AMERICAN
AND
Commercial Daily Advertiser.

BALTIMORE: *SATURDAY*, Dec. 24

PUBLISHED DAILY BY
W. PECHIN & G. DOBBIN & MURPHY
(PRINTERS OF THE LAWS OF THE UNION)
No. 4, Harrison-street.

Daily Paper $8—*Country Paper* $5 *per annum*
All Advertisements appear in both.

FROM THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

Mr. DUVALL's speech in Committee of the whole House in favor of the bill from the Senate calling for 80,430 militia from the several states, for the defence of the United States against invasion, and in opposition to the motion of the honorable Mr. Miller, from New York, to strike out the first section of the bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN—My desire to addresſ the committee on the preſent bill, does not ariſe from the hope of either fame or diſtinction.—Theſe can only belong to great talents and diſtinguiſhed action. But, sir, I am impelled by my judgment and duty, to proteſt againſt the opinions and doctrines which have been advanced by the honorable gentleman from New York (Mr. Miller) on the various ſubjects which he has brought before thi committee—opinions and o jections againſt the powers of Congreſs, which if they unfortunately ſhould be brought into practice, would overturn eve ry principle of civil liberty, deſtroy all ſubordination and union, and rend into pieces the con ſtitution of the country. Before I proceed to examine the arguments of the gentleman from N. York (Mr. Miller) permit me to ſay, I am oppoſed to ſtriking out any part of this bill unleſs I can be perſuaded in an hour of alarm and peril, to ſurrender the rights and liberties of the nation. The provisions contained in this bill are not only proper, but abſolutely neces ſary. The rejection of the meaſure would be to diſarm the nation, and increaſe the calamities of war I had hoped, that as the motion of the honorable gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Eppes) had prevailed, to reduce the term of militia ſervice from two years to one, that all further objections on the part of the oppoſition would vaniſh. I did not long remain in this error. All the clamor of party has been roused by this meaſure, and, by gentlemen in the opposition, it is loudly denounced as odious, tyrannical, and unconſtitutional. Sir, I had hoped that the ſtormy paſſions of party were in a great meaſure allayed, by the perilous situation of the country. Oppoſed to a powerful and ambitious enemy who is collecting all the deluge of war to pour on this devoted land with a treaſury exhauſted, and a gallant army reduced in numbers but not in ſpirit, I indeed had hoped, that gentlemen in the opposition (under theſe circumſtances) would have ſtood forward to defend their ſoil and ſovereignty. In this hope I have not altogether been diſappointed. Some gentlemen of high and diſtinguiſhed talents, and who now ſtand at the head of the federal party, have declared their determination to vote the ſupplies for the government, and on several occasions have nobly triumphed o ver their feelings, and placed themſelves on American ground. This is the duty of every American—they owe it to themſelves and their country. I aſk not gentlemen to ſacrifice their principles Surely, when their aid is demanded to preſerve our rights, let them expoſe the errors of the admininiſtration—let them expoſe the policy which has been purſued by the dominant party—let them endeavor to convince the people that their confidence has been mis placed and abuſed, nay, let them exert all their powers to change the rulers of the nation, and call other men and meaſures into action. But, in the name of our common country, I call on them to prepare to meet an enemy, as implacable as he is powerful. The member from New York (Mr. Miller) commenced his arguments againſt this bill by gravely informing the committee that he not only objected to this, but to all the military plans which had been offered; *because, he says, they are coercive.* Will the gentleman be ſo obliging as to inform me how long it has been ſince he made this important diſcovery? That the civil, criminal, and military laws of this country ſhould be coercive on its citizens, is ſurely very tyrannical. But, until the learned gentleman can point out to me a country whoſe laws have no *penalties*, and whoſe *military code* is not *coercive*, I muſt be permitted to believe, this ſtrange and viſionary notion has been only drawn from Plato's ideal republic. Indeed, ſir, this argument is an excellent ſpecimen of the lengthy, and learned, and elaborate ſpeech delivered by the gentleman on this ſubject; the whole of which was no doubt the offſpring of much painful reflection and deep reſearch If was the moſt logical, hiſtorical, and tragical diſcourſe that ever was delivered in a legiſlative body. I was at a loſs to determine whether moſt to admire his powers as an hiſtorian, his clearneſs as a logician, or the refined excellence of his poetic fancy. It is rare that one individual excels in more than one science or accompliſhment, but the honorable gentleman from New York is ſurely an exception. I feel half inclined to complain of the brilliancy of his fancy, for it threw ſuch a dazzling flood of light around his ſubject and arguments that I muſt own my mind was often ſo bewildered, as not to *comprehend all* his *nice and excellent deductions*—But this was certainly my fault, or rather my misfortune—for the eye of real genius is always cleareſt and brighteſt in the blaze of ſcience.

The committee will pardon this digreſſion, it was juſtly due to the gentleman. This bill has been called conſcription, for the purpose of rendering it odious to the people. It is not the firſt time that a meaſure has been denounced by ſome peculiar name, in order to produce oppoſition or to defeat its object Such a ſhallow artifice cannot deceive any but those who are willing to be deluded. The gentleman from N. York (Mr. Miller) read to the committee ſome pages of moſt pathetic declamation on the diſtreſſing ſcenes which conſcription had produced in France; but he forgot to ſhew the coincidence between the bill now before us and the conſcription code of France. I say, there is no coincidence, no—not even in the claſſification, and ſtill leſs in any other feature. The conſcription laws of France were firſt introduced by their Directory, and are in ſtrict imitation of the Roman diſcipline, which compelled every citizen to become a ſoldier. They were adopted for the purpoſe of aggrandizement and conqueſt. All Frenchmen were claſſed between the age of 20 and 25 only In this particular it was oppreſſive and unjuſt. The conſcripts were often treated with the utmoſt cruelty, and if they deſerted, their parents were made reſponſible for their appearance, or their fortunes paid an exhorbitant fine. All this too was done to carry on foreign wars without their conſent, to gratify an ambitious tyrant—The people of France were controlled by the iron rod of a military deſpot, who was only governed by his intereſt and glory They made no laws—their voice was not heard in their councils. Day after day, and year after year, were they dragged unwilling victims to fight the wars of their maſter in every part of the continent The young men ſaw no termination to their military toils but in the arms of death; and if they ſurvived the period aſſigned for military ſervice, they were but ſeldom rewarded for the ſcars which they bore, while unuſual hardſhips and conſtant expoſure entailed upon them poverty and premature old age. No wonder can then be excited when we are told, that the people of France dreaded and execrated conſcription.

Let us now examine this American militia bill and compare it with the conſcription of France. Firſt, all the free male population of the United States over the age of 18 and under 45, are bound to render military ſervice whenever they are legally draughted. The ſection which permits a claſs to exhonorate itself by furniſhing one recruit for the regular army, ſo far from being objectionable, is in fact an advantage to the whole body of militia. This difference and the extension of the term of ſervice six months longer than uſual, are the only changes in the militia laws now in operation.

If this is conſcription, it was practised during our revolution. It has been the invariable practice during the preſent war, and muſt continue ſo long as we are governed by the conſtitution. It is nothing more than the people of theſe ſtates expected, when they inſtructed their repreſentatives in Congreſs to declare war againſt G. Britain. If this be called conſcription by the oppoſition, it is equally ſo to bring the militia into the field for six or three months—nay, even for a single day. But the member from New York (Mr. Miller) and his friends, feeling that this argument was too weak to ſupport them even for a moment turned to the conſtitution and endeavored to baſe their reaſonings on its ſacred principles. Sir, in this they have failed, and their attempt has only more clearly expoſed the error of their doctrines. *The militia belong to the ſtates, it is urged, and Congreſs have no right to call them into ſervice, for they may be wanted for ſtate defence.*

I anſwer, the general government is bound to provide for the weal and protection of every ſtate in the union That the conſtitution gives to Congreſs the power to provide for organizing arming and diſciplining the militia, and for governing ſuch part of them as may be emloyed in the ſervice of the United States. That it also invests Congreſs with power to call forth the militia to execute the laws of the union, ſuppreſs inſurrections and repel invasions. Will it be denied that our country is now invaded? No—this muſt be admitted by the moſt incredulous. Yet, poſſeſſing theſe powers, and under theſe circumſtances, we are told that this bill is unconſtitutional. I aſk gentlemen ſo the very compact which they guard with if much watchfulneſs does not recognize the militia as the bulwark of our liberties! And yet they ſay in effect, that Congreſs cannot command their ſervices. Before my mind can aſſent to this ſtrange contradiction, and extraordinary opinion, gentlemen muſt prove to me that it is unconſtitutional to call the militia into ſervice for six or three months, or even for a day; for their reaſons will apply as ſtrong in every inſtance I have mentioned, as they can againſt this bill.

The member from New-York (Mr Miller) with great emotion has declared, that were he to vote for this bill, he should *disgrace the ashes of his fathers*, that it violates the rights of the people who ought to be suffered *quietly to enjoy their own fire sides.* I will tell the gentleman that he can never disgrace the ashes of his fathers by defending his country; they have given to him an example that should awaken all his pride to emulate; they never refused to defend the soil and independence which their noble valor has since given to their posterity; could their pure and generous spirits witness these scenes and hear such sentiments, they would weep angel tears over the degeneracy and ingratitude of their sons.—*But we should enjoy our fire sides!* What enjoyment let me enquire, is to be found in this enviable situation, when war is striding over the people, breathing destruction on our boarders—can the member from N. York (Mr. Miller) feel, in times such as these, the quiet & enjoyment of which he speaks? No, in the interest which he has taken in our various compaigns, in the minute recital of our misfortunes, in the painful and melancholy feeling, which he has illustrated by such frequent quotations of the poetic language of the great dramatist, it is disclosed, that he reposes not in these times in quiet content by his own fire side—let us not talk of these enjoyments in the strife of war, this theme the American will reserve for the halcyon days of peace.

But the member from New-York (Mr. Miller) has said that this nation can only be saved by reviving its credit, and recruiting its armies; yet he declares that his assent shall not be given to this end, although he has told us, *this and this only can* save the nation. Is it possible that the hon. member is so lost to duty and love of country, that under no situation in which we may be placed, he will give his aid to provide men or money for defence?

[Here Mr Miller rose, and said he was misunderstood by the gentleman from Kentucky; that he had said he would not give any supplies to the government for the conquest of Canada; but that if our army was withdrawn from that country, and the project of conquest relinquished, he would go as far as any gentleman to raise men and money for defence.]

Mr Duval regretted he had misunderstood the gentleman, that it was neither his object or his inclination to mistake his arguments, and no gentleman would accuse him of so mean a subterfuge.

It was but the other day that the member from New-York (Mr. Miller) declared on this floor, that the government had abandoned every object for which this war was commenced. I take him at his word, and the supposed conquest of Canada can not now be an obsticle; but to remove his fear of conquest, let me offer him proof which is undeniable to dissipate the inquietude which he still feels on this subject. I mean the instructions given to our ministers, and the offer to make peace on their part with the British commissioners on terms of which they have no right to complain. How then can it be seriously urged, that this is a war of conquest? Even the gentleman himself has said that all the objects for which this war was declared are now abandoned; in one breath we are told it would be dangerous to the liberties of the people, to place at the disposal and under the control of the men in power, a great military force; in the next moment the same gentleman declares that the administration have neither talents or capacity to carry on the war, and that such is their imbeciliy, that were they to furnish the supplies they would be profusly and ineffectually expended. I leave such absurd contradictions to be reconciled by those who claim them as just and unanswerable arguments.

But, said the gentleman (Mr. Miller) beware how you trample on the rights of your citizens, for remember justice never sleeps; I lament that his conduct has not proved the truth of his remark. Justice among the great body of the people I trust will never sleep, but with some of the opposition, she even now slumbers unto death. Justice expired with the gentleman and some of his friends in the opposition, when they declared in this hall and in the face of the whole nation, that this war is wicked and unjust.

That the nation commenced the war before they were prepared, was and is yet my opinion. But that we had not ample cause to justify our resort to arms, I do deny. Was it wicked and unjust to resist the enemy in their illegal decrees and blockades? Was it wicked and unjust to resist the capture and confistication of our vessels and cargoes? Was it wicked and unjust to resist the impressment of our seamen? If none of these contain the wickedness and injustice of which gentlemen complain, I ask in what does it exist? Let gentlemen no longer refuse their assistance—let them not sit calmly by and see the farms of their citizens pillaged, their inhabitants wrapt in flames; and when the voice of maddening distress shall assail them with petitions, coldly answer, we will not aid or protect you, for this war is wicked and unjust. When our territory is invaded by your enemy, and he bids defiance to your arms—when your citizens, no longer able to resist their iniquitious and rapacious demands, call on you for protection, which you have solemnly sworn under our constitution to give, will you violate the high obligation, and answer, it cannot be given, for this war is wicked and unjust? Have you not heard the cries of distress, arising from ruffian profanation? Have you not marked the spots where your cities and hamlets once stood—whose ashes have been slaked with the blood of your citizens? and yet are you calm and undisturbed, refusing to redress their sufferings, or to aid in the punishment of the incendiary myrmidons who have violated your people, because, you say, this war is wicked and unjust?

In vain may the citizens of your Indian frontier recite their sad and dreadful sufferings. The exterminating warfare of a merciless foe, whose joy in blood rises to madness, is suffered with your consent to rage with death and desolation on your borders. The rude children of the brave and daring hunter, and the family of the unoffending and peaceful emigrant, sink alike beneath the arm of their savage foe. Do they desire your protection? Yes; but you sternly bid them die, because you still say that this war is wicked and unjust.

I would ask from what does this apathy on the part of many in the opposition originate? I fear from local distinctions and invidious remarks, which, with regret and pain, I have so often heard thrown out in warmth of discussion. There is a class of politicians in this country who have for years with the most unwearied industry and artifice endeavored to make the eastern and northern sections of this Union believe that the southern and western states are jealous of their increasing wealth and commercial importance. This opinion has been supported and encouraged by demagogues for base and perfidious purposes. The good sense of the nation (it is the hope of every American) will soon correct so fatal an opinion. The happiness and interest of all the states are linked together by every tie that can bind society—speaking the same language—living under the same general laws—connected by marriage, blood and friendship, and worshipping the same great benevolent Being—how can stronger connexion exist? Is interest more binding? Be it so. The north and east are commercial; the south and west are engaged in agriculture: If commerce is impeded or suspended, the ships of our merchants are idle and decay; the produce of the south and west remain on the planter's or farmer's hands, dead, wasting and unproductive, or becomes spoiled, unfit for market, and is wholly lost. Nature intended that the northern and eastern states should produce the daring and enterprising mariners of the union; to make them so she has given to them fine bays, harbors and rivers—she has placed the fisheries in their neighborhood as a nursery for their seamen—their climate is cold, and soil unsuited to the various productions of raw material necessary for their factories, which are found in abundance in the south and west. New England will not only possess the carrying trade of the south and west, but will, from her great and increasing population, necessarily become their manufacturers. All this is so obvious and certain, that the demagogues of either party cannot long deceive the people by crying out that their interests are separate and distinct, Away, then, with invidious sectional distinctions—let us speak of ourselves as a nation, and not as separate hordes of wrangling and jealous savages. The bold and enterprizing mariner of the north may proudly rank with the first in the nation. Yes, sir, these are the men who belong to your navy—who have acquired more glory in two years for themselves and country, than ever England could boast in half a century—a gold which shall shine with undiminished splendor down the long annals of time. This nation should never in peace forget that a navy is her right arm in war.

It was with pleasure I listened to the gentleman from New-York while he praised the valor of our land and naval commanders, and I could not but deem it strange that he who seemed so animated at his own recital of their gallant deeds, should yet refuse to follow their example in defending his country.

I did not hope to follow the gentleman from New-York through all the various remarks which he pressed into this discussion; nor can I follow him in the sublime poetic effusions and numberless quotations from celebrated authors. Indeed, sir, it seemed to me that the gentleman's speech was not made for the present bill, but for the bill which has been reported to this house by the hon. chairman (Mr. Troup) of the military committee; but as it is probable it will not be acted on, the honorable member from New York has transferred his objection from that to the bill from the Senate. But nothing is impossible to great genius; no subject is too high or too low to escape its subtle attention. It delights to bring objects and things radically different together; and like electricity, its course is brilliant, wild and eccentric. Hence we may account for the introduction of Gov. Tompkins and his charger by the honorable member, to this committee, caparisoned in all the pomp of war; and also for the rapid flight which he instantly took from the back of this war horse, as he said, "to pluck bright honour from the pale faced moon," where, for the present, I leave the gentleman.

The attention of the committee shall not be claimed much longer by me, for I throw by many remarks which have been made in the course of debate, in order to call your reflections to a subject that has been too often agitated, to escape reply.—I mean the doctrine of rebellion which has been trumpeted in our ears by more than one member of this body. It is time that gentlemen in the opposition should allay the fury of passion, by the exercise of reason and calm enquiry. Can one individual in this body be found who will advocate principles destructive of the happiness and constitution of his country? Yes, this house has head discord and rebellion encouraged and avowed from more than one quarter. The member from New York (Mr. Miller) has declared, that this militia system, or, at he terms it, *conscription*, will not be submitted to by the people; that they ought to resist such oppression; such infringement of their rights, and *he hoped they would resist.*

[Here Mr. Miller rose to explain, and said that the language he had used, were the words of Mr Livingston, a democrat, and were delivered in a speech when he was opposed to Mr. Adams's administration, and he (Mr. Miller) now adopted them as his own.]

Mr. Duval said he had so understood the gentleman, and although he claimed the benefit of the example introduced, it was not on that account the less mischievous and pernicious; that demagogues belonged to all parties, and were equally to be detested and condemned. Let gentlemen who are giving tone and encouragement to rebellion, beware of the consequences; for, I tell them, they are treading over a burning volcano that may burst upon them in dreadful ruin. Do they propose to better their conditions, or the condition of their country, by such dangerous and mad contention? If so, let me drive from them far the fatal delusion Look to the French revolution, and learn in time to avoid the bloody scenes which may and will be reacted in America. How many of all the numerous and daring revolutionists of France are now in existence? Few, indeed, compared to the many who have fallen before the power of that rebellion, which owed to them its spring and creation. All France did not produce with her millions of men, a single individual who could snatch the helm and wield the sword of the nation.—Such men are rare creations of nature—five centuries will not produce such another man as the Corsican who braved the tempest of revolution, and rode on surges of blood to the imperial throne of France

Beware—in time beware of the fate that will attend your temerity; for believe me when I tell you, ye who create are not the men that can control the tide of rebellion; you first of all, shall be overwhelmed by its resistless fury. Deceive not yourselves and friends with the vain and forlorn hope that you can "mount the whirlwind and direct the storm," for you will be scattered before it "like chaff before the wind of heaven."

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, DEC. 22.

Mr. *Clendinen* of Ohio appeared and took his seat.

Mr. *Bradbury* of Ms. presented a remonstrance from a town in his district, against the transportation and opening of the mail on the Sabbath.

On motion of *Mr. Easton* of Missouri, so much of the report of the committee of Revisal and Unfinished Business as relates to the bill permitting certain locations, and granting certain donations of land, in the county of New Madrid, in the Missouri territory, was referred to a committee to report thereon.

On motion of *Mr. Reed* of Mas. the report recently received from the Navy Department, in answer to the resolution of the House of last session, was referred to the committee of Investigation on that subject which was appointed in March last.

DIRECT TAX.

The bill to provide additional revenues for defraying the expences of the government and maintaining the public credit by laying a direct tax on the United States, was read a third time.

Mr. Brigham of Mas. opposed the passage of the bill in a speech of moderate length, on general principles of opposition to the administration.

The question was then taken on the passage of the bill, and decided as follows—

Yeas	106
Nays	53

So the bill was passed and sent to the Senate for concurrence.

MILITIA DRAFT BILL.

The House took up the message of the Senate announcing their agreement to some, and disagreement to others of the amendments made by this House to their bill for authorising the President of the United States to call into service 80,000 militia. [Amongst the amendments *disagreed to* by the Senate, was that reducing the term of service from two years to one year, and that authorising the Executive to make requisitions on the militia officers directly, in case of failure of the Governors to comply with the demand made on them for this object.]

Mr. *Lewis* of Va. moved the *indefinite postponement* of the bill, and the amendments thereto.

Mr. *Ingham* of Pa. moved to lay the subject on the table, (for the purpose of taking up a more urgent message from the Senate) which motion was opposed by Mr. Lewis, Mr. Johnson of Ky. and Mr. Calhoun, and supported by Mr. Ingham and Mr Fisk, and was negatived.

The question recurring on indefinite postponement, on which the Yeas and Nays were demanded—a short debate arose.

Mr. *Gaston* of NC. rose, he said, to call the attention of the House to a single fact. The bill, the indefinite postponement of which was now moved, it had been stated by the Chairman of the committee of Ways and Means, would cost the U. States twenty millions of dollars. Before encountering this vast expenditure, the house ought to feel a moral certainty that some benefit would result from it in some degree commensurate with the magnitude of the expenditure. So far from this being the case, the strongest sentiment expressed in favor of the bill was a hope that some benefit would result from it. This amount of money, he thought, had better be expended in the old fashioned way of procuring recruits. This bill, he added, had done more to impede the adoption of efficient measures by Congress and the government than any bill which had been before them. The time employed on it would have been much better spent in devising means to fill the Treasury, &c. than on a bill which he believed would produce so little efficient good to the country. He trusted the house would now put an end to this project and employ the money in the old-fashioned way of filling the ranks of the regular army. Mr. G. purposely avoided renewing the discussion on the constitutional question, on which he was persuaded enough had been said.

Mr. *Troup* of Geo. in reply to Mr. Gaston's objections on the score of expense, said the gentleman was perhaps not aware that, the war continuing on its present footing, the undivided power of the enemy employed against us in time to come, as it had been in time past, the government must incur an expense for defensive purposes, in the ensuing year, of not twenty merely, but of forty millions of dollars. This was a fact from which gentlemen must not, at this moment, shrink. Gentlemen must remember, that if Congress are either not able or not willing to encounter this expense, the safety of the country will be jeopardized, its existence endangered.

Mr. *Gaston* observed, that his objection to the expense to be caused by this bill, was not that it was too much to be expended for the defence of the country. The gentleman had misapprehended him if he supposed that he thought any expense too great to accomplish that object. His objection was, that the bill peremptorily demanded the expenditure of so much money, without any certainty that such an expenditure would be necessary. If this law were not to pass, there yet remained in existence an act authorising the President to call into service the militia to serve for six months. He therefore saw no necessity for passing a law compelling him, whether he deemed it necessary or not, to call into service so many militia to serve for so long a term.

Mr. *Hawkins of Ky.* remarked, that the statement, to which allusion had been made that this bill would cause the United States an expense of twenty millions of dollars, was altogether hypothetical, and he could not for his part see on what data it had been founded. The bill had an object in view, viz. to obtain men to carry on the war. It offered to the militia men to be drafted the alternative of furnishing substitutes in the shape of recruits for the regular army. If it produced regulars it would be of the good old-fashioned sort, which the gentleman from N. Carolina so much desired, which were in the same way obtained during the revolution. If so, the very benefit would result which the gentleman desired of recruiting the army; and whether it had this operation or not, the statement of the expence was altogether speculative, &c.

Mr. *Gholson of Va.* said no man would go further than him to raise a powerful regular army, in any way deemed most expedient. But he considered it his bounden duty, enjoined on him by the consideration of what he owed to his country and himself, not to give his assent to any such project as that embraced in the bill now before the House. He believed it would bring ruin on the country; that it would prolong the war, by creating a dependence on a broken reed; and he was unwilling, therefore to squander the treasure of the nation on any such project. We shall be visited next spring by one of the most powerful armies ever seen among any people. He asked gentlemen if they were willing such an army should be met by a raw undisciplined militia? He meant no disrespect to the militia; he acknowledged them brave and high spirited—but, if every man were as brave as Caesar, without discipline, they would not be considered as competent to meet and contend with the veteran regulars of the enemy. As a militia bill, this would not be approved by the country: and it was nothing but a militia bill at last. Let us not, said he, turn aside from the lessons of experience. From the time of Washington to this day, few men of military character, he said, had ever recommended the adoption of such a system as this.

Mr. *Johnson of Ky.* said it was as painful to him, and no doubt to the house, to hear arguments advanced in relation to this subject, which ought not to have one moment's influence, as to take up a single moment of the house in deliberating on a question which had been bandied about the house for weeks. He would only say that this was the only proposition which had been offered for the defence of the country, and yet it was opposed, on the one hand, because it was too energetic, and on the other because it was said to be feeble and inefficient. He would not dwell on the the subject; but, rather than obtrude himself on the House in debating a question on which every man's mind was made up, he would only observe, that if this bill was rejected, they would have no dependence for defence but on six months' militia, and on that point he confidently rested the issue of this question.

Mr. *Calhoun*, of SC. made a few remarks, principally to shew an error in the statement of the comparative utility of 20 millions as employed in the recruiting system, or in defraying the expences arising from the present bill. In the one case, he said, it would require another 20 millions to support for one year the troops to be recruited, and in the other, the 20 millions would suffice for one year's maintenance. The present bill would he believed, produce a regular force; it might however, produce a militia force, which, if such were the effect of the bill, would be of a quality superior, from their extended term of service, to ordinary militia, &c.

The question of indefinite postponement was decided in the negative by the following vote, by yeas and nays:

For the motion	69
Against it	83

The Speaker then proceeded to state the amendments of this house in which the senate had refused to concur.

The first of these amendments was, that which proposes to strike out 'two' years and insert 'one,' as the term for which the drafts shall be held to service.

Mr. *Hawkins* of Ky. moved that the house *recede* from this amendment so as to fix *two* years as the term of service.

The question on this motion was taken by yeas and nays, and decided in the negative by the following vote:

For the motion	60
Against it	93

So the term of service remains, at present 'one year'.

The house having refused to recede from