



CONGRESS.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
FRIDAY, July 23.

Debate on the amendment of the Senate to the Funding Bill, to assume a part of the State Debts.

MR. SMITH. (S. C.)
Concluded.

THE opposition to the assumption was strongest from the States of Virginia and Maryland, and was founded in a belief that those States would be considerably injured by it. It had been said that they had extinguished a considerable portion of their State debts, and had placed the balance in a convenient train of settlement: the State of Virginia, including Kentucky, he said, was a very large and opulent State, abounding in internal resources, and the exertions she had made towards the discharge of her debt ought not to be estimated by a comparison with other States, but by a reference to her own size and strength: exertions which might appear considerable when put in opposition to those of smaller States, would perhaps appear of less importance when her magnitude and vast resources were contemplated. The members from that State had not informed the house how much of her debt had been discharged, tho' they had generally spoken of a large sum; he had been informed that it did not in the whole exceed three millions of dollars; now this was surely a moderate sum to be raised in a period of eight years by a State which, according to a respectable author, might without inconvenience, even in the time of war, raise 1,500,000 dollars annually. But South-Carolina, a State of not half the size and population, had paid more than three millions of her debt, although she had unquestionably suffered much more by the war.

With respect to the State of Maryland, notwithstanding she had fortunately escaped the ravaging hand of the enemy, yet she was obliged to resort to her confiscated property as a fund for the discharge of her debt, while South-Carolina had, in pursuance of the treaty of peace, and the recommendation of Congress, liberally relinquished a mass of valuable confiscated property, with which she might long ago have sunk every farthing of her debt.

Upon investigation it did not then appear that those States were entitled to more applause for their exertions, or would be more injured by the assumption than other States; but admitting, he said, that their exertions have been considerable, they will obtain a credit for them in the final settlement, and will become creditor States in proportion to their advances. The assumption will be favorable to both the debtor and creditor States; the former will be relieved from their debts, and will not be compelled to pay their balances by direct taxes which they otherwise must do; the latter can receive their balances by no other process; after the assumption, there will be more creditor than debtor States, consequently there will be a majority in both houses to enforce a settlement and payment. The advantages to the States in general will be considerable; relieved from a grievous pressure of State debt, and from an expensive mode of taxation, they will apply their internal resources to the improvement of their manufactures, the opening their inland navigation, and the increasing of their exports.

The non-assumption will be productive of endless embarrassments; some States were unable to discharge their debts with the aid of the impost and excise; how will they be equal to it, deprived of those resources, or having only a partial assistance from the latter? If the Union should resort to the excise as well as the impost, the States will have nothing left but direct taxation, and can they with that resource alone defray their civil list and contingent annual expences, and sink their debts? The States will be compelled to carry on a warfare of revenue against each other: manufactures protected by duties in a manufacturing State will be crushed by a heavy excise in a consuming State; excise will be laid on impost, and excise will be laid against excise, and the people will be ground between the rival systems. One of the principal causes of the present government was the mischief resulting from a contrariety of commercial regulations in the different States; the non-assumption will renew these embarrassments—will defeat one of the main objects of the constitution, and be repugnant to its very principles; the meeting at Annapolis had in view a uniform system of commercial regulations and duties and from that meeting sprung the present constitution. The rejection of this measure will induce a repetition of all those clashing systems which were so injurious to our trade and manufactures.

As the assumption relates to the government of the United States, there can be no doubt that viewing it as a federal question, it will be a measure which will contribute to the more durable union of the States and will greatly facilitate the collection of the revenue. It will be just and politic; just, because the expences were incurred in the common cause, and ought to be paid from the common treasury; and because Congress are exclusively possessed of the best resources of the country; politic, because the State systems of revenue will obstruct and injure the national system and impair the credit of the United States. These considerations should have weight with those who are specially appointed to administer this government.—In a great national question they should not suffer local considerations to warp their judgment and influence a vote on which perhaps the very existence of the union may depend. Will it be denied that there will be a clashing between the States on the subject of taxes and excises, that there will be heart burnings on the part of the State creditors who will be left destitute while ample provision is made for the continental creditors; that many of them will not only connive at frauds in the revenue, but will even promote them to reduce the continental creditor to a level with themselves, that smuggling, instead of being viewed as a crime against the union, will be deemed an innocent act, and even become popular; because those who think themselves abandoned by the government will feel themselves justified in thwarting the collection of a revenue which is to be distributed with so partial a hand; shall one creditor be ruined because he happened to be a citizen of a State, distant from the residence of Congress, and received State securities, while another, perhaps less meritorious (for he might not have been a voluntary creditor) will have the principal and interest of his debt well funded, and a comfortable subsistence provided for the remainder of his days? Shall the bare circumstance of a continental commissioner not going into a distant State till a considerable time after the peace, to liquidate the claims of its citizens, deprive them of a compensation for their services, or a retribution for their property employed in the common cause? Or shall the sufferings of a State during the war be aggravated at the peace, by saddling her with the payment of a large debt incurred for general purposes? When these reflections rush on the minds of the State creditors, would it be surprising that they should abhor a government by which they shall be treated with such palpable injustice?

But it is contended that justice will be done them by leaving the payment of their demands to the several States? And that justice will be also done to those States which have made greater exertions than others on a final settlement of accounts. With respect to the latter observation, it cannot be urged with sincerity by those who have declared themselves persuaded that no settlement will ever take place, and who have relied on that circum-

stance as an argument against the assumption, because, say they, it is unjust that the States which have made considerable efforts since the peace to discharge their debts, should be taxed a second time to contribute towards the debts of other States; when this objection is obviated, by telling them that on a final settlement of accounts, they will have credit for these payments, and that the smaller the debt which is assumed by the union, the larger will be their balance as creditor States, they ridicule the idea of any final adjustment of accounts; now when it is declared that the assumption is necessary to do justice to those States which made the most considerable exertions to repel the enemy, we are referred for that justice to a final settlement of accounts. But either there will be a settlement or there will not; If there will be a settlement, no injustice will be done by the assumption to the States which have already paid off a portion of their debts, for on such settlement they will have credit for their payments with interest; and will have their advances refunded: If there will not be a settlement, the argument in favor of the assumption is unanswerable, for it is the only mode by which justice can be done to the States which were most exposed to the attacks of the enemy, and made the greatest advances in the common defence. But if there be no settlement, I shall be asked how is retribution to be made to the States which have cancelled part of their debts since the war; will not the assumption be injurious to them? I answer in a considerably smaller degree than the non-assumption to the others; because their ability to discharge part of their debt since the peace is a strong proof that they sustained little injury by the war; and although they should contribute to the discharge of the debts of the suffering States, it would be no more than equalizing the expences and burdens of war. Let us however inquire by what extraordinary exertions some States have reduced their debts, and if in the progress of our inquiry we should find that they have got rid of their debts, in some instances with little difficulties to themselves, and in others with little benefit to their creditors, we shall not be ready to allow them so much merit for their exertion as they wish to obtain.—Some have paid no interest to their creditors for a number of years, but have cut down the capital of the debt at once, by a sale of confiscated property, or vacant and useless lands.—In this case the State made no exertions; her citizens were not taxed, nor was her government put to any inconvenience or difficulty.—The property of her enemies, which Congress at the peace recommended to them to restore, or unappropriated back lands were applied to the discharge of the debt, while the creditor, after waiting several years without receiving any interest on his certificate was obliged to receive the principal in confiscated property of wild lands, at an extravagant price. Others have discharged their debts with depreciated paper or by taxes payable in the principal of their debt, or by other arrangements as little burdensome to the State as advantageous to the creditor. No material injury therefore can result to these States, even should they never have credit for such payments.

Mr. Smith then observed, that the justice, policy, expediency, and even necessity of the assumption being evident in every view in which it could be contemplated, and the mischiefs which would flow from a rejection of it being equally obvious and alarming, he trusted it would on a further consideration be agreed to. A funding system without it would want the only basis on which it could stand; justice and the consent of the people were necessary for its existence; should it appear to them partial and unjust, its operation would be embarrassed and the continental creditors themselves would be the first persons to lament the absence of that necessary ingredient without which it would be vain and ineffectual. He then replied to some of Mr. Jackson's observations.

REMARKS ON THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

IN vulgar speech, the word *got* answers a great variety of purposes: A man has *got* a horse; has *got* his house done: has *got* his leg broke; has *got* his wheat to reap; has *got* to go to work: A boy has *got* to get his lesson, or has *got* his lesson to get: In short, if I attempt to mention a thousandth part of the ways by which this poor *got* is abused, I should have a task indeed. Let any farmer who comes from his field and sits down to read this paper, ask himself whether it is not quite as easy to say *he has a horse*, as to say, *he has got a horse*, and easier to say *he must go*, than to say, *he has got to go*. Let me ask whether it does not sound better to say, "he must get a cart," than to say, "he has got to get a cart?" If he should think this a matter of no consequence, I can only lose my labor of writing—no harm will be done.

Again; it is a custom with our modest country people to ask questions thus; you dont want any corn, do you? You have not any rum to sell, have you, you dont want to buy veal, do you? New-England people are much laughed at, for this singular practice; and indeed it is ridiculous. Let me ask our market people why it is not just as easy to ask a question decently and directly at once; *do you want to buy veal?* or, *will you buy corn?* One would think it best to finish the business directly and handsomely.

And here let me suggest to my countrymen a little more decision in answering questions. If I ask a man a civil question, I want a direct answer: I want no round about indirect answers, such as, *I don't much care if I do; I don't know but I will; I can't tell whether I will or not.* There may be cases when such an indefinite answer is necessary; but if I ask a man to eat or drink, or take a ride with me, I want no such answers as, "Why, I don't care much if I do."

How many ate there left? Said I to a man standing by me; *ne'er a one*, replied he. *Ne'er a one, ne'er a one*, said I; this is not English. *Never a one, never a one*; this is Irish or Scotch, it certainly is not English. So when I ask a man, how many horses he keeps, he tells me, he keeps *never a one*. This is odd indeed! But when he says *he has none*, this is plain intelligible English. [American Mercury.]

LONDON, JUNE 7.

OUR Constitution if kept upon its original purity, is far superior to any of the boasted republics of antiquity. In Rome, whose constitution was an improvement on the Grecian models, the citizens elected their Consuls, Prators, Tribunes of the people, &c. but the Senate was an hereditary body, and all powers might be said to be committed to their hands; for though the Tribunes, who sat in the porch of the Senate House, might give their "Veto" to any law, yet the whole of them must agree, as one dissentient voice would set aside the negative of the rest. In these kingdoms, however, we elect our Senators, and were but the Boroughs reformed, our form of constitutional government would come as near to perfection, as any political institution can possibly admit.

When the news of the late defeat of the Patriots reached Namur, several citizens, well affected to the house of Austria, expressed the highest satisfaction at the event. This was imprudent. But when they saw a number of wounded men brought from the Patriot army to the hospitals of Namur, their exultations increased, which doubtless were inhuman.

In the utmost consternation at the rumours of a defeat, and enraged at the treachery and info-

lence of the Royal party, the populace assembled attacked, pillaged, and completely demolished three houses belonging to the Royalists. A child was accidentally killed in the tumults.

On the 22d, the populace again assembled for the purpose of devastation and revenge, but the garrison troops joined the armed citizens and defeated their designs.

The excesses were again renewed on the 23d, at night, and the house of a Bookfeller was destroyed, and himself thrown out of a Window.

An Irish Gentleman being lately asked what he thought of Gen. Burgoyne's abilities, replied—"that, as a military man, he was a decent farce writer." Being asked what he meant by that, Sir Patrick replied—"the General wrote a good farce in England, and acted a bad one in America."

Nothing has yet transpired concerning Doctor Warton's literary occupations at the time of his death. It has been generally believed that he had undertaken a new edition of the Paradise Lost, at the particular request of his Majesty, and as he was peculiarly qualified both in critical talents and taste to do honor to such a work, we hope to hear that it is at least in such a state of advancement as to admit of publication.

COALITION BETWEEN FRANCE AND SPAIN,
AND
ITS NATURAL EFFECTS:

The Grandees of Spain about 300 years ago sold the liberties of the people to the then Monarch, the ancient constitution of every province being governed by its own peculiar laws was abolished, and a new system adopted, which obliged the Nobility, Clergy, and Representatives of the people to meet, confirm, and record the decrees of the Sovereign, without allowing them a negative on any occasion.

This arbitrary mode seemed so well formed for carrying into execution the oppressive views of tyranny, that Cardinals Richieu and Mazarine, effected its establishment in France, deprived the twelve Provinces of their privilege of making laws, or rather giving their assent or dissent to arrests, passed by the King for the Government of the Empire, and thereby made France a Monarchy as absolute as Spain in every other respect, except on the point of deciding upon civil actions.

The riots in Dublin have been of a very alarming nature, the election mobs sweeping all before them. Several persons have lost their lives in consequence of the Military being obliged to fire on the deluded hirelings of the party in that kingdom. The election for the city of Dublin, concluded something like our Westminster election, the mobility of weavers polling over and over again, in consequence of which, the Duke of Leinster's brother, and Mr. Grattan, have been returned by a large majority. The county of Dublin election is also finished, and Sir Edward Newenham and Mr. Talbot returned. Mr. Talbot is one of those independent gentlemen who mean to support government.

ADVERTISEMENT.

PURSUANT to a Resolve or act of Congress of the 10th day of May, 1780, relative to the destruction of Loan-Office Certificates by accident; notice is hereby given to all whom it may concern, that on the 2d day of January 1780, the house occupied by the subscriber in Market-Street, Philadelphia, took fire and was consumed, in which was lodged a number of Loan-Office certificates as pr. list below, all which were destroyed by the said fire: Therefore if any person, hath any objection why the said Certificates should not be renewed, agreeable to the resolves of Congress, they must make them before the expiration of three months, from the date hereof.

Invoice of Loan-Office Certificates destroyed in the house of John Holker on the 2d day of January 1780.

1778.	No.		Dols.
March 13.	1636	1 Samuel Cooke, jun. New-York,	600
	1673	1 ditto. do.	600
			Dollars, 1200.

In testimony whereof I have signed the present for publication.
New-York, July 26th, 1790.
HOLKER.

TO BE LET,

On very low terms—and entered upon immediately, until the first of May next.

THAT elegant new TWO STORY BRICK HOUSE, in the Bowery-Lane, formerly occupied by ROBERT GILBERT LIVINGSTON, deceased; it has seven Fire Places with a good Cellar under the whole House—a convenient out-House in the rear, with a Coach-House, and Stables; for further particulars enquire of MANGLE MINTHORN. Corporation Dock.

This day published,

And to be sold by THOMAS ALLEN, Queen-Street, corner of Fly-Market,
A COLLECTION OF
ESSAYS AND FUGITIVE WRITINGS,
On various subjects.
By NOAH WEBSTER, Junr.

The Mail Diligence,

FOR PHILADELPHIA,

LEAVES the Ferry-Stairs, at New-York, Ten minutes after Eight o'clock every morning except Sunday.
Stage Office, City Tavern.
Broad-Way, New-York June 5, 1790.

Dr. Price's Revolution Sermon may be had of the Editor.—Price 1/7.