

THE WAYS AND MEANS.

The House resumed the consideration of the bill for laying and collecting a direct tax within the United States.

Other amendments thereto were proposed which were variously disposed of.

The Speaker having decided the question in the affirmative, Mr. Pitkin appealed from the decision, which was confirmed by the House by a vote of 98 to 68.

The question on engrossing the bill for a third reading was then taken, and decided in the affirmative, as follows:

For the engrossment 95
Against it 73

On motion of Mr. Bibb, the House then resolved itself into a committee of the whole. Mr. Nelson in the chair, on the Tax Bills. The bill establishing the office of the Commissioner of Revenue was read through, and no amendment proposed.

Thursday, July 8.

Mr. Fisk, of Vermont, called up the Massachusetts remonstrance, and moved to refer it to a select committee, for the purpose of giving an answer.

LAND TAX.

When the land tax bill came to its third reading, and the question upon its passage was about to be put, Mr. Brigham, of Massachusetts, rose in a speech of some length, attacked the bill, denied the propriety of taxing the people to support the war.

When Mr. B. sat down, no one rose to justify the bill or in support of the war.

Mr. Culpepper then rose, and in a distinct and forcible manner reviewed the causes upon which the war is founded; shewed the utter impracticability of obtaining from England our demands by means of this war.

Before the question was finally taken, Mr. Nelson of Virginia, moved a recommitment of the bill. He declared that as the bill came from the committee to the house, his constituents were taxed a certain sum; that in the house that sum had been nearly doubled.

The effect of calling the previous question being to preclude all amendments and debate, placed Mr. Nelson's district in the situation of which he complained so grievously.

The bill laying a DIRECT LAND TAX then passed—70 to 96. It contains two clauses, which make the whole system a fraud and imposition upon the public creditors.

Friday, July 9.

THE WAYS AND MEANS.

The engrossed bill imposing a duty [of four cent. per lb.] on sugar refined within the United States, was read a third time and passed without debate, by the following vote:

For the bill 94
Against it 63

The engrossed bill to establish the Office of Commissioner of the Revenue, was read a third time and passed without a division.

The engrossed bill imposing a duty on sales at auction of merchandize, and of ships and vessels was read.

[This bill imposes, after the 1st day of January next, upon all sales by way of auction, one dollar for every hundred dollars of the purchase mo-

Caration of the Regent is silent on this point?—No sir, it was to be presumed that the new maritime code of Napoleon would be adhered to, or relinquished. If adhered to the orders were to continue—if relinquished, they were to cease.

The dispute between the U. States and Great Britain, was as to the fact of repeal or no repeal of the French decrees, and not whether the repeal was limited to America alone, or extended to all neutrals. As to the dispatch of Lord Castlereagh, none of us can pretend to know its contents, further than may be collected from the correspondence between Mr. Monroe and Mr. Foster.

One remark sir, on the correspondence of Mr. Monroe and Mr. Foster, ought not to be omitted. No man can examine it, without being sensible of the superiority with which it was conducted on the part of the American secretary; and in nothing is that superiority more manifest than in the management with which the British minister is drawn in to give an answer to the abstract question of a supposed repeal by France of the decrees, so far as they affected America.

The gentleman from Tennessee cannot help his argument by any expressions in the order of the Prince Regent, of 23d June, repealing the obnoxious Orders in Council. It is very true that it pronounces that the tenor of the decree of the 28th April, 1811, does not satisfy the conditions upon which he had pronounced in his declaration of the 21st of April, 1812, that the orders should cease and determine—nor does it.

The gentleman from Tennessee cannot help his argument by any expressions in the order of the Prince Regent, of 23d June, repealing the obnoxious Orders in Council. It is very true that it pronounces that the tenor of the decree of the 28th April, 1811, does not satisfy the conditions upon which he had pronounced in his declaration of the 21st of April, 1812, that the orders should cease and determine—nor does it.

limited to one nation. What would have been the effect, was to be collected from the spirit of the pledge given, as to the retaliatory character of the orders, and of their ceasing step by step with the decrees on which they were founded.

But it is doubted whether a timely repeal of the Orders in Council would have prevented a war. Sir, such a doubt cannot be removed by argument. He who indulges it will cherish it the more, because it is almost exclusively his own; and because it soars above the reach of argument.

Mr. G. said, there was another point of view in which the suppression of this repealing decree was of immense importance. Although it had not been followed by a revocation of the orders in council, its publication must have prevented war. Never (said he) can I forget the impression which the first appearance of this document made on my mind, and sure I am there is, at least one honorable gentleman in this house who voted for the war, (and no doubt upon the best conviction of his understanding, and with the most upright motives) who will not readily forget the impression which the first communication of this decree made on his mind.

The very issuing of this decree proclaims that the Berlin and Milan decrees had not been theretofore repealed. It tells you and it tells the world, that it is not a fact, as you have declared, that France has done the act which justified you on your own principles in making a distinction between her and G. Britain.

Yet, sir, this decree, the suppression of which, has involved my country in war—this decree, of which our first knowledge is its communication to Barlow in May 1812—this very decree the French government declares was duly laid before

the proper representatives of this nation both abroad and at home. The great object of these resolutions is to ascertain the truth or falsehood of these charges.—When I reflect on the situation of those whom I represent on this floor, not the wealthy inhabitants of your cities, who in times of need can live luxuriously upon the gains which they have amassed in the days of prosperity, but in general the plain industrious farmers of your country, once comfortable and happy, though never rich—When I consider the general embarrassment which prevails among them, and the new burthens which your tax bills are about to impose—When I think of the utter distress which has seized on that portion of my constituents who once gained a decent competence by laboring in their native forests, or by navigating their dangerous coast, or by mechanical pursuits connected with commerce—and recollect that all these calamities have sprung from a fatal war which had its origin in a trick, a delusion, I should be a traitor to them if I did not aid with my efforts in discovering the authors of the fraud.

Sir—It is premature to pronounce an opinion before the desired information is given us. But as other gentlemen have not hesitated to declare theirs, and as forbearance on my part might be misinterpreted, I have no hesitation in expressing my belief, that the assertion of the duke of Bassano is false. I do not think that the executive could have been guilty of an act so detestably wicked as the wilful concealment of a document so all important to his country.

Congress of the United States.

IN SENATE.

On Friday Mr. Anderson reported a bill providing for the further defence of the ports and harbors of the United States.

[This bill provides—“That the President be, and he is hereby authorized, whenever the same shall be deemed necessary for the defence and security of any of the ports and harbours of the United States, to cause to be hired or purchased, hulks or other means of impediment to the entrance of the ships or vessels of the enemy, to be sunk with the consent of the proper authority of the state in which such port or harbor may be, and the same to be removed whenever in his opinion it may be done with safety to such ports or harbors.]

The bill was read.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, July 5.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, Mr. Nelson in the chair, on the tax bills. The bill to lay and collect a Direct Tax within the United States, was then taken up, discussed, amended and reported to the House, and the committee obtained leave to sit again on the remaining bills.

The House then proceeded to consider the report of the committee of the whole on the Direct Tax bill; but adjourned before having gone through the same.

Tuesday, July 6.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The engrossed bill to lay a duty on licenses to distillers of spirituous liquors, was read a third time.

[This bill proposes a duty on licences to distillers, as follows: For the employment of a still or stills employed in distilling spirits from domestic materials, for two weeks; nine cents for each gallon of the capacity thereof, including the head; for one month, eighteen cents; for two months, thirty-two cents; for three months, forty-two cents; for four months, fifty-two cents; for six months, seventy cents; for one year, one hundred and eight cents for each gallon of its capacity as aforesaid.

The bill was passed, without debate—Yea 83 Nays 49.