore; ſchooner Hannah Loretto, Wheland, Philadelphia, and ſch'r Ann, ——, ditto. At St. Thomas, with a number of American veſſels, the brig Taſk, M'Pherſon, of Philadelphia, juſt arrived.

NORFOLK, January 4.

Arrived, the Britiſh brig Maid of the Mill, capt. Carey, 23 days from Halifax.

Arrived, the Britiſh brig Dart, captain Whylie, 18 days from Grenada.

Arrived, the ſchooner Weymouth, capt. Boſton, in diſtreſs, 20 days from Kingſton, bound to Philadelphia.

Arrived, the ſchooner Polly and Peggy, captain Harding, 9 days from Turk's-Iſland.