Barclay and M'Kean
HAVE IMPORTED
FALL GOODS.
September 29. d48t

APPLES.
Just received, a few barrels of APPLES, consisting of Pippins, Swedes, Nonpareils, and Poplar Islands—for sale at No. 7, Bowly's wharf.
October 22. d

Jonathan Harvey,
No. 206, Baltimore-street,
Has received by the late arrivals from England, his
FALL GOODS.
October 1. d30t

Spanish Hides.
Salted and unsalted Laguira and Havanna HIDES, of first quality, for sale by
ABRAHAM SINGER,
No. 172, Market-street.
November 2. d6t

P. Hoffman and Son
Have received per the Almy, an additional supply of
WOOLLEN GOODS, &c.
November 3 d10t-eo5t

M. Sanderson
Is now opening at his store No. 32, Water-street,
A general assortment of
DRY GOODS,
Received by the late arrivals from London and Liverpool. October 3. d

A Tutor Wanted,
To take charge of a small Boarding School, now established in a genteel family and neighborhood in the country. Any person wishing such a situation will please to leave their address with the printers, which will be duly attended to.
September 8. d

New Theatre.
To-Morrow Evening, November 4,
Will be presented a Comedy, in 5 acts, called
A Cure for the Heart-Ache.
After which, a Grand Heroic Pantomimical Romance, called
The Knights of Calatrava;
Or, THE BRIDAL SPECTRE.
By T. Dibdin—Founded on the popular Tale of *Alonzo and Imogen.*
(The original music by John Morehead.)
With new scenery and decorations—the scenery painted by Messrs. Holland and Milbourne.
The pantomime under the direction of Mr. Francis.
Scene 1—A Grand Colonade—a company of knights and ladies discovered.
Knights—Messrs. Usher, Warren, Jefferson, Blissett, Wheatly, Milbourne, Gibbons, &c.
Ladies—Mrs. Oldmixon, Mrs. Shaw, Mrs. Warren, Mrs. Francis, Mrs. Downie, Mrs. Durang, Miss Westray, Miss Solomon, Miss Hunt, &c.
Song—"*The Soldier tir'd of war's alarms,*" by Mrs. Oldmixon.
A Dance—*The Pas De Trois,* by Masters Harris, Durang and Miss Hunt.
A Messenger enters with the following scroll:
"The sovereign invites all true knights to embark for Palestine, and join the sacred order of the cross"
Messenger, Mr. Wheatly
The knights associate in a determination to display their zeal for religion, take leave of their respective ladies, and go to prepare for embarkation.
Alonzo is particular in his adieus to Imogen—as he is retiring, observes the Baron St. Clare very attentive to Imogen—calls back the Baron, who is attempting to follow her, and asserts his claim, the Baron challenges Alonzo!
Alonzo, Mr. Cain
Baron St. Clare, Mr. Downie.
Imogen, Mrs. Snowden.
Scene 2—A Gothic Saloon—In the centre a picture of Alonzo, and a curtain above it—Imogen entering, addresses herself to the picture—Alonzo enters, entreats her to be constant to him; she draws the curtain above the painting, and discloses the following stanza:
"If ever by deceit or by wealth led aside,
"I forget my Alonzo the brave,
"God grant that to punish my falsehood & pride,
"Thy ghost at my wedding may sit by my side,
"May tax me with perjury, claim me as bride,
"And bear me away to the grave."
Alonzo, satisfied, receives her picture and glove, places the latter on his helmet, and takes his leave.
Scene 3—A Grove—the Baron and his party seize Alonzo, his helmet and robe taken from him, an *iron* mask fixed on his face, and deprived of the picture of Imogen—he is forced away.
Lorenzo, the Baron's Squire, enters with Leonora, they plan to deceive Imogen.
Lorenzo, Mr. Francis.
Leonora, Miss Solomon.
Scene 4—Sea Shore—Procession of knights, who are about to embark on board the galleys.
Order of the procession,
Two monks, bishop with silver cross.
Banner of the order of Malta.
Knights of Malta—their esquires.
Banner of the order of St. Jago.
Knights of Jago—their esquires.
Banner of the order of Calatrava.
Knights of Calatrava—their esquires.
Scene 5—Grove—Imogen, deceived by the artifices of the Baron and his party, consents *to be his bride.*
Scene 6—A Gloomy Forest—Ambrosio, Alonzo's esquire, discovers the treachery practised on his master, fight between him and Lorenzo—Lorenzo falls; Ambrosio deceives the Baron, and finds where his master is concealed.
Ambrosio, Mr. Durang.
Scene 7—Subterraneous Cavern, where Alonzo is confined, he is released from captivity by Ambrosio.
Scene 8—Alonzo escaping from his confinement, attended by Abrosio, resolves to repair to Imogen, &c.
Scene the last—A GRAND BANQUET to celebrate the *Nuptials* of *Imogen* and the *Baron*—their mirth interrupted by the appearance of a Knight in sable armour, who places himself by the side of Imogen—A Friar enters, and prepares to join the hands of St. Clair and Imogen—the Bell Tolls Thrice!—The sable Knight points to the Curtain, which rises and discovers the picture of Alonzo, *Pale and Bloody*—the inscription above it changed to the following one, in LETTERS OF BLOOD!
"Heav'n grants that, to punish thy falsehood
"and pride,
"My ghost, at thy wedding, shall sit by thy side,
"Shall tax thee with perjury, claim thee as bride,
"And bare the away to the grave."
Alonzo discovers himself—fight between him and the Baron—vanquishes St. Clair—explanation between Alonzo and Imogen—the piece concludes with
A GRAND
SPANISH FANDANGO.
November 3.

Wanted
To purchase or hire, a Boy or Man, as a waiter in a small family. None but a good character need apply. Enquire of the printers.
October 28. 2aw

Congress of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, October 31.

A message was received from the senate, stating that they had receded from their disagreement to the amendments of the house to the act "to enable the president of the United States to take possession of the territories ceded by France to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris, on the 30th of April last; and for the temporary government thereof."

Mr. Eppes, from the joint committee of enrolment, reported that the committee had examined the above bill, and had found the same to be duly enrolled; whereupon, Mr. Speaker signed the same.

Mr. Mitchell from the committee of commerce and manufactures, reported a bill against the petition of Stephen Kingston.

The report was taken up.

Mr. J. Clay opposed it on the ground of facts not stated in the report.

Mr. Griswold moved to recommit it for the purpose of ascertaining the facts.

Mr. Dana and Mr. Clay supported, and Mr. Mitchell opposed the recommitment.

Recommitment carried.

Mr. Randolph moved a resolution for affording relief to the owners of the Danish brigantine Henrique.

Referred, together with the report of the secretary of state on the same case, to the committee of claims.

On motion of Mr. Early, the resolution laid on the table by Mr. Rodney, for the extinguishment of state balances, was postponed till the 1st Monday of December, to allow time for the representation of New-Jersey in the house.

Thursday, November 1.

The house took up the report of a select committee on the standing rules of the house, recommending the adoption of the last congress, and concurred therein.

Mr. Jackson moved a resolution for making provision by law for the application of one-twentieth part of the net proceeds of land within the state of Ohio, sold or to be sold by congress, to the laying out and making public roads, in conformity to an act of the last session.

Referred to a committee of the whole to-morrow.

The house went into a committee of the whole—Mr. J. C. Smith in the chair—on the bill making an appropriation for carrying into effect the 7th article of the British treaty.

The bill appropriates 50,000 dollars for the payment of awards against the United States.

The committee reported the bill without amendment.

The house postponed the further consideration of the bill till to-morrow.

Mr. Nicholson offered a resolution for the appointment of a committee to enquire whether any additional provisions are necessary in the act prescribing the mode in which the public acts, records and judicial proceedings of one state shall be authenticated, so as to take effect in every other state.

Agreed to, and a committee appointed.

Mr. Dawson said he had last session submitted two resolutions respecting post-roads, which had not been acted upon.—He therefore renewed them, in substance as follows:

1. *Resolved,* That provision ought to be made by law for the establishment of post-roads throughout the United States.

2. *Resolved,* That whatever money received from the post-office shall remain, after defraying the expences of the same, be appropriated to the fixing and improvement of the post-roads.

Referred to a committee of the whole and made the order for Monday.

The committee of claims made a report against the petition of Amy Darden.

Referred to a committee of the whole on Friday.

Monday, October 24, 1803.

Call for Papers.

[*Continued from Wednesday's Gazette.*]

Mr. Lyon said he might have agreed to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, had he brought it forward in a respectful manner. But the terms of the motion imply that the executive has made a bargain for that to which we have no right. He wished the gentleman would give a little of that confidence which he had been in the habit of giving so liberally on former occasions. For his part, he was willing to see all the papers. He had no doubt of obtaining possession of Louisiana; and that gentleman might have seen the order of the Spanish government to surrender the province to the French. Mr. Lyon concluded by saying, he had only risen to express his sense of the indecency of the motion.

Mr. Goddard did not intend to enter upon a long discussion of the resolution; but it seemed to him that the reasons of the gentleman from Virginia for opposing it were very erroneous. On what ground was the opposition made? Altogether on the ground that Spain had actually made the cession to France. Mr. G. apprehended no such impression had been made on the house by the information before them. In the first article of the treaty they learned what the title of France was. The treaty says,

"Whereas by the article the 3d of the treaty concluded at St. Ildefonso, the 9th Vendemiaire, an 9, (1st October, 1800) between the first consul of the French republic and his Catholic majesty, it was agreed as follows:

"His Catholic majesty promises and engages on his part, to cede to the French republic six months after the full and entire execution of the conditions and stipulations herein relative to his royal highness the duke of Parma, the colony or province of Louisiana, with the same extent that it now has in the hands of Spain, and that it had when France possessed it; and such as it should be after the treaties consequently entered into between Spain and other states.

"And whereas in pursuance of the treaty, and particularly of the third article, the French republic has an incontestible title to the domain and to the possession of the said territory. The first consul of the French republic desiring to give to the United States a strong proof of his friendship, doth hereby cede to the United States, in the name of the French republic, forever and in full sovereignty, the said territory with all its rights and appurtenances, as fully and in the same manner as they have been acquired by the French republic in virtue of the above-mentioned treaty, concluded with his Catholic majesty."

Mr. Goddard asked whether the conclusion followed that France had an incontestible title to Louisiana. There was no such evidence. If in virtue of this treaty we purchase a promise on the part of his Catholic majesty to cede, and not an incontestible title, he would ask if the promise constituted a title. France only says, we cede all our title. This, and this only, is the language of the instrument. If this is the case, is it not proper to enquire whether there are other acts by which Spain has ceded Louisiana to France? Such acts may exist. Certain stipulations were made by France to Spain, on which the cession depended. Do we not then wish to know whether these stipulations have been fulfilled and whether they are binding, or whether Spain has waved them. Are there in existence any documents to this effect? It has been hinted that such documents exist in the newspapers; but are we in an affair of this magnitude to be referred to the dictum of a newspaper? He apprehended that this was a novel mode of legislation.

The gentleman from Virginia says that the 4th article of the treaty stipulates for the delivery of the country. That article is to this effect:

"There shall be sent by the government of France a commissary to Louisiana, to the end that he do every act necessary, as well to receive from the officers of his Catholic majesty the said country and its dependencies, in the name of the French republc, if it has not been already done, as to transmit it in the name of the French republic to the commissary or agent of the United States."

Now what is the commissary to do? He is, in the first instance, to receive the province from Spain. Can he transmit it to the United States before he receives it from Spain? We require to know, if Spain refuses to deliver Louisiana to France, can France transmit it to us? We desire to know whether there is any prospect of a refusal on the part of Spain.

Suppose we shall receive the colony from France under the dictation of the first consul to Spain, without experiencing any opposition from her.—May not the time arrive, on a revolution in the affairs of Europe, when she will enquire by what title we hold it. Is it not proper then for us to obtain papers, by which our title may be fully understood,

One singular argument is used by the gentleman from Virginia. This treaty, he says, is hailed by the acclamations of the country. But Mr. G. would ask if the public had any opportunity of examining it, and being fully acqainted with its principles and probable operation. It had been made public only within a few days. What evidence of popular affection for it can there yet have been manifested? Will the people hail it with acclamation when they shall learn that it gives fifteen millions of dollars for a mere promise. At any rate, as all agree in the importance of the subject, and as we are called upon to legislate upon it, is it not proper first to obtain all the necessary information that is to be had? The resolution goes this far and no farther, and if gentlemen claim our confidence, ought they not to furnish us with information?

Mr. Smilie remembered, that a subject of this nature had been brought before the house, in the first session of the fourth congress. He thought it proper to recur to the proceedings on that occasion to learn the sentiments entertained at that day. At that day it had been argued by certain gentlemen that the right of passing or not passing the necessary laws for carrying a treaty into effect, did not belong to that house; but that they were under an absolute obligation to pass them; that they had no discretion on the subject: This was a doctrine which he did not believe true. He then believed that they possessed the right, and still entertained the same opinion. To shew the sentiments entertained in the case of the British treaty, he would recur to the journals of the house.

On the 24th of March, 1796, the following motion was made:

"Resolved, That the president of the United States be requested to lay before this house, a copy of the instructions to the minister of the United States, who negotiated the treaty with the king of Great-Britain, (communicated by his message of the first instant) together with the correspondence and other documents relative to the said treaty, excepting such of the said papers as any existing negociation may render improper to be disclosed."

This resolution was carried in the affirmative by ayes and noes, and among the noes I observe, said Mr. Smilie, the name of the mover of this resolution. The resolution was carried by a large majority, and sent to the president? What was his opinion? Not that I approve it, or am governed by it; though it ought, in my opinion, to be a rule on this occasion to those who coincided with him. On the 30th of March the president communicated the following message to the house:

"*Gentlemen of the house of representatives,*

"With the utmost attention I have considered your resolution of the twenty-fourth instant, requesting me to lay before your house, a copy of the instructions, to the minister of the United States, who negotiated the treaty with the king of Great-Britain, together with the correspondence and other documents relative to that treaty, excepting such of the said papers, as any existing negociation may render improper to be disclosed. In deliberating upon this subject, it was impossible for me to lose sight of the principle, which some have avowed in its discussion, or to avoid extending my views to the consequences which must flow from the admission of that principle.

"I trust that no part of my conduct has ever indicated a disposition to withhold any information which the constitution has enjoined upon the President as a duty to give, or which could be required of him by either House of Congress as a right; and with truth I affirm, that it has been, as it will continue to be while I have the honour to preside in the government, my constant endeavour to harmonize with the other branches thereof; so far as the trust delegated to me by the people of the United States, and my sense of the obligation it imposes, to preserve, protect and defend the constitution, will permit.

"The nature of foreign negociations requires caution, and their success must often depend on secrecy: and even when brought to a conclusion, a full disclosure of all the measures, demands, or eventual concessions which may have been proposed or contemplated, would be extremely impolitic: for this might have a pernicious influence on future negociations, or produce immediate inconveniences; perhaps danger and mischief, in relation to other powers. The necessity of such caution and secrecy was one cogent reason for vesting the power of making treaties in the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate; the principle on which that body was formed confining it to a small number of members. To admit then a right in the House of Representatives, to demand and to have as a matter of course, all the papers, respecting a negociation, with a foreign power, would be to establish a dangerous precedent.

"It does not occur, that the inspection of the papers asked for, can be revalant to any purpose under the cognizance of the house of representatives, except that of an impeachment; which the resolution has not expressed. I repeat that I have no disposition to withhold any information which the duty of my station will permit, or the public good shall require to be disclosed; and in fact all the papers affecting the negociation with Great-Britain were laid before the senate, when the treaty itself was communicated for their consideration and advice.

"The course which the debate has taken, on the resolution of the house, leads to some observations on the mode of making treaties under the constitution of the United States.

"Having been a member of the general convention, and knowing the principles on which the constitution was formed, I have ever entertained but one opinion on this subject; and from the first establishment of the government to this moment, my conduct has exemplified that opinion, that the power of making treaties is exclusively vested in the president, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, provided that two thirds of the senators present concur; and that every treaty so made, and promulgated, thenceforward becomes the law of the land. It is thus that the treaty making power has been understood by foreign nations; and in all the treaties, made with them, *we* have declared and *they* have believed, that when ratified by the president, with the advice and consent of the senate, they became obligatory. In this construction of the constitution, every house of representatives has heretofore acquiesced, and until the present time, not a doubt or suspicion has appeared to my knowledge, that this construction was not the true one. Nay, they have more than acquiesced; for till now, without controverting the obligation of such treaties, they have made all the requisite provisions for carrying them into effect.

"There is also reason to believe that this construction agrees with the opinion entertained by the state conventions, when they were deliberating on the constitution, especially by those who objected to it, because there was not required in commercial treaties the consent of two-thirds of the whole number of the members of the senate, instead of two thirds of the senators present, and because in treaties respecting territorial and certain other rights and claims, the concurrence of three fourths of the whole number of the members of both houses respectively, was not made necessary, is a fact declared by the general convention, and universally understood, that the constitution of the United States was the result of a spirit of amity and mutual concession. And it is well known that under this influence the smaller states were admitted to an equal representation in the senate, with the larger states, and that this branch of the government was invested with great powers, for on the equal participation of those powers, the sovereignty and political safety of the smaller states were deemed essentially to depend

"If other proofs than these, and the plain letter of the constitution itself, be necessary to ascertain the point under consideration, they may be found in the journals of the general convention, which I have deposited in the office of the department of state. In those journals it will appear that a proposition was made, that no treaty should be binding on the United States which was not ratified by a law: and that the proposition was explicitly rejected.

"As, therefore, it is perfectly clear to my understanding, that the assent of the house of representatives is not necessary to the validity of a treaty, as the treaty with Great-Britain exhibits in itself all the objects requiring legislative provision, and on these the papers called for can throw no light, and as it is essential to the due administration of the government, that the boundaries fixed by the constitution between the different departments should be preserved: a just regard to the constitution and to the duty of my office, under all the circumstances of this case, forbid a compliance with your request.

GEO. WASHINGTON."

United States,
March 30th, 1796.

Mr. Smilie concluded by saying he perceived no necessity for the papers desired by gentlemen, and should therefore vote against the motion.

Mr. Randolph said if the gentleman from Connecticut would confine his motion to the treaty of St. Ildefonso, he should be ready to acquiesce in it, though he did not believe that instrument would throw any new light on the subject.

Mr. Gregg said his wish was that the resolution should be divided; and that the treaty of St. Ildefonso only should be requested. It had been conceded that it might be of some use in ascertaining the limits of the cession. To the other members of the resolution he was opposed. He, therefore moved a division of the question.

Mr. Griswold remarked that it would be more orderly to move the striking out the last paragraph.

Mr. Sanford did not rise to say with his colleague, (Mr. Lyon), that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Conneticut was indecent, but to say, that, in his opinion, is was altogether unnecessary. It appeared to be a fact well understood in the United Sates, that Louisiana did, before the late Convention, belong to France. The fact was recognised in the treaty. If this fact be acknowledged, what remains for us to do but to pass the necessary laws for carring into operation the convention concluded on the 30th of April. Though there might be no official information to that effect, he was correct in saying possession of the country had been given to France by Spain. What then can be necessary on our part to obtain possession other than the passage of the necessary laws to carry the treaty into effect?

MR. ELLIOTT was opposed to every part of the call on the Executive for papers. He had a variety of objections to this request, with the mention of all of which he should not however trouble the House. His great objection was that the call was premature, and this appeared, in his opinion, clearly appeared even from the shewing of the honorable gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Griswold) and his honorable colleague (Mr. Goddard). To their brilliant talents he was disposed to pay the highest homage. The first gentleman was not only ingenious and indefatigable, but likewise thoughtful and profound. He had already been frequently delighted with his eloquence and instructed by his intelligence. The remarks also of his colleague were ingenious and worthy of attention. But still he thought them premature. For what purpose was this call made? The gentleman says his attention is called to the subject by the President informing us in his Message that it is necessary for us to pass temporary laws, and that thence it becomes desirable to learn whether we have acquired either new territory or new subjects. Mr. Elliott was clearly of opinion that as yet we had not, though, in a short time, if the treaty were carried into effect, we shall acquire them. The difficulties stated by the gentleman, the least investigation will shew to be imaginary. Young as I am, said Mr. Elliott, and little conversant in diplomatic knowledge, I believe the views I shall exhibit will be as clear as those of the gentleman.

The message of the president, at the opening of the session, announces that "the enlightened government of France saw, with just discernment, the importance to both nations of such liberal arrangements as might best and permanently promote the peace, friendship and interests of both: and the property and sovereignty of Louisiana, which had been restored to them, has, on certain conditions, been transferred to the United States by instruments bearing date the 30th of April" The president then informs us that "when these shall have received the constitutional sanction of the senate, they will, without delay, be communicated to the representatives also, for the exercise of their functions as to those conditions which are within the powers vested by the constitution in congress."—The message goes further and informs us, not in the phraseology of the gentleman from Connecticut, that we have acquired new subjects, but that if the treaty shall receive the constitutional sanction of the senate and house of representatives, we shall gain an acquisition not of subjects, but of citizens—"with the wisdom of congress, and the president, it will rest to take those ulterior measures which may be necessary for the immediate occupation and temporary government of the country; for its incorporation into our union; for rendering the change of government a blessing to our newly adopted brethren"—

Whether we acquire this territory and these citizens is consequential on the constitutional ratification of the treaty.

But it is said that our title to Louisiana is deducible from the 1st article of the treaty, and that that article only contains a promise; and it is triumphantly asked whether the people of the United States will be satisfied with paying fifteen millions for a mere promise [Mr. Elliott here quoted the 1st. article of the treaty.] I acknowledge, said he that this is only an assertion by France of her incontestible title, and an assurance that on certain terms she will convey this title to the United States. But, according to the treaty and Convention, an agent is to be appointed by France, who is to deliver up the possession before we pay the fifteen millions. But say gentlemen, though this may be done, Spain may not abandon her title to the province. No such consequence, however, can result. The convention that follows the treaty contains a stipulation, that the stock created shall not be delivered until "after Louisiana shall be taken possession of in the name of the government of the United States." So that taking the treaty and the convention together there can result none of the inconveniences apprehended. A treaty has been made between the First Consul and the United States, by which the First Consul has transferred to us the domain and jurisdiction of Louisiana. In the treaty it is stipulated that a commissary shall be sent to receive the country from the court of Madrid and to give us possession. If these two articles be carried into effect, and they must be to make the treaty binding, we must obtain not only the actual, but also the legal possession. It is incumbent, therefore, on us to do every thing, necessary on our part, to realise the possession

Mr. Thatcher said though the gentleman who had just set down, had acquitted himself handsomely, he had neither convinced him that the resolution of the gentlemen from Connecticut was ill-founded or unnecessary. As they were in the capacity of a legislative body, called upon to pass laws for new territory and new citizens, it was, according to his understanding, necessary, in the first instance, to learn that they had acquired new territory and new citizens. The title to Louisiana, as derived to France from Spain, was stated in the first article of the treaty. [Here Mr. T. read the first article.] By this it appears that another treaty had been formed between France and Spain. It was admitted that the province had belonged to Spain; and to her it must still belong unless France had performed certain stipulations agreed to as the price of the cession. The object of the mover is to obtain this treaty, and to learn whether France has performed these stipulations.

Gentlemen objecting to this resolution, have taken different grounds. Some oppose it as inconsistent with the sentiments that prevailed in the case of the British treaty; others because it is premature, and others, because it is unnecessary. He did not expect the first objection from any member on that floor; much less did he expect it from the quarter in which it originated. The advocates of the motion were charged with inconsistency. He was not a member of the house at the time of the British treaty—but on referring to the journal, it would be perceived that the object of gentlemen who then called for papers was to go into the merits of the British treaty. It would not be denied that the ground then taken by gentlemen on the other side was that the house had a right to examine the merits of the treaty, and to the assertion of that right, it was that the president answered. We now say that it is not necessary for us to act in our legislative capacity, intending, if it shall appear to be necessary, not to withhold acting. Mr. T. therefore conceived that they exhibited no inconsistency, as they did not purpose at this time to go into the merits of the treaty, and as they acknowledged the treaty, if constitutionally made, to be binding. But they wanted information on subjects of legislation.

It has been said that the newspapers inform us of the order of Spain to deliver Louisiana to France. But they were not to be guided by newspaper accounts. We desire to know from an authentic source whether the stipulations entered into by France have been executed. By the first article of the treaty it appears that "His Catholic majesty promises and engages on his part, to cede to the French republic, six months after the full and entire execution of the conditions and stipulations herein, relative to his royal highness the duke of Parma, the colony or province of Louisiana, with the same extent that it now has in the hands of Spain, and that it had when France possessed it; and such as it should be after the treaties subsequently entered into between Spain and other states." This article goes to say that Spain may have altered the boundaries of Louisiana differently from what they were when France before possessed it. And for what we know, she has done so. Hence the importance of seeing the papers asked for. If we obtain the bare possession, it is one thing; the legal possession is another thing. It is one thing to govern the colony with a corps of civilians, and another and a different thing to govern it with an army. The president may, perhaps, have considered it a good bargain to obtain, for the payment of fifteen millions, the mere quit claim of France to the province. At any rate it is proper that we should act with our eyes open; and therefore, the importance of having a copy of the treaty entered into between the governments of Spain and France, or evidence that Spain has acquiesced in the cession to the United States.

Mr. Nicholson was extremely glad to find that gentlemen on the other side of the House had at length abandoned the ground which they had taken some years ago. He was rejoiced that they were now willing to acknowledge, what they had heretofore most strenuously denied, that the House of Representatives had a constitutional right, not only to call for papers, but to use their discretion in carrying any treaty into effect. That this must now be their impression was evident, or their conduct was surely unaccountable. Why else do they call for papers, why enquire into our title to the province of Louisiana? If the doctrine of a former day was still to be adhered to, why urge this enquiry? If gentlemen are consistent with themselves, if they have not forgot the lessons which they incalcated upon the ratification of the British treaty, this House has no right to call for papers, no right to make enquiry, no right to deliberate, but must carry this treaty into effect, be it good or bad; must vote for all the necessary measures, whether they are calculated to promote the interests of the United States or not. The doctrines of old times, however, are now given up, the ground formerly taken is abandoned.—We shall no longer hear that the executive is impotent, and that the representatives of the people are bound to vote, blindfolded, for carrying into effect all treaties which the president and the senate may think proper to make and ratify. He thanked the gentlemen for the admission, and hoped that the country would profit by it hereafter.

He was happy to say that this was not now, nor never was, the doctrine of himself and his friends. They meant to deliberate, they meant to use their discretion in voting away the treasure of the nation. He agreed with gentlemen, that if a majority of the house entertained any doubt as to the validity of the title we had acquired, they ought to call for papers, and he had no doubt, if there was any dissatisfaction they would