Congreſs of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 27.

(Debate concluded.)

Mr. T. Morris ſaid if he underſtood the gentleman from Maſſachuſetts (Mr. Bacon) right, who had ſpoken on this ſubject during the laſt winter, he had ſaid that not only every judge, but every juſtice of the peace had a right to decide on the conſtitutionality of a law. If that opinion was correct, and he ſtill entertained the ſame opinion, he knew no reaſon why he ſhould now object to the inſtitution of an impartial tribunal. The judges thought one way, and congreſs the other. The repealing law may be conſtitutional or not. Why then refuſe to refer the deciſion to an impartial tribunal. Believing this the moſt correct mode, he thought the application proper. But the gentleman from Virginia ſays if you allow a tribunal to the judges, why not alſo allow one to ſettle the claims of our revolutionary ſoldiers. To this Mr. M. ſaid he had no objection; though he did not think that in thoſe caſes they were ſo fully called upon as in this caſe. The former were principally appeals to the liberality of the houſe. Whereas this involved a great conſtitutional queſtion. He underſtood, indeed, that ſuch a proviſion exiſted in the ſtate which that gentleman (Mr. Randolph) repreſented, by which any individual, conſidering himſelf aggrieved, could apply to a court of juſtice, in conſequence of the deciſion of which, money could be drawn from the treaſury.

Mr. John C. Smith ſaid he did not propoſe to diſcuſs, much leſs decide the queſtion whether the petitioners were entitled to their ſalaries, becauſe he perceived a ſtrong diſpoſition in the houſe not to conſider the petition on its merits, and becauſe this was a queſtion which the judges themſelves did not deſire ſhould be ſettled by congreſs; but referred to the determination of a diſintereſted and impartial tribunal. The honorable gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Randolph) had obſerved that this courſe would be unexampled, and that the government might with equal propriety erect a forum to decide the numerous applications to this houſe for invalid penſions. Mr. S ſaid the very alluſion made by the honorable gentleman had brought to his recollection a precedent which he thought not inapplicable to the preſent caſe.

He ſaid it would be remembered, that at a certain period, the judges of the ſupreme court were directed by an act of congreſs to receive on their circuits the evidence of *claims to invalid penſions*, and report their evidence to the ſecretary of war for his ultimate determination—Some one or more of the judges conſidered the act unconſtitutional, as requiring them to perform a ſervice not within the ſphere of their official duties, and refuſed to execute it—the others diſcharged the duty enjoined, but under the title of *commiſſioners*—A queſtion aroſe whether the proceedings of theſe commiſſioners were valid ſo as to entitle the claimants to the proviſion contemplated by the act—How was this queſtion diſpoſed of? Inſtead of putting an end at once to all doubts on the ſubject by a legiſlative deciſion, congreſs directed *the ſecretary at war, in conjunction with the attorney-general, to take ſuch meaſures as might be neceſſary to obtain an adjudication of the ſupreme court of the United States on the validity of any ſuch rights as were claimed under that act.* Here, ſaid Mr. S. is a precedent for the meaſure now propoſed, produced by an occaſion of infinitely leſs importance, in his opinion, than the preſent. He conſidered the judges as ſtanding on at leaſt as high ground as ordinary claimants—They had been elevated to office not by their own acts but by the government itſelf—their ſalaries had been ſecured to them not for their perſonal benefit, but for the public good.

Mr. S. ſaid he had riſen merely to make theſe remarks—but being up, he muſt be permitted to ſay, that during the time he had had the honor of a ſeat in that houſe he had never known any buſineſs precipitated in that manner. When the report of a ſelect committee upon a petition of the moſt trifling nature was referred to a committee of the whole—on motion of any gentlemen, a diſtant day would be aſſigned; and order would be made for printing it, and in ſhort the moſt ſolemn deliberation would mark every ſtep of its progreſs. What had been now done? One hour had ſcarcely paſſed away ſince theſe petitions were uſhered into the houſe; and we are now diſcuſſing them in committee of the whole. They were not permitted to be printed, and members of the houſe were uninformed of their contents except from the curſory reading at the clerk's table.

Mr. S. ſaid he hoped gentlemen would be able to juſtify that procedure to themſelves—but he did believe in a moment of calm reflection they would find it a fruitful ſource of pungent regret.

Mr. Smilie would aſk whether the ſupreme court in ſuch a caſe as this could be denominated an impartial tribunal? He aſked, if they had not ſeen the time when during the diſputes between the clergy and the laiety, no wiſe man, not of the clerical order, would have truſted himſelf in the hands of the clergy. The ſame remark applied to the military; and alſo with equal force, to the judges of the ſupreme court. He really, however, thought that the judges would not receive the ſalaries, even if they were offered to them, as it would be contrary to every idea of patriotiſm. He therefore, conſidered the application as mere matter of form.

Mr. Nicholſon ſaid if this queſtion had never before been argued, there might be ſome degree of propriety in the remarks of gentlemen, and the houſe perhaps might be chargeable with precipitation. But he begged it might be remembered that the very queſtion embraced by the reſolution now on the table, had at the laſt ſeſſion undergone the moſt ample diſcuſſion that ever took place in congreſs. It had not only been argued here for a conſiderable length of time, but he believed it had attracted the attention of every reflecting man in the nation—A ſtrange diſtinction however is attempted to be ſet up. At one moment gentlemen declare it is not the ſame queſtion, and immediately after concede by their arguments that it is the ſame. They ſay that men of high legal character in the United States have granted that congreſs have a right to take from the judges all power of acting as ſuch, but deny the right to deſtroy the office. They may diveſt him of power, but the office muſt remain, and he is ſtill a judge. To him this was a perfect abſurdity. He could not poſſibly conceive the idea of a judge, who had nothing to do; who had no duties to perform, no power to decide. Theſe high legal characters ſuppoſe that he might remain a judge for the purpoſes of receiving his ſalary, but not for the purpoſe of performing any duty. This was not his idea, and both the gentlemen from Connecticut (Meſſrs. Griſwold and Dana) appeared to agree with him in opinion. In fact it was the great ground of diſpute laſt ſeſſion, whether you could repeal a law under which a judge was appointed, and thereby deprive him of his office, by taking from him all the powers and duties of a judge. Whatever the opinions of high legal characters might be on this queſtion, congreſs had laſt year after full and ample diſcuſſion, ſolemnly decided, that they had a right by repealing the law, to diveſt the judges of their judicial powers, and thereby deſtroy their offices.

Another gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. J. C. Smith) had alluded to a law paſſed ſome years ago, which aſſigned certain duties to the judges of the ſupreme court, in relation to the claims of perſons who alledged that they ought to be placed on the penſion liſt. It would, no doubt, be recollected that the judges refuſed to carry this law into execution; and he might be permitted to aſk what ſecurity there was that they would not now refuſe to carry into effect any law which we might paſs embracing the object of the reſolution? Was it to be imagined that they would refuſe to decide on the claims of thoſe who fought our revolutionary battles, and yet kindly attend to the claims of their brethren? The reſolution contemplated, giving the power to try the right of the judges to their claims, but the great object in reality was to authorize the judges of the ſupreme court to decide upon the conſtitutionality of the repealing act. Let this object then be avowed; let it be ſo declared openly and not introduced in this incidental manner. From the remarks made laſt year by gentlemen on the other ſide of the houſe, it was a little ſurprizing that this application ſhould be made, for it was then ſtrenuouſly contended, that the ſupreme court had the right to decide upon the conſtitutionality of all laws. Why then aſk for it? If they have this right we need not confer it; if they have it not, we cannot give it them. If the petitioning judges can bring their caſe before the ſupreme court, let them do ſo. My conſent ſhall never authorize it. If the ſupreme court ſhall arrogate this power to themſelves, and declare our law to be unconſtitutional, it will then behove us to act. Our duty is defined.

In his opinion, Mr. N. ſaid the beſt method of trying the right of congreſs to repeal the judiciary act, had been for ſome time, and was yet in operation. The people conſtituted the great tribunal before whom the conſtitutionality of all laws of congreſs ſhould be brought, and by them this queſtion will be decided. Some of them have decided, and the remainder will decide by their elections. It is an impartial tribunal to whom we may all appeal, and their judgment will bind us. To their deciſion it is already referred, and with them he was willing to leave it rather than to any court of juſtice.

Mr. Euſtis ſaid when the office of the judge was aboliſhed, all his duties ceaſed. The ſalary allowed was a compenſation for ſervices. Now when there were no ſervices to be performed, what ſalary could there be allowed, or what retribution demanded? On what did this claim reſt? On the opinion of the judges. But by the deciſion of the laſt winter their offices were aboliſhed; it followed, therefore, of conſequence that their ſalaries ceaſed too. This was a plain and ſimple queſtion. He conſidered the memorial as the proteſt of the judges againſt this deciſion. As ſuch, he was willing that it ſhould reſt on the files of the houſe; and inſtead of being offended at this treatment the judges ought to be thankful. When he obſerved yeſterday a memorial preſented by an individual for a greater amount than the claim of all the judges, and obſerved how lightly it was treated, and particularly by the chairman of the committee of claims (Mr. John C. Smith) who moved the reference, he was ſurpriſed that he, above all men, ſhould complain of the treatment of this memorial, which had been reſpectfully referred to a committee of the whole. Mr. Euſtis concluded by obſerving that he forebore going into the merits of the memorial.

Mr. Dana ſaid the ideas of the gentleman from Maſſachuſetts were in one reſpect correct. The memorial of the judges was a proteſt againſt the law paſſed by congreſs. It was proper they ſhould make it, ſo far as they confined themſelves to language not indecorous or diſreſpectful. He would admit likewiſe that the queſtion of powers decided the queſtion of ſalary. Others, however, entertained a different opinion. Why object then, in a caſe where there was a difference of opinion to refer the deciſion to an impartial tribunal. The only queſtion is, whether in a conteſt for power, you, the legiſlature will claim the excluſive exerciſe of power, and whether, even if you ſhall exceed the conſtitutional limits, you will aſſert the entire right of ſaying ſo, or whether you will refer it to a tribunal which ſhall be an umpire between thoſe who hold different opinions.

Mr. Nicholſon moved to amend the reſolution. He obſerved that the judges of the circuit court were the judges of the ſupreme court and thoſe of the diſtrict court united. He therefore moved to inſert before the word "*judges*," the word "*former*."

Mr. Griſwold, wiſhing to have the queſtion directly taken, moved to add after "judges of the circuit court"—thoſe words, "appointed under an act, entitled, "An act to provide for the more convenient organization of the courts of the United States, paſſed on the 13th of Febrnary, 1801."

Mr. Nicholſon agreed to the inſertion of thoſe words with the addition of the following: which he moved, "which ſaid act was repealed at the laſt ſeſſion of congreſs."

This amendment was carried; ayes 56.

Mr. Alſton ſaid the reſolution required another amendment. As it now ſtood, it would appear that all the late judges of the circuit court claimed a compenſation for ſervices not rendered. He believed this was not the caſe. There were ſome of thoſe judges who had made no ſuch requeſt. He, therefore, moved to inſert the names of thoſe who had preſented memorials; alſo to inſert the word "late" before the word "judges."

Carried without a diviſion.

The reſolution as amended ſtood thus: Reſolved, that proviſion ought to be made by law, for ſubmitting to judicial deciſion the right of William Tilghman, Oliver Wolcott, Jeremiah Smith, Richard Baſſet, Philip B. Key, George K. Taylor, Charles Magill, Samuel Hitchcock, Benj. Bourne, Egbert Benſon, and William Griffiths, late judges of the circuit court appointed under an act entitled "an act to provide for the more convenient organization of the courts of the United States, paſſed on the 13th February, 1801," which ſaid act was repealed at the laſt ſeſſion of congreſs, to their compenſations.

On which the queſtion being put, it was loſt—Ayes 35—Noes 57.

Mr. Varnum obſerved that the memorial contained two principles both of which had been negatived. To draw the attention to a final deciſion he would move another reſolution, to wit: "That the prayer of the petition of William Tilghman, and others (naming them) *late judges of the circuit courts of the United States;* ought not to be granted, and that the petitioners have leave to withdraw their petitions.

Mr. T. Morris moved that the committee ſhould riſe and report progreſs, that the petition might be printed. Negatived without a diviſion.

The reſolution was then carried without a diviſion, when the committee roſe and reported it.

The houſe immediately took it into conſideration; when Mr. Randolph moved to ſtrike out the words "late judges of the circuit courts of the United States."

Mr. Griſwold ſaid he preſumed it was not the object to expunge all evidence of theſe gentlemen being judges, or late judges of the circuit courts of the United States; and yet that would appear to be the effect of the motion. He muſt, therefore, call for the yeas and nays, which would make that fact be recorded on the journals.

Mr. Randolph ſaid he had made the motion, that the reſolution might conform to the prayer of the petition. Had the memorialiſts called themſelves late judges, he ſhould have had no objection to their being ſo deſignated in the reſolution. His wiſh was to ſtyle them in the reſolution as they had ſtyled themſelves.

Mr. Griſwold ſaid though they had not expreſsly ſtyled themſelves circuit judges, yet they had ſtated that they had been appointed circuit judges under a law of the United States. They had therefore virtually ſo ſtyled themſelves.

A few words were added by Mr. Euſtis againſt, and by Meſſrs. Randolph and Nicholſon in favor of ſtriking out the words, when the queſtion was taken by yeas and nays and carried—Yeas 50—Nays 47.

The queſtion was then taken by yeas and nays on the reſolution as reported, and amended by ſtriking out the words in *Italic*, and carried—Yeas 61—Nays 37—as follow:

YEAS—Meſſrs. Alſton, Archer, Bacon, Biſhip, Bowie, Brent, Brown, Butler, Cabell, Claiborne, Clay, Clopton, Condit, Cutts, Davis, Dawſon, Dickſon, Early, Elmendorf, Elmer, Euſtis, Gray, Gregg, Hanna, D. Heiſter, J. Heiſter, Helms, Hoge, Holland, Holmes, Jackſon, Leib, Meriwether, Mitchill, Moore, Mott, New, Newton, jun. Nicholſon, Randolph, jun. Smilie, Iſrael Smith, J. Smith, N. Y. J. Smith, Virg. Joſiah Smith, S. Smith, Southard, Stanford, Stanton, Stewart, Taliaferro, jun. Thomas, Thompſon, A. Trigg, J. Trigg, Van Cortland, Varnum, Van Horne, R. Williams, Winn, Wynns—61.

NAYS—Meſſrs. Boude, Campbell, Cutler, Dana, Davenport, Dennis, Foſter, Goddard, Griſwold, Grove, Haſtings, Hemphill, Henderſon, Hill, Huger, Hunt, Lowndes, Mattoon, L. R. Morris, T. Morris, Perkins, Plater, Read, Rutledge, Shepard, J. C. Smith, Stanley, Stratton, Tallmage, Tenney, Thatcher, Tillinghaſt, Upham, Van Renſſelaer, Wadſworth, L. Williams, Woods—37.

PORTLAND, January 14.

Arrived, ſchooner Lively, captain Wm. Warner, of Glouceſter, 60 days from Cadiz, having been in at Landſend, three days. Sailed from Cadiz, in company with brig Morning Star, of New-York, G. Hobſen maſter. January 7, 45 leagues E. S. E. of Cape Ann, ſpoke ſhip Governor Gilman, captain Boardman, of Portſmouth, bound to Cape of Good Hope, in lat. 41, 50, long. 55 degrees. January 7, ſpoke brig Columbia, captain Torry, of Marblehead, for Bilboa, 9 days out.

Arrived, brig Nabby, captain William M'Lellan, 22 days from Trinidad. Sailed in company with the brig Helen, captain Hooper, of Marblehead. Left there, ſloop Suſanna, captain Morgan, of Philadelphia, bound for a market; ſchooner John, captain Levitt, of Beverly, to ſail in eight days for Baltimore; ſchooner Powder-Point, captain Proctor, of Marblehead, to ſail in 15 days for New-York, brig Atlantic, captain Bartlett, of Boſton, ſchooner Paragon, captain Morgan, for Newlondon; ſchooner Experiment, capt. Bacon, of Boſton; ſloop Anne, capt. Hammon, of Philadelphia; ſchr. Bellona, Frye, of Salem; brig Ferdinand, captain Lane, of Kennebeck; brig ——, captain Gogland, of Pepperelborough; barque America, ——, of Norfolk; ſchooner Diana, captain Wood, of Newbedford.

Arrived, brig Ranger, captain John M'Intoſh, 20 days from Nevis.

Arrived, ſhip Vigilant, captain Nathaniel Archer, 43 days from Trinidad. Spoke the ſhip Experiment, 4 days out from New-York, bound to Jamaica, in lat. 38, 55, long. 70, 20.

Arrived, brig Edward, captain William Young, 18 days from St. Vincents. Left there, ſhip Hibernia, of Boſton, to ſail in 4 days for North-Carolina; brig Betſy, of Old York, for Portſmouth; ſhip Sally, of Kennebunk, to ſail 1ſt February; brig Bellona, captain Chaſe, to ſail in four days for Wilmington, N. C. ſchooner Betſy, captain Lymburner; ſloop Maria, captain Kent, to ſail in 4 days for North-Carolina; ſchooner Nancy, captain Comfield.

NEW-YORK, February 2.

James Munroe, eſquire, we are informed, has engaged his paſſage to Havre-de-Grace in the ſhip Warren, which is intended to ſail from this port on Sunday next.

The ſtore and counting-room of Meſſrs. Woolſey and Rogers, merchants, in this city, were broken open on Monday night, and a red morocco pocket-book taken thereout, which contained a bill of exchange for 2300l. ſterling, one for 100l. one for 173l. 17s. one for 326l. 3s. one for 67l. one for 22l. one for 9l. 14s. two bank notes for 5 dollars each, and a note of hand for 50 dollars. There were alſo ſtolen, about ten dollars in ſilver, a ticket in the South-Hadley Canal lottery, and a ſteel mounted piſtol. Payment of the bills has been ſtopped, and a reward of 40 dollars offered for apprehending the perſon or perſons who committed the burglary.

Arrived laſt night, the brig Enterprize, Terry, in 34 days from Surrinam. Left, ſhip Rambler, Dawſon, of Boſton; ſhip Leonard, Williams, of do to ſail in 12 days; ſchooner Courier, Cook, for do. in 15 days; brig Apollo, Beale, for ditto; ſchooner Betſy, Tucker, in 10 days for Salem; ſhip Waſhington, Lewis, in 10 days for Portland; ſchooner Amelia, in 10 days for New-London; ſchooner Ann Eliza, Brown, of Providence; brig Felicity, Walker, of Portſmouth, from the Iſle of May, ſailed for Demerara 7 days before the Enterprize. Spoke January 14, in lat. 29, long. 72, 30, brig Ruby, Anderſon, 6 days from St. Thomas, for Philadelphia. The ſloop Sally, Smith, ſailed 10 days before the Enterprize, for New-York. In the Gulph, the Enterprize was ſtruck with lightning, and one of the ſeamen ſo much injured, that he has not ſince been able to do his duty. American produce, except lumber, bore a tolerable good price at Surrinam.

Alſo, the brig Ann Maria, Hand, in 14 days from Savannah. Saw a number of veſſels on the coaſt, bound in.

Below laſt night, one ſchooner.

Among the veſſels which ſailed from this port yeſterday, was the Engliſh ſhip Medway, Potts, for Madeira. Mr. Thomas Hamerſley, of this city, went out paſſenger in her for the benefit of his health. The Medway, three brigs, two ſchooners, and a ſloop, came to anchor yeſterday afternoon within the Hook, on account of a head wind.

Cleared, ſhips Hare, Worth, Liſbon; Columbus, Burger, Cape Francois; ſch'r Reſolution, Sturges, Jamaica; ſloop Guaverberry, Outerbridge, St. Thomas.

LEGISLATURE OF NEW-YORK.

Wedneſday, January 26, 1803.

The following letter from Gouverneur Morris, one of the ſenators from this ſtate, in the congreſs of the United States, addreſſed to his honor the ſpeaker, was read, as follows:

Waſhington, December 25, 1802.

SIR,

On the 24th of February laſt, I communicated to the ſenate of the United States, the reſolutions which you did me the honor to tranſmit. On the 3d of May, a reſolution was brought up from the houſe of repreſentatives, embracing the latter part of that which the ſtate of New-York had propoſed, viz That in all future elections of preſident and vice-preſident, the perſons voted for ſhould be particularly deſignated, by declaring which is voted for as preſident and which as vice-preſident. On the queſtion my vote was in the negative, and had it been otherwiſe the reſolution would have been paſſed.

Having thus ſtated the facts, it may not be improper to trouble you with ſome of the reaſons which governed my deciſion.

Firſt—I am oppoſed to amendments on the general ground, that changing the articles of a conſtitutional compact leſſens that reſpect for it which is a main ſupport of free governments.

Secondly—I am oppoſed becauſe it is, generally ſpeaking, better to bear an evil which we know, than hazard thoſe which we are unacquainted with.

Thirdly—I am oppoſed becauſe the preſent mode ſeems preferable to that which is propoſed.

When this article was under conſideration in the national convention, it was obſerved that every mode of electing the chief magiſtrate of a powerful nation, hitherto adopted, is liable to objection. The inſtances where violence has been uſed and murders committed, are numerous. Thoſe in which artifice and fraud have ſucceeded againſt the general wiſh and will, are innumerable. And hence it was inferred, that the mode leaſt favorable to intrigue and corruption, that in which the unbiaſſed voice of the people will be moſt attended to, and that which is leaſt likely to terminate in violence and uſurpation ought to be adopted. To impreſs a conviction on this ſubject, the caſe of Poland was (not unaptly) cited. Great and ambitious princes took part in the election of a Poliſh king; money, threats and force were employed. Violence, bloodſhead and oppreſſion enſued. And now that country is parcelled out among the neighboring potentates—one of whom was but a petty prince two centuries ago.

The evils which have been felt in the preſent mode of election were pointed out to the convention, but after due adviſement the other mode appeared more exceptionable. Indeed if the preſent be changed, it might be better to aboliſh the office of vice-preſident and leave to legiſlative proviſion the caſe of vacancy in the ſeat of the firſt magiſtrate.

The convention was aware that every ſpecies of trick and contrivance would be practiſed by the ambitious and unprincipled. It was therefore conceived, that if in elections the preſident and vice-preſident were diſtinctly deſignated, there would generally be a vote given for one of two rival preſidents, while there would be numerous candidates for the other office; becauſe he who wiſhed to become preſident would naturally connect himſelf with ſome popular man of each particular diſtrict for the ſake of his local influence, ſo that the vice-preſidency would be as a mere bait to catch ſtate gudgeons. The perſon choſen would have only a partial vote, be perhaps unknown to the greater part of the community, & probably unfit for thoſe duties which the death of a preſident might call on him to perform.

The convention not only foreſaw that a ſcene might take place ſimilar to that of the laſt preſidential election, but even ſuppoſed it not impoſſible, that at ſome time or other a perſon admirably fitted for the office of preſident might have an equal vote with one totally unqualified, and that by the predominance of faction in the houſe of repreſentatives, the latter might be preferred. This, which is the greateſt ſuppoſable evil of the preſent mode, was calmly examined, and it appeared that however prejudicial it might be for the moment, an uſeful leſſon would reſult from it for the future, to teach contending parties the importance of giving both votes to men fit for the firſt office. This, ſir, is one great object contemplated by the conſtitution, whether it would be obtained by altering the mode of election deſerves a ſerious attention. The other great object is to defeat the fraud, the force and the corruption, which may be uſed to place bad men in high authority. After the moſt mature reflection of which my mind is capable, I am perſuaded that the preſent mode is preferable to that which is propoſed in lieu of it, and my voice has been given according to my conviction.

I have the honor to be,
With perfect reſpect, Sir,
Your moſt obedient ſervant,
GOUV. MORRIS.

The Hon. the Speaker of the Houſe of Aſſembly of the ſtate of New-York, Albany.

NEWARK, February 1.

On Saturday laſt, at the houſe of Mr. Joſeph Lyon, in Elizabeth-town, there were to be ſeen, two children; one two years and nine months old, weighing upwards of one hundred pounds; the other, nearly eight years old, weighing but twenty-two pounds. Both appeared to be in good health, and the ſmall one, whoſe height was about two feet two inches, was poſſeſſed of extraordinary agility.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 3.

Cleared, ſhip Active, M'Kown, Cork and Newry.

We are deſired to ſtate that the report of "The ſhip Patty, Snell, for Londonderry, having proceeded to ſea, after having put *back in diſtreſs*," as appeared in the True American of yeſterday, is entirely without foundation—and that the Patty is not bound for Londonderry but for Newry.

The reſolutions which we publiſhed on Wedneſday laſt, approbating the conduct of our repreſentatives in congreſs, and mildly cenſuring the weak and puſillanimous conduct of the miniſterial junto in congreſs, for their feeble efforts in aſſerting the rights of their weſtern brethren, as it relates to the free navigation of the Miſſiſippi and their right to a place of depoſit on the ſame, paſſed in the Senate on Friday laſt. [*Dover Ark.*]