ARTICLE VII.

It is farther agreed, that the commissioners and arbitrators shall be respectively paid in such manner as shall be settled between the governments of the United States and Great Britain, at the time of the exchange of the ratifications of this convention. And all other expenses attending the execution of the commission, shall be defrayed jointly by the United States and His Britannic Majesty, the same being previously ascertained and allowed by the majority of the board.

ARTICLE VIII.

A certified copy of this convention, when duly ratified by His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of their Senate, and by His Britannic Majesty, shall be delivered by each of the contracting parties, respectively, to the minister or other agent of the mediating power, accreditted to the government of the United States, as soon as may be after the ratifications shall have been exchanged, which last shall be effected at Washington, in six months from the date thereof, or sooner if possible.

In faith whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries, have signed this Convention drawn up in two languages, and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in triplicate, at St. Petersburg, this thirtieth / twelfth day of June, / July, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-two.

(L. S.) NESSELRODE,
(L. S.) COPODISTRIAS,
(L. S.) HENRY MIDDLETON,
(L. S.) CHARLES BAGOT.

partir du jour de l'echange des ratifications de la presente convention.

ARTICLE VII.

Il est convenu en outre, que les commissaires et arbitres recevront de part et d'autre un traitement, dont les Gouvernemens des Etats-Unis et de Sa Majeste Britannique se reservent de determiner le montant et le mode a l'epoque de l'echange des ratifications de la presente convention. Toutes les autres depenses qui accompagneront les travaux de la commission seront supportees conjointement par les Etats-Unis et par Sa Majeste Britannique. Ces depenses devront d'ailleurs etre au prealable verifiee et admises par la majorite du conseil.

ARTICLE VIII.

Lorsque la presente convention aura ete duement ratifiee par Sa Majeste Imperiale, par le President des Etats-Unit de l'avis et du consentement de leur Senat, et par Sa Majeste Britannique, une copie vidimee en sera deliveree par chacune des parties contractantes au ministre ou autre agent de la puissance mediatrice, accredite pres le Gouvernement des Etats-Unis, et cela le plutot que faire se pourra, apres que les ratifications auront ete echanges: cette derniere formalite sera remplie a Washington, dans l'espace de six mois, de la date cidessous, ou plutot s il est possible.

En foi de quoi, les Plenipotentiaires respectifs ont signe la presente Convention et y ont appose respectivement le cachet de leurs armes.

Fait triple a St. Petersbourg, 30 Juin, / 12 Juillet, de l'e. annee mil-huit-cent-vingt et deux.

NESSELRODE,
COPODISTRIAS,
HENRY MIDDLETON,
CHARLES BAGOT.

A.

Le Soussigne Secretaire d'Etat Dirigeant le Ministre Imperiale des affaires etrangeres a l'honneur de communiquer a Monsieur de Middleton, Envoye Extraordinaire et Ministre Plenipotentiaire des Etats Unis d'Amerique, l'opinion que l'Empereur, Son Maitre, a cru devoir exprimer sur l'objet des differends qui se sont eleves entre les Etats-Unis et la Grande Bretagne, relativement a l'interpretation de l'Article primier du Traite de Gand.

Monsieur de Middleton est invite a considerer cette opinion comme la decision arbitrale demandee a l'Empereur par les deux Puissances.

Il se rappellera sans doute, qu'aussi bien que le Plenipotentiare de S. M. Britannique, il a dans tous ses memoires principalement insiste sur le sens grammatical de l'Art. I. du Traite de Gand, et que meme dans sa note du 4/16 Novembre, 1821, il a formellement declare que c'etoit sur la *signification des mots dans la texte de l'article tel qu'il existe*, que devoit se fonder la decision de Sa Majeste Imperiale.

La meme declaration etant consignee dans la note du Plenipotentiaire Britannique en date du 8/20 Octobre, 1821, L'Empereur na fait que se conformer aux vœux enonces par les deux Parties, en vouant toute son attention a l'examen de la question grammaticale.

L'opinion ci-dessus mentionnee fera connoitre la maniere dont Sa Majeste Imperiale juge cette question, et afin que le Cabinet de Washington connoisse egalement les motifs sur lesquels se fonde le jugement de L'Empereur, le Soussigne joint a la presente, un extrait de quelques observations, sur le sens litteral de l'Article primeir du Traite du Gand.

Sous ce rapport, L'Empereur s'est borne a suivre les regles de la langue employee dans la redaction de l'act, par lequel les deux Puissances ont reclame son arbitrage, et defini l'objet de leur differend.

C'est uniquement a l'autorite de ces regles, que Sa Majeste Imperiale a cru devoir obeir et Son Avis ne pouvoit qu'en etre la consequence rigoureuse et necessaire.

Le Soussigne saisit avec empressement cette occasion, pour reiterer a Monsieur de Middleton les assurances de sa consideration tres-distinguee.

St. Petersbourg, ce 22 Avril, 1822. NESSELRODE.

A MONSIEUR DE MIDDLETON, &c. &c.

A.

OPINION DE SA MAJESTE IMPERIALE.

Invite par les Etats-Unis d'Amerique et par la Grande Bretagne a emettre une opinion, comme arbitre dans les differends qui se sont eleves entre ces deux Puissances, au sujet de l'interpretation de l'article primier du Traite qu'elles ont conclu a Gand, le 24 Decembre, 1814, l'Empereur a pris connoissance de tous les actes, memoires et notes ou les Plenipotentiaires respectifs ont expose a Son Ministere des affaires etrangeres, les argumens que chacune des parties en litige fait valoir a l'appui de l'interpretation qu'elle donne au dit article.

Apres avoir murement pese les observations developpees de part et d'aute: considerant que le Plenipotentiaire Americain et le Plenipotentiaire Britannique ont demande que la discussion fut close, considerant que le premier dans sa note 4/16 Novembre, 1821, et le second dans sa note du 8/20 Octobre, de la meme annee, ont declare, que c'est *sur la construction du texte de l'article, tel qu'il existe*, que la decision arbitrale doit se fonder, et que l'un et l'autre n'ont invoque que comme moyens subsidiaires, les principes generaux de droit des gens et de droit maritime.

L'Empereur est d'avis, "que ce n'est que d'apres le sens litteral et grammatical de l'article 1, du Traite de Gand que la question peut etre decidee."

Quant au sens litteral et grammatical de l'article 1, du Traite de Gand.

Considerant que la periode sur la signification de la quelle il s'eleve des doutes, est construite ainsi qu'il suit.

"Tous les territoires, lieux et possessions quelconques, pris par l'une des parties sur l'autre, durant la guerre, ou qui pourroient etre pris apres la signature du present traite, a l'exception seulement des isles ci-dessous mentionnees, seront rendus sans delai et sans faire detruire ou emporter aucune partie de l'artillerie ou autre propriete publique *originairement prise dans les dits forts et lieux et qui s'y trouvera au moment de l'echange des ratifications du traite*, ou aucuns esclaves ou autres proprietes privees. Et tous archives, registres, actes et papiers, soit d'une nature publique ou appartenans a des particuliers, qui dans le cours de la guerre peuvent etre tombes entre les mains des officiers de l'une ou de l'autre partie, seront de suite, en tant qu'il sera praticable, restitues et delivres aux autorities propres et personnes auxquelles ils appartiennent respectivement: considerant que dans cette periode, les mots: *originairement prise et qui s'y trouvera au moment de l'echange des ratifications*, forment une phrase incidente, laquelle ne peut se rapporter *grammaticalement* qu'aux substantifs ou sujets qui precedent.

Qu'ainsi l'article 1 du Traite de Gand, ne defend aux parties contractantes d'emporter des lieux dont il stipule la restitution, que les seules proprietes publiques *qui y auroient ete originairement prises et qui s'y trouveroient au moment de l'echange des ratifications*, mais qu'il defend d'emporter de ces memes lieux, *aucune propriete particuliere quelconque*.

Que d'un autre cote, ces deux defenses ne sont applicables qu'uniquement aux lieux dont l'article stipule la restitution.

L'Empereur est d'avis:

"Que les Etats-Unis d'Amerique sont en droit de reclamer de la Grande Bretagne une juste "indemnite pour toutes les proprietes particulieres que les forces Britanniques auroient em- "portees, et comme il s'agit plus specialement d'esclaves, pour tous les esclaves que les forces "Britanniques auroient emmenes des lieux et territoires dont le traite stipule la restitution, en "quittant ces memes lieux et territoires."

"Que les Etats-Unis sont en droit de regarder comme emmenes tous ceux de ces esclaves qui, "des territoires indiques cidessus auroient ete transportes a bord de vaisseaux Britanniques "mouilles dans les eaux des dits territoires, et qui par ce motif n'auroient pas ete restitues."

"Mais que s'il y a des esclaves Americains emmenes de territoires dont l'article 1r du traite "de Gand n'a pas stipule la restitution aux Etats-Unis, les Etats-Unis ne sont pas en droit de "reclamer une indemnite pour les dits esclaves."

L'Empereur declare en outre, qu'il est pret a exercer l'office de Mediateur qui Lui a ete defere d'avance, par les deux Etats, dans les negociations que doit amener entre eux, la decision arbitrale qu'ils ont demandee.

Fait a St. Petersbourg, le 22 Avril, 1822.

B.

Le Soussigne Secretaire d'Etat, dirigeant le Ministere Imperial des affaires etrangeres, s'est empresse de porter a la conoisance de l'Empereur son maitre, les explications dans lesquelles Mr. l'Ambassadeur de S. M. Britannique est entre avec le Ministere Imperial, a la suite de la communication prealable et confidentielle qui a ete faite a Monsieur de Middleton ainsi qu'a Mr le Chevalier Bagot de l'opinion exprimee par l'Empereur, sur le vrai sens de l'art. Ier du Traite de Gand.

Mr. le Chevalier Bagot entend qu'en vertu de la decision de Sa Majeste Imperiale, "S. M. Bri- "tannique n'est pas tenue a indemniser les Etats-Unis d'aucuns esclaves qui, venant des endroits "qui n'ont jamais ete occupes par ses troupes, se sont voluntairement reunis aux forces Bri- "tanniques, ou en consequence de l'encouragement que les officiers de S. M. leur avoit offert, "ou derobes au pouvoir de leur maitre, ces esclaves n'ayant pas ete emmenes des lieux ou ter- "ritoires pris par S. M. Britannique durant la guerre, et consequemment n'ayant pas ete em- "menes des lieux don l'article stipule la restitution."

En reponse a cette observation, le soussigne est charge par Sa Majeste Imperiale, de communiquer ce qui suit a Monsieur le ministre des Etats-Unis d'Amerique.

L'Empereur ayant, du consentement mutuel des deux plenipotentiaires, emis une opinion fondee uniquement sur le sens qui resulte *du texte de l'article* in li ige, ne se croit appelle a decider ici aucune question relative a ce que les loix de la guerre permettent ou defendent aux parties belligerantes, mais toujours fidele a l'interpretation grammaticale de l'art. Ier du traite de Gand, Sa Majeste Imperiale declare une seconde fois qu'il lui semble, d'apres cette interpretation.

"Qu'en quittant les lieux et territoires dont le traite de Gand stipule la restitution aux "Etats-Unis, les forces de S. M. Britannique n'avoient le droit d'emmener de ces memes lieux "et territoires, absolument aucun esclave, par quelque moyen qu'il fut tombe ou venu se re- "mettre en leur pouvoir."

"Mais que si, durant la guerre, des esclaves Americains avoient ete emmenes par les forces "Angloises, d'autres lieux que ceux dont le traite de Gand stipule la restitution, sur territoire "ou a bord de vaisseux Brittanniques, le Grande Bretagne ne se croit pas tenue d'indemniser les "Etats-Unis de la perte de ces esclaves, par quelque moyen qu'ils fussent tombes ou venus se "remettre au pouvoir de ses officiers."

Quoique convaincu, par les explications prealables dont il a ete question plus haut, que tel est aussi le sens que Mr. le Chevalier Bagot attache a son observation, le soussigne n'en a pas moins reçu de Sa Majeste Imperiale, l'ordre d'addresser aux plenipotentiaires respectifs, la presente note, qui leur pouvera, que pour mieux repondre a la confiance des deux gouvernemens, l'empereur n'a pas voulu qu'il put s'elever le plus leger doute sur les consequences de son opinion.

La Soussigne saisit avec empressement cette occasion de reiterer a Monsieur de Middleton, l'assurance de sa consideration tres distinguee. NESSELRODE.

St. Petersburg, le 22 Avril, 1822.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT KNOWN, that I, JAMES MONROE, President of the U. States, have caused the said Convention to be made public; to the end that the same, and every clause and article thereof, may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof.

[L. S.] In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington, this eleventh day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-three, and of the Independence of the United States the forty-seventh. JAMES MONROE.

By the President: JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, Secretary of State.

THE WAYS AND MEANS.

The report made by order of the Committee of Ways and Means to the House of Delegates, in the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, announces a new deficit of 30.000 dollars, in the annual Revenue; and it declares that the committee cannot hesitate to recommend, at once, that a new tax of $30,000 be levied, in additon to the sum of $30.000 formerly authorized; so that the annual expenses of the state, now exceed its ordinary revenue $60,000, which sum is to be hereafter raised by direct taxation, for at least the term of three years, if the present views of the committee prevail in the Legislature.

But whether that course ought to be adopted at all, which they hope will be taken unanimously, is the question? And this I now intend to examine. For I persuade myself that even the members of that committee, would cheerfully recommend the adoption of any other mode, that can be shewn to be just and more expedient, by which the deficit in our annual means can be either met or reduced. And I have to thank those gentlemen for the clear and detailed view of the resources and expenditures of the state, which they have submitted through the Legislature to "The People." Their statement furnishes the leading fact that gave rise to my present reflections It specifies the salaries of our Judges, as a charge upon the Treasury, amounting, annually to the sum of $35,800. This item, alone, exceeds the new annual deficit, estimated at $30,000, to the extent of $5,800. And the specification has led me to inquire into the propriety of charging the salaries of the Judges upon the general funds or treasury of the State. A glance over the list of expenditures shews, that the salaries of our Judges are paid out of the treasury, whilst their whole paraphernalia of Clerks, Sheriffs &c. are not mentioned, and must, of course, be otherwise paid for their services.

No one will question the expediency of paying Judges well, regularly and certainly. It is right too that they should be paid at the Treasury of the State.—But, I am not satisfied that the amount of their wages should be uniformly defrayed out of the general receipts of the treasury; or in better words, become a general tax.

I rather believe, that special provision should be made to bring into the treasury a sufficient amount of money to pay, or cover the salaries of the Judges. The Clerks, Sheriffs and other officers of Courts; as well as our Magistrates and Bailiffs, are all paid for their respective services, by charges authorised to be made against the parties who demand, or cause the interference of the judicial or magisterial power of the state.

Then, why not order a charge to be made against, and originally collectable from the plaintiffs to every individual case which comes to trial, or occupies the time of our Judges? Similar charges are now authorised to pay Magistrates for their services—our clerks of courts, sheriffs, bailiffs, &c. are likewise thus paid.—Then why not order fees to be levied by the clerk of each court, and collected by the sheriffs of each county, to be paid by them into the treasury; & at a rate to be prescribed by the chancellor or treasurer, so that the amount collected shall be sufficient to satisfy, or cover the salaries of our Judges?

I cannot perceive any objection to the proposition. The dispensation of justice, under the State authority, between poor citizens, before magistrates, having cognizance only over cases not exceeding $50, becomes a direct charge in all its bearings exclusively upon the parties immediately interested. And in matters of great moment, involving the interests of richer persons; who could better bear the expense of litigations, which they too often institute, or occasion, to gratify improper feelings, shall every citizen be required to bear a portion of the charge?—This inconsistency argues a departure from principle, either in the first or last case.

If magistrates are to be paid at the expence of litigants, why shall not the pay of Judges be likewise thus defrayed? I do not advocate similarity of mode but of result. It is convenient, and it may therefore probably be most expedient that magistrates should themselves receive or collect their own fees directly from the parties. The time of Judges ought not to be thus occupied, but the fees of the bench might be collected by the county officers, as the other charges of the courts are, and be paid into the treasury. I would not make the pay of judges any wise dependant upon the receipt or amount of the bench fees; but I would direct them to be assessed and collected so as currently or eventually, to cover that charge upon the books of the treasury.

I have thus simply unfolded the views of a plain and retired citizen, upon a part of this very interesting, fiscal subject; happy in the enjoyment of a previlege and opportunity which a free and independent press offers to every one, to communicate with our rulers. But before I bid you adieu for the present, permit me to remark that, if my suggestions should find favour with our law givers, the FIRST effect thereof would be, to prevent the levying of a general tax upon the citizens of this state of 30,000 dollars for partial purposes.

2dly. They would place the sadule upon the blood horse, as fairly as upon the hackney: in other words, the *rich* would be made to pay as do the *poor*, where they required, or occasioned, the interference of the judicial power of the state.

3dly. The prodigal hand will be checked in its expenditures of the common property to the amount of 30,000 dollars pr. ann. The lost child will be found, not the same material being, but the spiritual—the revenue I mean, of 600,000 dollars will hereafter annually reach the treasury by partial collections made for partial use—so that the great body of The People may yet be and remain as exempt from general taxation as if the principal, spent during the war and subsequently, was yet funded property and snugly in the state treasury.

Other parts of the *Report* might, possibly, justify similar discussion, and I hope that any one who can offer propositions, apparently as unexceptionable as that which I have now respectfully submitted will be encouraged to do so—by the interest which every one has in the general welfare. DALLAS.

FROM THE BALTIMORE PATRIOT.

To the Members of the General Assembly of Maryland.

GENTLEMEN—About the commencement of your present session, I addressed a few thoughts to you on the Governor's right to grant a nolle prosequi in criminal cases. I endeavored in that address to shew, that he ought to be divested of that power, inasmuch as he is liable to be deceived by exparte representations, and under that deception may stop prosecution against the vilest offenders. You can scarcely go into a county in the state, but you will find persons in the full enjoyment of this liberty, and of all the comforts of life, who have committed or attempted to commit murder; or who have been guilty of the crimes of man-slaughter in an aggravated degree, arson, burglary, kidnapping, &c. &c. and who have been released from even the shadow of a trial, by some one of our former Governors. If you will examine the records of these very counties, you will find that a number of other persons, for the same crimes, have been tried, convicted, and sentenced to the gallows, or the penitentiary. If you will enquire of persons who have a knowledge of the facts, you will be convinced that some of the persons who have suffered the penalties of the law, were innocent in comparison with some of those, who have been discharged.

If these things be true, (and they are susceptible of the clearest demonstration) is justice administered fairly and impartially in this state; and does crime meet with its merited contempt and punishment? As I before attempted to prove, I still aver, that it is better for a man, as it respects punishment from human tribunals to murder, to assault with intent to murder, or even to kidnap, (if he has influential friends,) than to strike a man with his fist. In the former cases he can get a nolle prosequi, which relieves him from the shame of a trial, or the costs of a prosecution; while in the case of a simple assault and battery, he will be presented, convicted and fined, and if he is unable to pay the fine, the jail will be his portion.—It appears to me to be a hardship to punish any man rigorously at this day, under present circumstances. We know not how our present Governor will act in such matters. From my knowledge of his character, I do not believe that he would knowingly screen from punishment any whom he believed to be guilty of a crime, without some circumstances of mitigation attending its commission; but it is easy for friends to represent these mitigating circumstances to exist. What objection can be successfully urged against every man's having a trial. If there be really any circumstances in mitigation, they would appear on the trial; and there are few men so unfeeling, who would not join in recommending the prisoner to the clemency of the Governor, if such circumstances are found to exist. Be it far from me to intimate that all persons who have received nolle prosequis ought to have been punished. I know of some instances where it would have been cruel to have inflicted punishments. These particular cases form exceptions to the general rule.

I would not be understood to be an advocate for vindicative punishments, but merely as the advocate of equal justice. I am decidedly for every man having justice administered to him, let him have influential friends, or be devoid of a friend. Supposing your minds were deeply engaged at the commencement of the session, in devising ways and means for the election of your respective friends to the Gubernatorial chair, or as members of the Council, I have deemed it advisable to call your attention to some of the most prominent points of my last address, and hope you will weigh what has been written.—Enquire into the facts, which I have stated—Look into your penitentiary and see how many persons except the poor and friendless are confined there. Appeal to your own recollection of cases, and then say in your consciences that you act the part of good legislators, if you do not put a stop to this iniquitous proceeding, which punishes the poor, and exculpates the rich from punishment.

EQUAL JUSTICE.

E. Shore, Jan. 10th, 1823.

Congressional Register.

SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS...SECOND SESSION.

In Senate.

FRIDAY, Jan. 17.

Mr Van Dyke, from the Committee of Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill to enable the holders of French, British and Spanish titles to land in Louisiana to try the validity thereof, reported the same with sundry amendments.

The resolution offered yesterday by Mr. Smith, of Md. directing an enquiry into the expediency of making appropriations for the erection of fortifications on St. Mary's within the mouth of the Potomac, and on a point in the Patuxent, being read:

Mr. Smith stated to the Senate the advantages which would result, in time of war, to the commerce of the Chesapeake, and to the Navy, from fortifications on the points designated; the security they would give to the extensive shores, above, &c. He referred, also, to the protection they would afford to the seat of government, as no enemy could land on the Patuxent in less than 25 miles below the position he suggested for a work there, if a proper one were erected. These works with the aid of those below and a few steam frigates, he said, would give complete protection to the commerce of the bay and its waters, the extensive commerce of Baltimore, &c. which, thus protected, could not be interrupted by any enemy in the Bay. The fortifications at the mouth of the bay, he said, could not alone protect it from the incursions of an enemy; it was necessary to have other works above. Vessels taking shelter from an enemy under the guns of the fortifications he proposed, could make sail at night fall, and, before morning be out of reach of an enemy; in fact he knew of no fortifications in the country, which afford as valuable protection to the commerce as these would, which he now proposed.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Senate then again went into committee on the bill to abolish imprisonment for debt—Mr. Smith, of Md. in the chair.

Which after debate the bill was laid on the table, on the motion of Mr. Van Dyke—and about 4 o'clock,

The Senate adjourned to Monday.

MONDAY, Jan. 20.

The President communicated a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statements of the foreign commerce of the U. States, made in pursuance of the act of Jan. 10, 1820; which letter was read.

The Senate then resumed in Committee of the Whole, the consideration of the bill to abolish imprisonment for debt—Mr. Smith of Md. in the chair.

After a few explanatory observations, between Mr. Smith, of South Carolina, Mr. Taylor of Virginia, touching the merits of the common law,

The bill was laid on the table—the amendment of Mr. Southard ordered to be printed; and—The Senate went into the consideration of Executive business—after which they

Adjourned.

TUESDAY, Jan. 21.

Mr. Benton, from the Committee on Public Lands, reported a bill to enable the President of the United States to treat with the Chippewa Indians for the purchase of certain lands, on the south side of Lake Superior, supposed to contain valuable mines of copper; which bill was twice read by general consent.

Mr. Benton also laid before the Senate a communication from Governor Cass, detailing certain informaton on the said subject, which was read.

Mr. Benton, also from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported a bill to authorize the President of the U. States to cause the lead mine and salt spring lands, belonging to the U. States, to be exposed to public sale.

The Senate took up the bill from the other House, "concerning the disbursements of public moneys," and, after some explanation by Mr. Lowrie, of the amendments reported by the Committee of Finance to the bill, (giving a discretion, in certain cases, to the Heads of the Departments only, as heretofore particularly stated) the amendments were agreed to, and the bill ordered to a third reading.

The Senate then again resumed, in committee of the whole, the consideration of the bill to abolish imprisonment for debt, Mr. Smith, of Md. in the chair.

Mr. Van Dyke offered his views of the propositions before the Senate, and his reasons for being opposed to the broad measure originally proposed, yet in favor of a modified system of exemption from imprisonment for debt. He concluded by moving that the bill and amendments be referred to a select committee of seven members, that they might, having heard the various views offered by gentlemen, endeavor to frame, from the different substitutes which had been proposed, such a bill as would meet the concurrence of a majority of the Senate.

This motion was agreed to; and Messrs. Van Dyke, Johnson, of Ky. Van Buren, Southard, Mills, Taylor, of Va. and Smith, of S. C. were appointed the committee.

A message which was received from the President of the United States, on Thursday last, and read, was taken up, and, on motion of Mr. Barbour, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The message was as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

The Convention concluded and signed at St. Petersburg, on the 12th day of July last, under the mediation of his Imperial Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, having been ratified by the three powers, parties thereto; and the ratifications of the same having been duly exchanged, copies of it are now communicated to Congress, to the end that the measures for carrying it, on the part of the United States, into execution, may obtain the co-operation of the Legislature, necessary to the accomplishment of some of its provisions. A translation is subjoined, of the three explanatory documents, in the French language, referred to in the fourth article of the Convention, and annexed to it. The agreement executed at the exchange of the ratifications is likewise communicated.

JAMES MONROE.

Washington, Jan. 16, 1823.

The Senate then spent some time in the consideration of Executive business—and then

The Senate adjourned.

House of Representatives.

FRIDAY, Jan. 17.

On motion of Mr. Conklin, it was

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be instructed to enquire into the expediency of providing by law for the establishment of a Naval Academy for the instruction of Midshipmen and other young officers in the services appertaining to their profession.

Mr. Lincoln, of Maine, offered the following resolution, which will, of course, lie on the table one day:

Resolved, That the Secretaries of the Department of State, the Treasury, War and Navy, be directed severally to inform this House what newspapers, journals, and other periodical publications are taken at the public expense in their respective departments: also, to furnish catalogues of all books which have been purchased at the public expense in their respective departments, stating the titles and prices of such as have been procured by each during the last six years.

UNITED STATES' COURTS IN LOUISIANA.

The engrossed bill for the better organization of the District Court of the state of Louisiana, was read a third time.

Mr. Cocke moved to re-commit the bill, with instructions to amend it so as to leave it a simple provision authorizing the holding additional terms of the Court in Opelousas.

Here arose a debate, which lasted several hours, upon the points, whether additional compensation should be given to the District Judge, and whether for this additional Court, a new Marshal, Clerk, or Attorney, should be appointed. The ground was narrow, but it was strongly contested by the friends of the bill, headed by Mr. Johnston, of Lou. and its opponents, led by Mr. Cocke.

On motion of Mr. Johnston, the bill was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

The House, then, not without considerable opposition to the recess of to-morrow, adjourned over to Monday.

MONDAY, Jan. 20.

Mr. F. Johnson, of Ky. from the Committee on the Post Office and Poast Roads, reported "a bill further to regulate the Post Office Department:" which was twice read and committed.

Mr. Fuller from the Committee on Naval Affairs, made a report, accompanied by "a bill to fix and render permanent the Naval Peace Establishment of the United States;" which bill was twice read and committed.

On motion of Mr. F. Johnson of Ky. it was

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be instructed to inquire into the amount of annual expenditures in support of the Marine Corps, the number of officers and men composing that corps, what services they render to the United States; also into the expediency of reducing the number, or of abolishing the same.

Mr. Mallary moved the following:

Resolved That the Committee on Naval Affairs be instructed to inquire into the expediency of providing for an equal selection of midshipmen for the Navy, from the different States of the Union.

[In submitting this resolution Mr. M. said his object was to attach every part of the nation to that essential arm of national defence, the Navy, by giving to every part of the nation an interest in its prosperity, &c. so far as that effect might be produced by the equal distribution of the offices among the population of our country. Such a distribution, he believed, would have the further effect to strengthen the Government. With these views, he hoped to be indulged in the proposed inquiry.]

The resolve was agreed to.

REGULATION OF DUTIES ON IMPORTS.

The House then again resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, Mr. Hill in the Chair, on the unfinished business of Thursday last being a bill regulating the duties on imports.

The gentlemen who took an active part in arranging the details of the bill, and discussing the various amendments proposed to it, in the committee, to day, are Messrs. McKim, Cambreleng, Colden, Little, McLane, Tracy, Wright, Ingham, Walworth, Barstow, Rhea, Whipple, Tomlinson, and McCoy.

Before going through the details of the bill, the Committee rose.

The Speaker communicated a letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a Report from the Secretary of the Navy, respecting the cost and expediency of fortifying Thompson's Island, or Key West—which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed. And then

The House adjourned.

TUESDAY, Jan. 21.

After the reading of the Journal of the House was concluded—

The Speaker laid before the House the following letter:

WASHINGTON, Jan. 21, 1823.

SIR: In the Washington Republican of last evening is an article, a copy of which we have the honor to annex hereto, impeaching the honesty of our conduct as printers to the House of Representatives.

We are glad to meet this charge in a tangible form, unfounded as it is. Always holding ourselves amenable to the authority of the House for the faithful discharge of our official functions, we ask of the House, that it will do us the justice to institute a committee to inquire into the correctness of our conduct, herein impeached, with power to send for persons and papers, and report the result of its investigation to the Honorable Body over which you preside.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc3923_scm2843-0246.jpg