AMERICAN
AND
Commercial Daily Advertiser.

BALTIMORE: *MONDAY, Dec. 5.*

DESPATCHES—CONTINUED.

NO. II.

AMERICAN NOTE.

The Ministers Plenipotentiary and Extraordinary of the U. States to the Plenipotentiaries of his Britannic Majesty.

GHENT, August 24, 1814.

The undersigned, ministers plenipotentiary and extraordinary from the U. States of America have given to the official note which they have had the honor of receiving from his Britannic Majesty's Plenipotentiaries the deliberate attention which the importance of its contents required, and have now that of transmitting to them their answer on the several points to which it refers.

They would present to the consideration of the British Plenipotentiaries, that Lord Castlereagh, in his letter of the 4th of Nov. 1813, to the American Secretary of State, pledges the faith of the British government that "they were willing to enter into discussion with the government of America for the conciliatory adjustment of the differences subsisting between the two states, with an earnest desire on their part to bring them to a favorable issue, upon principles of perfect reciprocity, not inconsistent with the established maxims of public law, and with the maritime rights of the British empire." This fact alone might suffice to shew, that it ought not to have been expected that the American government, in acceding to this proposition should have exceded its terms, and furnished the undersigned with instructions authorizing them to treat with the British plenipotentiaries respecting Indians situated within the boundaries of the U. States. That such expectation was not entertained by the British government might also have been inferred from the explicit assurances which the British plenipotentiaries gave, on the part of their government, at the first conference which the undersigned had the honor of holding with them, that no events, subsequent to the first proposal for this negotiation, had, in any manner, varied either the disposition of the British government, that it might terminate in a peace honorable to both parties, or the terms upon which they would be willing to conclude it.

It is well known that the differences which unhappily subsist between G. Britain and the U. States, and which ultimately led to the present war, were wholly of a maritime nature, arising principally from the British orders in council, in relation to blockades, and from the impressment of marin rs on board of American vessels. The boundary of the Indian territory had never been a subject of difference between the two countries. Neither the principles of reciprocity, the maxims of public law, nor the maritime rights of the British empire could require the permanent establishment of such boundary. The novel pretensions now advanced could no more have been anticipated by the government of the U. States, in forming instructions for this negotiation, than they seem to have been contemplated by that of G. Britain in November last in proposing it. Lord Castlereagh's note makes the termination of the war to depend on a conciliatory adjustment of the differences then subsisting between the two states, and in no other condition whatever.

Nor could the American government have foreseen that Great Britain, in order to obtain peace for the Indians, residing within the dominions of the U. States, whom she had induced to take part with her in the war, would demand that they should be made parties to the treaty between the two nations, or that the boundaries of their lands should be permanently and irrevocably fixed by that treaty. Such a proposition is contrary to the acknowledged principles of public law [illegible] of Great Britain and of the U. States. It is not founded on reciprocity. It is unnecessary for the attainment of the object which it professes to have in view.

No maxim of public law has hitherto been more universally established among the powers of Europe possessing territories in America, and there is none to which G. Britain has more uniformly and inflexibly adhered, than that of suffering no interposition of a foreign power in the relations between the acknowledged sovereign of the territory, and the Indians situated upon it.—Without the admission of this principle, there would be no intelligible meaning attached to stipulations establishing boundaries between the dominions in America of civilized nations possessing territories inhabited by Indian tribes. Whatever may be the relations of Indians to the nation in whose territory they are thus acknowledged to reside, they cannot be considered as an independent power by the nation which has made such acknowledgment.

That the territory of which G. Britain wishes now to dispose, is within the dominions of the U. States, was solemnly acknowledged by herself in the treaty of peace of 1783, which established their boundaries, and by which she relinquished all claims to the government, propriety, and territorial rights within those boundaries. No condition respecting the Indians residing therein, was inserted in that treaty. No stipulation similar to that now proposed is to be found in any treaty made by G. Britain, or within the knowledge of the undersigned, by any other nation.

The Indian tribes for whidh Great Britain proposes now to stipulate have, themselves, acknowledged this principle. By the Greenville treaty of 1795, to which the British plenipotentiaries have alluded, it is expressly stipulated, and the condition has been confirmed by every subsequent treaty, so late as the year 1810, "That the Indian tribes shall quietly enjoy their lands, hunting, planting and dwelling thereon, so long as they please, without any molestation from the United States; but that when those tribes, or any of them, shall be disposed to sell their lands, they are to be sold only to the United States; that until such sale, the United States will protect all the said Indian tribes in the quiet enjoyment of their lands against all citizens of the U. States, and against all other white persons who intrude on the same, and that the said Indian tribes again acknowledge themselves to be under the protection of the aid United States, and of no other power whatever."

That there is no reciprocity in the proposed stipulation is evident. In prohibiting Great Britain and the U. States from purchasing lands within a part of the dominions of the latter power, while it professes to take from G. Britain a privilege which she had not, it actually deprives the U. States of a right exclusively belonging to them.

The proposition is also utterly unnecessary for the purpose of obtaining a pacification for the Indians residing within the territories of the U. States. The undersigned have already had the honor of informing the British plenipotentiaries, that, under the system of liberal policy adopted by the U. States in their relations with the Indians within their territories an uninterrupted peace had subsisted from the year 1795, not only between the U. States and all those tribes, but also amongst those tribes themselves for a longer period of time than ever had been known since the first settlement of North America. Against those Indians the U. States have neither the interest nor inclination to continue the war. They have nothing to ask of them but peace. Commissioners on their part have been appointed to conclude it, and an armistice was actually made last autumn with most of those tribes. The British government may again have induced some of them to take their side in the war, but peace with them will necessarily follow immediately a peace with Great Britain. To a provisional article, similar to what has been stipulated in some former treaties, engaging that each party will treat for the Indians within its territories, include them in the peace, and use its best endeavors to prevent them from committing hostilities against the citizens or subjects of the other party, the undersigned might assent, and rely on the approbation and ratification of their government. They would also, for the purpose of securing the duration of peace, and to prevent collusions which might interrupt it propose a stipulation which should preclude the subjects or citizens of each nation, respectively from trading with the Indians residing in the territory of the other. But to surrender both the rights of sovereignty and of soil over nearly one third of the territorial dominions of the U. States to a number of Indians not probably exceeding twenty thousand, the undersigned are so far from being instructed or authorised, that they assure the British commissioners that any arrangement for that purpose would be instantaneously rejected by their government.

Not only has this extraordinary demand been made a sine qua non, to be admitted without discussion, and as a preliminary basis; but it is accompanied by others equally inadmissible, which the British plenipotentiaries state to be so connected with it, that they may reasonably influence the decision of the undersigned upon it, yet leaving them uninformed how far these other demands may also be insisted on as indispensable conditions of a peace.

As little are the undersigned instructed or empowered to accede to the propositions of the British government, in relation to the military occupation of the western lakes. If they have found the proposed interference of G. Britain in the concerns of Indians residing within the U. States utterly incompatible with any established maxim of public law, they are no less at a loss to discover by what rule of perfect reciprocity the U. States can be required to renounce their equal right of maintaining a naval force upon those lakes, and of fortifying their own shores, while G. Britain reserves exclusively the corresponding rights to herself. That in point of military preparation, G. Britain in her possessions in North America, ever has been in a condition to be termed, with propriety, the weaker power, in comparison with the U. States, the undersigned believe to be incorrect in point of fact. In regard to the fortification of the shores, and to the forces actually kept on foot upon these frontiers, they believe the superiority to have always been on the side of G. Britain.——If the proposal to dismantle the forts upon her shores, strike forever her military flag upon her lakes, and lay her whole frontier defenceless in the presence of her armed and fortified neighbor, had proceeded not from G. Britain, to the U. States, but from the U. States to G. Britain, the undersigned may safely appeal to the bosoms of his Britannic majesty's plenipotentiaries for the feelings with which, not only in regard to the interests, but the honor of their nation, they would G. Britain herself say, if in relation to any other frontier, where she has the acknowledged superiority of strength, it were proposed that she should be reduced to a condition even of equality with the U. States.

The undersigned further perceive, that under the alledged purpose of opening a direct communication between two of the British provinces in America, the British government require a cession of territory forming part of one of the states of the American union, and that they propose, without purpose specifically alledged, to draw the boundary line westward, not from the Lake of the Woods, as it now is, but from lake Superior. It must be perfectly immaterial to the U. States, whether the object of the British government, in demanding the dismemberment of the U. States, is to acquire territory, as such, or for purposes less liable, in the eyes of the world, to be ascribed to the desire of aggrandizement. Whatever the motive may be, and with whatever consistency views of conquest may be disclaimed, while demanding for herself, or for the Indians, a cession of territory more extensive than the whole island of G. Britain; the duty marked out for the undersigned is the same. They have no authority to cede any part of the territory of the U. States, and to no stipulation to that effect will they subscribe.

The conditions proposed by G. Britain have no relation to the subsisting differences between the two countries; they are inconsistent with acknowledged principles of public law: they are founded neither on reciprocity nor on any of the usual bases of negociation, neither on that of the uti possidetis, or of status ante bellum; they would inflict the most vital injury on the U. States, by dismembering their territory, by arresting their natural growth and increase of population, and by leaving their northern and western frontier equally exposed to British invasion and to Indian aggression; they are, above all, dishonorable to the U. States, in demanding from them to abandon territory and a portion of their citizens, to admit a foreign interference in their domestic concerns, and to cease to exercise their natural rights on their own shores and in their own waters. A treaty concluded on such terms would be but an armistice. It cannot be supposed that America would long submit to conditions so injurious and degrading. It is impossible, in the natural course of events, that she should not, at the first favorable opportunity, recur to arms, for the recovery of her territory, of her rights, of her honor. Instead of settling existing differences, such a peace would only create new causes of war, sow the seeds of a permanent hatred, and lay the foundation of hostilities for an indefinite period.

Essentially pacific from her political institutions, from the habits of her citizens, from her physical situation, America reluctantly engaged in the war. She wishes for peace; but she wishes for it upon those terms of reciprocity, honorable to both countries, which can alone render it permanent. The causes of the war between the U. States and G. Britain having disappeared by the maritime pacification of Europe, the government of the U. States does not desire to continue it, in defence of abstract principles, which have, for the present, ceased to have any practical effect. The undersigned have been accordingly instructed to agree to its termination, both parties restoring whatever territory they may have taken, and both reserving all their rights, in relation to their respective seamen. To make the peace between the two nations solid and permanent, the undersigned were also instructed, and have been prepared to enter into the most amicable discussion of all those points on which differences or uncertainty had existed, and which might hereafter tend in any degree whatever to interrupt the harmony of the two countries, without, however making the conclusion of the peace at all depend upon a successful result of the discussion.

It is, therefore, with deep regret, that the undersigned have seen that other views are entertained by the British government, and that new and unexpected pretensions are raised, which, if persisted in, must oppose an insuperable obstacle to a pacification. It is not necessary to refer such demands to the American government for its instruction. They will only be a fit subject of deliberation, when it becomes necessary to decide upon the expediency of an absolute surrender of national independence.

The undersigned request the British plenipotentiaries to accept the assurance of their high consideration.

(Signed)
JOHN QUINCY ADAMS,
J. A. BAYARD,
H. CLAY,
JONA. RUSSELL,
ALBERT GALLATIN.

To the Plenipotentiaries of His Britannic Majesty, &c. &c.

CONGRESS.

IN SENATE.

FRIDAY, December, 2.

The bill (reported some days ago) to authorize the purchase of the library of Thomas Jefferson, was ordered to be engrossed to a third reading.

The bill to extend Oliver Evans's patent for steam engines, was read a third time, passed and sent to the house for concurrence.

The following motion of Mr. Anderson, made some days ago, was taken up, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the committee to whom was referred so much of the message of the President of the U. States as relates to naval affairs, be instructed to enquire into the expediency of making provision by law, that the officers and crews of of the vessels authorised to be built or purchased, by an act passed the 15th Nov. 1814, may be entitled to receive the whole of the prize money which may rise from the sale of such vessel or vessels, and their cargoes, as they may capture, and which may be condemned as good prize according to law; and that the committee have leave to report by bill or otherwise.

The bill further in addition to an act, entitled 'an act more effectually to provide for the national defence by establishing an uniform militia throughout the U. States,' reported by Mr. Worthington (lately a senator from Ohio) and published in this paper of the 11th ult. was taken up and considered.

On motion of Mr. Hersey to postpone the further consideration of the same to the 1st Monday in December next in other words to reject the bill—the vote stood as follows;

YEAS—Messrs. Daggett, Dana, Fromentin, Goldsborough, Gore, Horsey, Hunter, King, Lambert, Mason, Smith, Talt, Taylor, Thomson, Turner, Walker—16.

NAYS—Messrs Anderson, Bibb, Bledsoe, Chase, Condit, Gaillard, German, Lacock, Morrow, Roberts, Varnum, Wharton—12.

Mr. *King*, from the committee to whom was referred the petition of sundry bankers and merchants of N. York on the subject, reported a bill to incorporate the subscribers to the bank of the United States of America,—the bill, but understood it is a bill materially of the same character as that first reported by the committee of ways and means in the house of representatives—the capital to be fifty millions of dollars]—*Nat. Int.*

The bill was read and passed to a second reading.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, Dec. 2.

Mr. *Wilson* of Mass. presented a petition of Joseph Perkins of Castine in the district of Maine, praying compensation for a ship called the Liverpool Trader, which was destroyed by fire by order of and whilst in occupation of Capt. Charles Morris of the navy of the U. States—Referred to the committee of claims.

Mr. *Smith* of N. Y. presented a petition of Sarah Easton and Dorothy Storer, daughters and legal representatives of the late Robert H. Harrison of the state of Maryland, praying to be allowed the commutation of half pay and the grant of land to which their father was entitled as an aid de camp and 1st secretary to Gen. Washington during the revolutionary war—Referred.

The house resumed the consideration of Mr. *Robertson's* motion to suspend so much of the rule of the house as precludes the reconsideration of any subject on which the house has during the same session decided

Some debate arose on the motion, which was supported by the mover and by Mr *Wilson* and opposed by Mr. *Stanford* and others. In the course of the debate, it was mentioned that a bill on the subject of a national bank was in preparation in the senate. Mr. Ward of N. J. moved to lay the resolution on the table; which motion was negatived, 64 to 44.

The question was then taken on agreeing to the resolution, and negatived, as follows:

For the motion	50
Against it	65

The *Speaker* laid before the house a letter from the secretary of the treasury, in reply to one from the speaker requiring a warrant for money to defray the charges of this house, apprising him that, the appropriation on this head being exhausted, a further provision therefor by law was necessary. The letter was ordered to lie on the table, on the intimation of Mr. Ingham that the committee of ways and means were about to act on the subject.

A report was received from the navy department, of the contracts made by that department, with individuals for the two past years.

A report was also received from the same department on the petition of the president and directors of the Eastern Branch Bridge. The report states that the bridge was not destroyed, at the instance of Gen. Winder, but by the agency of the navy department, and under the immediate superintendance of capt. Creighton.

This report was, on motion of Mr. Lewis of Va. ordered to be referred to the committee claims.

WAR MEASURES.

The House then, on motion Mr. Troup, resolved itself into a committee of the whole, Mr. Nelson in the chair, on the several bills reported by the military committee of this house, as well as the two bills from the senate on that subject.

The bill first taken up, was *the bill authorising the president of the U. States to call into service 80,430 militia, to serve 2 years for the defence of the frontiers of the United States.*

A motion was made by Mr. *Troup* to strike out the first section of the bill.

Mr. Troup supported this motion in a speech of considerable length and ability. He commenced by briefly adverting to the state of our affairs as indicated by documents relating to the negociation at Ghent yesterday laid before congress. In the consideration of this subject, he said, men would be governed by their hopes and their fears, and generally by their hopes more than their fears. He knew what effect the disclosures of yesterday might have on this body; but he shou d be sorry if it should be such as to induce the congress to discontinue for a single moment its preparations for a vigorous prosecution of this war. He would not say that we might not have peace; but so far from our military measures being predicated on the expectation of peace, sound policy would dictate to us to distrust the probability of a peace.——If by any possibility it should happen that it was the design of the enemy by negociation at Ghent to impose a deception on us, to lull us into a false security, that at the opening of the next campaign he may take us unprepared at all points—if such was his purpose, a valuable object would be gained to him by instilling into us a belief in the probability of a peace. Without saying that a peace might not grow out of the negociation, Mr. T. said he would take no measures on the faith of what has been or will be done by the ministers at Ghent or the congress at Vienna. If it was the design of the enemy to take us by surprize and unarmed in the spring, by means of his fine qua nons, status ante quo, and uti possidetis, and he should succeed in it, he would very reasonably come to the conclusion that he was a match for the Yankees at every thing, and at least as cunning as they are, &c. Mr. Troup, then demonstrated the necessity of a perseverance in the prosecution of the war against the enemy's territories, where, more than any other point, he is vulnerable by us. To this a larger regular force was necessary than the force we actually have, and larger than could be obtained, as Mr. T. endeavored to shew, by the process of recruiting. The mode of filling the ranks by classification, as in the bill proposed by the military committee of this House, he considered most feasible; and greatly preferrable to this bill, which he considered as an experiment of doubtful character, and not an efficient substitute for the bill reported in this House. He therefore desired to destroy this bill by striking out the first section in order to prefer to it one which he conceived much better suited to the exigencies of the country. In the course of his speech, Mr. T. called on the gentleman on whose motion this bill had been taken up in preference to that reported by Mr. Troup, to assign his reasons therefor, and shew why it was preferable.

Mr. *Calhoun* briefly replied to the call made upon him by Mr. Troup for the reasons why he preferred acting on the bill, that reason he thought very obvious; that the bill, having met the approbation of the Senate, would if it passed this house immediately become a law. Policy appeared to him to require a preference of this bill to that reported by the committee of this house. If the Senate send us one bill, and we instead of acting on it, send them another, it would place the two hous s in an awkward predicament. It seemed to him, he said, that the whole argument of the gentlemen against this bill was misplaced. This bill, as well as the gentleman's bill, would produce a certain number of recruits for the regular army. Should the bill reported by the gentleman prevail, it would give us either regulars or money; if this bill should pass, we shall have regulars or good militia. Both bills were calculated to produce regulars, if they could be obtained by purchase. If absolute certainty was the object of the gentleman, it could only be obtained by resorting to a regular and fair system of conscription. To the result of any other system, whether that reported by the military committee of this house, or that now under consideration, some uncertainty must attach. The bill from the Senate promising as much certainty as that reported in this house, he hoped it would be gone through with and finally passed.

The question was then taken, without further debate, on the motion to strike out the first section of the bill, and decided as follows:—

For the motion 62 Against it 64

[So the motion to strike out the first section was negatived, It may be proper to observe, that every Federal Member with the exception of some one or two, voted in favor of it—from objections to the bill, probably, directly the reverse of those pressed on the committee by Mr. Troup.]

The following is the apportionment of the proposed draft of men among the several states and territories:

From New Hampshire, two thousand five hundred eighty.

From Massachusetts, eight thousand six hundred five.

From Vermont, two thousand five hundred eighty.

From Rhode Island, eight hundred sixty.

From Connecticut, three thousand ten.

From New York, eleven thousand six hundred fifteen.

From New Jersey two thousand five hundred eighty.

From Pennsylvania, nine thousand eight hundred ninety five.

From Delaware, eight hundred sixty.

From Maryland, three thousand eight hundred seventy.

From Virginia nine thousand eight hundred ninety-five.

From North Carolina, five thousand five hundred ninety.

From South Carolina, three thousand eight hundred seventy.

From Georgia, two thousand five hundred eighty.

From Kentucky, four thousand three hundred.

From Ohio, two thousand five hundred eighty.

From Tennessee, two thousand five hundred eighty.

From Louisiana, four hundred thirty.

From the Mississippi territory, five hundred twenty-two.

From the Indiana territory, five hundred forty-nine.

From the Illinois territory, two hundred thirteen.

From the Michigan territory, sixty.

From the Missouri territorty, three hundred seventy-six.

And from the territory of Columbia, four hundred thirty.

Mr. *Jennings* moved to amend the apportionment for Indiana territory by striking out 549 and inserting 300. The motion was opposed by Mr. Rhea of Ten. and negatived, 20 or 30 members only rising in favor of it.

Mr. *Lewis* of Va. moved to strike out the present apportionment of the District of Columbia, viz. 430, and insert 80, which he said would be at the rate of every twenty-fifth man. This motion was opposed by Mr. Rhea and negatived.

Mr. *M'Kee* of Ky. moved to strike out the 7th section of the bill (which limits the services to be required of the drafted militia to the bounds of their own and any adjoining state, with the exception of the western states, who are when required to serve in Louisiana and those of Penn. and Virginia in like manner in the Michigan territory, &c. He could not see any possible benefit to arise from it, but he could see great inconvenience. It might frequently be important that the militia of one state should serve in a state which was not adjoining to theirs, and in some sections of their country might refuse their cooperation in such case, sheltering themselves under the provisions of this act, &c.

This motion was seconded by Mr. *Sharp* of Ky. who thought this section calculated to excite feelings of dissention and state and local prejudices. We ought to legislate as if for a nation, and not for state authorities. We ought to encourage national feeling, not sectional views. He should like to see that feeling diffused through the nation which prevails in some parts of the Union, that would induce the citizens freely to march from one extreme to another to meet the enemy, rather than he should hold a foot of the soil. But when you recognize the principle that the militia of one state, say Massachusetts, shall not, on occasion, be liable to march for the defence of the shores of another, say Maryland or Virginia, or that the militia of the state of Kentucky or Tennessee should not if necessary march to the defence of Massachusetts, you sanction a local state feeling which will be the bane of the prosperity of the nation. The states West of the Mountains and those East of the Potomac, were as much sister states, he said, as if they lay contiguous to each other. From the mode of legislation embraced in this section, Mr. S. feared the excitement of sentiments hostile to the grandeur of the character of this nation as well as to its honor, both of which could only be attained by an amalgamation of national feeling.

Mr. *Calhoun* remarked, that, even were the section stricken out, it would not materially vary the nature of the service of these militia forces, which would be confined to their respective states unless necessity required their service elsewhere, in which case such a limitation as is contained in the bill would be very inconvenient. He therefore concurred in the opinion that the section ought to be stricken out.

Mr. *Kilbourn* of Ohio supported the motion to strike out the 7th section. He conceived the militia service already sufficiently injured, if not dishonored by the construction of the constitution which had limited its utility. He hoped it would not be further restricted in such a provision as this. To shew its injurious tendency, he instanced the case, which might happen, of the militia of New Jersey being called on to cross the Delaware to aid in the defence of Pennsylvania or Delaware—the enemy retiring across an imaginary line into the state of Maryland, to regain their ships in the Chesapeake, the militia would, under this section, be precluded from pursuing them beyond the line, unless it suited their pleasure, &c.

The question on striking out the 7th section was decided in the affirmative by a large majority.

Several other unimportant amendments were proposed, giving rise to desultory discussion, which were variously disposed of.

Mr. *King* of N. C. moved to amend the bill so as not to confine the Governors of states, in the selection of the officers to command the militia to be drafted in pursuance of the bill, to the present militia officers.

This motion was supported by the mover, and by Messrs. Forsyth of Geo. Fisk and Shipherd of N. Y. and Gholson of Va. on the ground of the expediency of allowing the widest field for the selection of officers qualified for command, without confining it to the militia officers new in commission, many of whom, though highly respectable men, were unfit for military command, having been selected in a time of peace, without reference to their military qualifications.

The motion was opposed by Messrs. Cannon and Rhea of Ten. Pearson of N. C. and Pickering of Mass. on the ground of alledged injustice to the merits of our present militia, on constitutional scruples, and on the difficulty which would be presented by the variance of the modes of appointment in the different states.

The motion was at last negatived, 43 voting in favor of it.

Mr. *Lewis* of Va. moved to strike out two years, the proposed term of service of the militia to be drafted in pursuance of this bill, and insert six months. The motion was negatived by the following vote:

For the motion	45
Against it	82

On motion of Mr. *Forsyth*, the bill was so amended as to make the officers of the drafted militia eligible *according to the constitution and laws of the several states.*

This bill having been gone through, the house proceeded to the consideration of the bill from the Senate "further to provide for filling the ranks of the army of the U. States."

[This is the bill that has occasioned so much debate in the Senate, and which authorizes the enlistment of minors.]

The bill having been read through—

A motion was made by *Mr. Pitkin* of Con. to strike out so much of the bill as authorizes the enlistment of minors over 18 years of age without the consent of their parents or guardians; which motion he supported by a few pertinent remarks.

This motion was opposed by Mr. Hopkins of Ky. in a short speech of much force and energy.

For the motion	51
Against it	83

The house then proceeded to consider the bill authorizing the President to accept the services of certain volunteer corps (which bill was before the house some weeks ago for several days). On motion of *Mr. Johnson* of Ky. this bill was then so amended as to reinstate it precisely in the form in which it stood as originally reported, before it underwent amendment by the House.

The committee then rose and reported to the house the three bills they had under consideration.