FOR THE FEDERAL GAZETTE.

To the Honorable the General Assembly of Maryland.

THE subscribers, citizens of Baltimore, resident within St. Paul's parish in Baltimore county, beg leave to represent to your honors, that the said parish is of the length of near thirty miles, and of the breadth of eight to sixteen miles; that from the increase of population in the city and county of Baltimore, all your petitioners cannot be accommodated with pews upon such terms as are suited to their circumstances.

Your petitioners further state, that they are anxious to purchase a lot of ground in the city of Baltimore, for the purpose of erecting a church thereon; which church, when erected, they are desirous should be subject to the laws, rules and regulations that all other Protestant Episcopal churches are within the state of Maryland, except that your petitioners should, in the first instance, elect the vestry of the said church, and that afterwards the vestry of the said church should be elected by the free white male citizens, contributing to the support of the same.

Your petitioners further state, that their local situation, disposed as they are throughout the city and county of Baltimore, in said parish, makes it impossible for the convention of the Protestant Episcopal church to divide them into a parish, or constitute bounds for them.

Your petitioners beg leave to state, that they are not to be considered as desirous of seceding from the Protestant Episcopal Church, on the contrary that they wish the name and title thereof, and in all respects to be governed by the laws, rules and convention thereof, except as herein stated.

Your petitioners therefore pray, that a law may pass authorising certain persons therein named, to ask and receive voluntary contributions, for the purpose of purchasing a lot of ground in the city of Baltimore, for the erecting thereon a Protestant Episcopal Church; also to purchase ground, either within or without the city of Baltimore, for the purpose of a burial ground; and authorising or requiring the said persons to make over and convey the said land to such vestry as may be appointed by law, pursuant to their said petition; and that the same may be held as other property now is, or may be held, belonging to any other Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of Maryland; and granting to your petitioners the power of electing a vestry to the said church, in manner herein before stated. And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will pray.

AN ACT

To authorise the building of a Protestant Episcopal Church within the city of Baltimore, by the name of Saint Peter's Church, and for other purposes.

BE *it enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland*, That Jeremiah Yellott, John Scott, William Jolly, Hezekiah Waters, Josias Pennington, Simon Wilmer, (of Edward) and James Corrie, of the city of Baltimore, are hereby authorised and empowered to solicit and receive subscriptions and donations, not exceeding twenty-five thousand dollars, for the purpose of purchasing a lot of land in the city of Baltimore, not exceeding one acre, for the building thereon a Protestant Episcopal church, to be called Saint Peter's church, and a lot of land either within or without the said city, not exceeding two acres, for a burial ground to the said church.

And be it enacted, That the said Jeremiah Yellott, John Scott, William Jolly, Hezekiah Waters, Josias Pennington, Simon Wilmer (of Edward) and James Corrie, or a majority of them, may and they are hereby authorised and empowered to receive a conveyance or conveyances of the said lot or lots of land to them and their heirs as joint tenants, and to purchase materials and contract with workmen for the building of the said church.

And be it enacted, That when the said church shall be so built as to admit of divine worship to be performed therein, that the said Jeremiah Yellott, John Scott, William Jolly, Hezekiah Waters, Josias Pennington, Simon Wilmer (of Edward) and James Corrie, and the survivors and survivor of them shall, by advertisement in the different newspapers in the city of Baltimore, notify the subscribers thereto, professing themselves members of the said church, to assemble and meet together in the said church, thirty days at least after such notification, for proceeding to the election of a vestry to the said church.

And be it enacted, That the said subscribers, professing themselves members of the said church, or so many of them as shall then and there assemble and meet together shall proceed to elect by ballot by a majority of votes, nine vestrymen from among the members of the said church, who shall be deemed and considered the vestry of the said church for the ensuing year.

And be it enacted, That when the said vestry shall be thus elected, that they shall have and enjoy every right, power, benefit, privilege and indulgence that is given or granted to, used or enjoyed by, any other vestry of the Protestant Episcopal church within the state of Maryland.

And be it enacted, That when the said vestry shall be thus elected, all and every the lot and lots of land purchased as herein before directed, and belonging to the said church, shall become vested in the said vestry in fee simple, as other property is vested in corporate bodies, and as such shall be by the said vestry held and enjoyed.

And be it enacted, That after the said first election of the vestry to the said church shall have been made as herein directed, the subscribers to and members of the said church, contributing to and attendants on the same, and being free white male citizens, shall annually on Easter Monday, meet in the said church and elect nine vestrymen for the ensuing year, by a majority of votes, by ballot.

And be it enacted, That as soon as the vestry herein first named shall be elected, the said Jeremiah Yellott, John Scott, William Jolly, Hezekiah Waters, Josias Pennington, Simon Wilmer (of Edward,) and James Corrie, and the survivors and survivor of them, shall by deed of bargain and sale duly executed, and to be recorded among the land records of Baltimore county, convey the said lot and lots of land to the said vestry and their successors, in fee simple, to be by them held, used and enjoyed as other real property is held by any other vestry of the Protestant Episcopal church in the state of Maryland.

And be it enacted, That every law, or any part of any law heretofore passed and enacted contrary to the provisions herein contained, shall be, as to the church herein before named and the vestry thereof hereafter to be elected, and the same is, hereby repealed.

True copy from the engrossed law.

LOUIS GASSAWAY,
Committee clk. ho. del. Maryland.

From the NEW-YORK EVENING POST.

Munroe's Speech recited by Randolph.

In the congressional debates which are now publishing, our attention is particularly arrested by the speech of Mr. Munroe, formerly delivered in the Virginia convention and now read in congress by Mr. Randolph; which is concluded in this evening's paper. The object of this speech is to prove "that in the old congress, the southern states had been firm friends of the free navigation of the Mississippi, and that seven of the eastern states had been in favor of a proposition made by Mr. Jay, secretary for foreign affairs, in the character of negociator with the Spanish minister, to forbear the free navigation of that river for twenty-five years."

This insidious attempt of Mr. Randolph to excite a belief in the minds of our western citizens, that the eastern states have been regardless of their rights, while the southern states alone have been their "firm friends," ought not to pass without some comment and explanation. Independent of the unfairness, and the untruth of the insinuation, a regard for decorum as well as policy should have prevented it. On a great national question, in which the interests, the honor, and the dignity of the country, in its collective capacity are eminently concerned, the endeavor to inspire one part of the community with ill will and distrust towards another part, has a manifest tendency to weaken the energies of the nation. It will naturally produce coolness in those who are suspected, and a jealous and distant conduct on the side of those, who imagine that their interests are neglected. Under such circumstances, a cordial co-operation cannot be expected: Between doubt on the one hand, and indignation on the other at being thus unworthily treated, those measures which spring from a sincere union of sentiment and exertion, and which can alone be useful, will either not be undertaken, or if they are, will be pursued with all the pusilanimity which marks the councils of a nation, that has no confidence in the integrity of its own members. If therefore Mr. Randolph had been at all attentive to the plainest duties of a statesman, he would have restrained himself from indulging in the malicious effort to create a schism in the country, upon a question, which it is believed, is viewed throughout every part of the union, in the east no less than in the south, as one affecting our common rights; our national sovereignty; consequently, one on which mere local situation ought to have no influence.

Since, however, this gentleman has seen fit to make use of Mr. Munroe's speech, with the avowed intention of throwing an odium on the Eastern states, it is proper to recur to some facts connected with the state of things alluded to in that speech: it shall then be submitted to our Western brethren, to appreciate the professions of those who now so boldly declare, that in the "Old congress the *southern* states had been the *firm friends* of the *free* navigation of the Mississippi."

Whilst Mr. Jay was in Spain as our minister, during the revolutionary war, the *southern states* procured a resolution to be passed instructing Mr. Jay to yield entirely to the views of Spain relative to the Mississippi, upon condition that Spain would recognize our Independence. What then were the views of Spain upon this subject? They are well known to have been the *exclusive navigation* of that river, not for 25 years, or for any other limited time, but FOREVER. This indeed is admittted in the speech itself; but governor Monroe is materially incorrect when he states that this step was taken by congress, upon the suggestion of Mr. Jay: On the contrary, this gentlemen, with that discernment and firmness which have ever characterised his public conduct, did not think fit to surrender his judgment, to what he justly considered as an unwise and short-sighted policy in congress; he did not therefore, act upon the instructions sent to him.

Here then we find, that these *firm friends* of the *free* navigation of the Mississippi, did expressly authorise our minister to consent to the *entire renunciation of all right to the use of that river*. It is true, that the stipulation on the part of Spain for such an act, was to be the acknowledgment of our independence; but it is not less true, that Spain was, with France, at that very time engaged in the war against Great-Britain, and that it was not in her power to prevent our independence, had she been ever so strongly disaffected towards us. The event too proved that it was not necessary to obtain her recognition of it by a sacrifice on our part so imprudent, as that contemplated in the resolution alluded to.

After the conclusion of the war, Mr. Gardoqui, the Spanish minister resident in this country, was instructed to negociate with our government relative to the Mississippi. Mr. Jay, then secretary of foreign affairs, was appointed by congress to treat with him. The exclusive navigation of this river was a favorite project of the king of Spain—it was insisted on with unyielding pertinacity. To abandon forever our right to participate in its use, was an idea not to be endured; it was attempted to meet midway. Spain at length proposed, that we should cede to her for 25 years the sole navigation of that river, for which in return very important and exclusive commercial advantages were offered as the equivalent; among these our vessels were to be received in her ports, (other than South-America) on the same footing with her own; subject to no other restrictions or duties. It is true that Mr. Jay reported to congress these terms, as the result of his negociation with Mr. Gardoqui, and that he recommended to congress to accede to them. It is also true, that "seven of the eastern states" voted in favor of the report. The weak and unsettled state of our government, however, at that time prevented the completion of a treaty, and the business there terminated.

Now when Mr. Randolph adverted to this transaction, it would have been well for him not to have relied too implicitly upon the authority of Mr. Munroe's speech, but to have examined for himself the facts that have been here briefly mentioned before he undertook to vaunt of the conduct of the southern states in relation to the Mississippi, and to criminate the proceedings of what then constituted a majority of the union.

A slight view of existing circumstances at the time of this negociation, it is presumed will abundantly repel the unjust inferences of Mr. Munroe and of Mr. Randolph, that the eastern states in voting for the proposed arrangement with Spain, were governed by an unfriendly spirit to the western settlers, or even a desire to depress southern influence.

From what has been said, it appears that the exclusive navigation of the Mississippi was a matter of ardent desire with the Spanish king; that the war had no sooner closed than he sought the means of urging his claim to it; that when his minister broached the subject to our government, it had neither energy to insist upon its rights, nor power to protect them. If we had refused all overtures of accommodation, might it not have been justly apprehended, that Spain would usurp and maintain by force what she could not avail herself of by gentler means; and that therefore the only measure which presented itself was to temporise or to bargain?

An important and leading inducement with our statesmen who were in favor of the proposed measure, is here to be mentioned. Spain claimed the exclusive right to the river, and denied that we had any pretensions: we on our part advanced a rival claim, to participate at least, in the privilege of its navigation. How were these jarring rights to be settled? It was then supposed by Mr. Jay and those who acted with him, that if the affair could be made to assume a shape that would imply that Spain accepted the river as our lessee for a certain time, it would follow that she virtually recognized the reversionary right to be in us, and thus there would quietly be an end to all future disputes as to the question of ownership. This, it is affirmed on good authority, was a leading idea on our part, and a primary motive for listening to the proposal.

Again; it will not be pretended that the most sanguine imagination of that day, formed any conception of the rapid growth that has taken place in the numbers and wealth of our Western Territory. It was not then supposed that the Mississippi would, in any considerable degree, be wanted in a shorter period than 25 years, as an outlet for the produce of our country bordering on it. Little was it then expected, that the wilderness would so soon be converted into the cheerful abodes of man; that villages would already adorn those wild and dreary plains; that the *noise of the axe and the hammer* would thus early supplant the silence of the forest, where solitude held her reign in

"*Antres vast and desarts idle.*"

These were calculations which, to have then made, would have been deemed romantic—On the contrary, it was the sober judgment of a great portion of the most enlightened men in our country, that the offers of Spain would be attended with very beneficial effects upon our trade; such as, in a national point of view, would produce more solid advantages than were likely to arise from the free navigation of a river, which it was believed would not be materially wanted during the time we were to relinquish its use.

Our situation too at that time should not be forgotten. We were in no circumstances to contend with Spain if she had chosen to resort to force for the accomplishment of her purposes; our revolution was just ended, our government a mere sound, our country exhausted, our commerce in its infancy, struggling with all the embarrassments of scanty resources at home, and perplexed with all those difficulties abroad which grow out of national imbecility, want of capital and of credit. At this crisis it was that Spain, then the third commercial power in the world, declared her willingness to open to us her most valuable ports and admit our vessels upon the same terms with her own, upon condition that we would make a temporary surrender to her for twenty-five years of the Mississippi. The offer was certainly not without its temptations; the evils that might result from a refusal were great; the advantages which would flow from it were obvious; their extent incalculable. It is obvious that this was a subject, on which much speculation would be indulged, and various opinions entertained as to the course proper to be taken.

Is it then to be wondered at that seven of the eastern states should be of opinion that the negociation offered advantages which should be accepted of? And is there either generosity or justice in imputing to them on this occasion a want of friendship and due consideration for our western brethren? We fear that such suspicions have been but too successfully and for too long a time instilled into the minds of the western people against the eastern. We speak with much confidence then, when we say that there was nothing in the above transaction warranting the illiberal representation made by Mr. Munroe and revived by Mr. Randolph, that the eastern states were on that occasion influenced by an unfriendly disposition towards the interests of our western citizens, or that any other local considerations gave a bias to their opinions.

It is hoped that the attempt here made to place this affair in its proper point of view, will meet with the attentive consideration of every reflecting man, whatever may be his particular system of politics: this is one of those subjects, in the consideration of which, party strife ought not to mingle; all should unite in measures of common defence in support of the common interests and honor of the country. And we venture to say, that whenever the time may come that shall render it necessary the inhabitants of the West will find their Eastern brethren, however they have been advised to suspect them as *federalists*, as ready at least as their Southern friends, to render them prompt and effectual aid in asserting and enforcing all their lawful rights and privileges.

Congress of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, January 24, 1803.

Mr. Mitchill presented a memorial from the chamber of commerce of New-York, against the repeal of discriminating duties.

Referred to the committee of the whole to whom that subject was referred.

The memorial, on the motion of Mr. Bayard, was ordered to be printed.

Mr. Mitchill rose to address the house on a subject of a commercial nature. He alluded to the depredations committed upon the commerce of the United States, by French armed vessels during the late war in Europe. The gentlemen of the house would, he hoped, turn their attention for a few minutes to the numerous memorials received from our merchants during the last session, praying compensation for these losses. Those papers were numerous and respectful, and came from a most valuable portion of our fellow-citizens. Their grievances had not hitherto been redressed, nor even enquired into with the minuteness which it appeared to him to deserve. It was true a committee, numerous and intelligent, had been appointed during the last session, to examine the matter of these applications. A report had been made to the house. This report was full of information concerning the political and commercial connection between the United States and France. It comprised a concise and correct history of what had been done on both sides since the mutual misunderstandings arose. It was a valuable document, as far as it went. But it did not conclude with any recommendation of a mode of relief, or even of investigation. It stopped short with the historical narrative without proposing even a mode of further enquiry. During the present session, nothing further had been done or attempted. Early after the congress assembled, he had himself given notice of an intention to revive the subject. It was confessedly, of magnitude enough to merit investigation. This notice, he remembered, was given previous to the receipt of the message from the executive. But the multitude of public business that had grown out of that communication, added to other subjects, had so completely occupied his mind, that he had hitherto suffered it to pass on without bestowing on it the consideration which he owned that it deserved. He was now ready to make amends for this inadvertant or necessary, certainly not intentional delay. He had heard with satisfaction the call of a gentleman from South-Carolina (Mr. Lowndes) for his (Mr. Mitchill's) promised motion. He acknowledged the hint of that gentleman to be seasonable, and felt himself obliged to him for acting the part of a good prompter. To shew that gentleman that he had profited by the suggestion made on Friday last, he had now risen with an intention to lay a resolve upon the table. The object of the resolve was to cause an enquiry to be entered upon, by a special committee of the house, what amount of property, or its value in current money, had been taken from the Americans during the late war by the cruizers of France. The committee could devise some mode of ascertaining the magnitude of the sufferings complained of. This he considered as the first step that ought to be taken, towards the procuring of redress for the petitioners. And until this was taken, he believed nothing was likely to be done. Another object of the resolve he was about to offer, was to instruct the same committee to enquire into the different classes of captures and claims. He did not suppose that all the petitioners were entitled to compensation. Some of them he knew were not. But it was equally clear that some of them were. This complicated mass of applications could be examined by a committee, who could draw some distinctions that would be useful. They could tell, for instance, that one sort were lawful captures for and on account of contraband, others for want of a role d'equipage, others were taken wrongfully without any cause whatever, and the like. Some judgment might be formed in this way of the probable amount that might be contemplated as bona fide claims. He suspected this amount would be found to be but an inconsiderable part of the gross amount of captures. But whether it was large or small, he hoped an examination would be attempted; and for that purpose he moved the following resolve:

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to enquire, by what means, the value or amount of property taken from citizens of the United States by the French during the late war in Europe can be best ascertained, and the several sorts of captures distinguished and classed, and report their opinion thereon to this house, to the end that indemnification may be made.

Mr. Mitchill then said, that he did not press an instant decision upon it; but wished it to lie a day or two on the table for consideration.

Mr. Randolph, from the committee of ways and means, reported it as their opinion that no alterations are necessary in the act supplementary to the act laying a direct tax.

The report is accompanied by a letter from the chairman of the committee of ways and means to the secretary of the treasury, and his answer.

Referred to a committee of the whole house on Monday next.

The committee to whom was referred a bill from the senate, and sundry resolutions respecting the erection of monuments, reported that it would not be expedient at this time to make provision for the erection of any other monuments besides those contemplated by resolutions of the old congress; and accordingly reported amendments, making provision for the erection of monuments to generals Warren, Mercer, Nash, and De Kalbe, in addition to those directed to be erected in the bill received from the senate.

Referred to a committee of the whole house on Thursday.

Mr. S. Smith from the committee on so much of the president's message as relates to American seamen left abroad, reported a bill which was read twice and referred to a committee of the whole house on Thursday next.

The house took up the report of the committee of the whole on the report of the select committee on the alterations necessary to be made in the military establishment.

The house occurred in the two first resolution, and non-concurred in the third.

[For the resolutions see Wednesday's Gazette.]

On agreeing to the report of the committee in their disagreement to the 4th resolution, respecting the allowance of clerk hire,

Mr. Leib expressed himself against concurring.

Mr. Varnum was also against concurring, as it was absolutely necessary that each officer, stated in the resolution, should have one clerk. The payment for clerk hire had heretofore been paid out of the contingent fund. But it was thought best to make a provision by law. Mr. Varnum observed that if the house should non-concur, he would then move to add to the resolution the following words—"not exceeding a sum sufficient for the hire of one clerk for each officer."

The question was then taken on concurrence and lost—Ayes 23.

Mr. Varnum then moved his amendment.

Mr. Griswold opposed the amendment, and was for limiting the appropriation to some specific sum, as had hitherto been usual with regard to other executive officers.

Mr. Varnum's amendment was lost.

Mr. Leib moved to amend the resolution, so that a sum not exceeding in the whole 2,000 dollars, should be allowed for clerk hire.

Carried—Ayes 41—Noes 28.

The resolutions were then referred to a select committee to bring in a bill.

Mr. Davis said he held a resolution in his hand, which embraced a measure of considerable importance, and which he had long contemplated. He had suggested it last session; but owing to the press of other business, he had not then urged it. He then offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to enquire into the expediency of concentring the several public offices, and other public buildings, belonging to the United States in the city of Washington—and concluded by giving notice that in case the resolution should be agreed to, he should move the appointment of a committee by ballot, instead of the ordinary way (by the speaker.)

Mr. S. Smith, according to notice, called for the order of the day on the report on *discriminating duties*.

Mr. Eustis hoped the gentleman would suspend the call for it at least this and the ensuing week. He observed that the commercial towns were now attending to the subject. It appeared to him highly important that the opinions of the merchants of the United States should be known: When known, the house would be enabled to act if not with better understanding, at least with greater satisfaction. For himself he was not only not prepared to vote, but even to give an opinion. He