

The Gazette.

PHILADELPHIA,

TUESDAY EVENING, DECEMBER 12.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY—DECEMBER 12.

Messrs. M'Dougall and Gillespie, appeared in their places for the first time this session.

The Speaker announced a communication from the Treasury department, which he delivered to the clerk to be read. It contained a report and estimate of the appropriations which will be necessary for the service of the year 1793, and also an account of the receipts and expenditures for the year preceding the 1st of October, 1792. Ordered to be printed and referred to the committee of Ways and Means.

The Speaker also communicated a report from the Secretary of the Treasury on the memorial of Robert Hazlehurst, and others, merchants of Charleston, (S. C.) complaining of the operation of the act directing all goods and wares imported from abroad, to be weighed and gauged by an officer of the custom-house, stating that this direction injured the private property of individuals who had heretofore had this privilege. The Secretary recommended that no law should be passed on the subject but that the matter in dispute between the custom house and individuals should be brought to a legal decision. Ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. Harper, from the committee of ways and means, reported that the committee had taken into consideration the resolution of the house respecting the stamp act, and had directed him to report in part. The report states, that as the Secretary of the Treasury had found it impossible to provide the necessary machinery, dies, &c. for carrying the act into effect at the time proposed (the 1st of January next) he had omitted to give the notice which was directed to be given in each state three months previous to its taking place; that, finding it will not be safe to fix the period at which the duty shall take effect earlier than the 1st of July next, they recommend a law to be passed to that effect. They mention, that some other alterations had been suggested as necessary, but they thought it necessary to leave these for future consideration, as it would be proper to pass this act as soon as possible. The report was read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole for to-morrow.

Mr. Shepard presented the petition of Abraham Whitney, a collector of revenue, praying for certain reimbursements. Referred to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Macon, from the committee of revision and unfinished business, reported the laws which will expire before the next meeting of Congress.—Referred to a committee of the whole.

Mr. Venable, from the committee to whom was referred, to enquire whether any and what alterations were necessary in the law respecting silver coin, reported it as their opinion, that a law should be passed authorizing and requiring collectors of revenue to receive foreign silver coin, other than Spanish dollars and parts thereof, at the rates at which they were received before the 15th day of October last, for two years, and from thence to the end of the next session of Congress; and to suspend so much of the act as relates to foreign gold coin, for the like time.

On motion to agree to the report (as it was said to be in consonance with a circular letter which had been sent to the collectors from the Treasury department) it was moved to be postponed, by Mr. Sitgreaves, to Wednesday.—Agreed.

Mr. Holmes presented the petition of Richard Schott, a soldier in the war, for compensation. Referred to the committee of claims.

Mr. Sewall, from the committee to whom was referred that part of the speech of the President of United States, which related to the measures necessary to be taken for the protection of commerce and the defence of the country, stated that that committee had requested him to ask the same leave for them to report by bill or otherwise, which had been given to all the other committees appointed at the same time.

Mr. Nicholas thought the nature of this resolution fully justified the deviation which had been observed in the forming of the resolution appointing this committee. It appeared to him better to have the subject in the form of a report, than a bill, in order that it might receive full discussion.

Mr. Sewall said, it was not possible that the committee could bring forward any thing upon which the house would not have full power to act, and if they were allowed to report by bill, it would considerably lessen their labour, which was the principal object of the motion.

Mr. Nicholas was not desirous of imposing unnecessary difficulty or trouble upon any committee; but if the business was so important, it was an additional argument for the house not only to examine the subject, but the details. It was the practice of the house to have all important business first in the form of a report, which gave time for discussion and reflection, and he thought an innovation upon the usual order of proceeding in this respect might have a bad effect. He wished before any project should be brought before them in a bill, they might discuss its principles.

Mr. Pinckney said, the leave now asked, was no more than had been allowed to all the other committees appointed to take into consideration parts of the President's speech. He thought if a bill were reported, every opportunity would be given to obtain information on the subject, as sufficient time might be allowed betwixt the several readings, and they could better explain the nature of the regulations, with respect

to the duty of collectors at the several ports, by a bill than a report. He hoped, therefore, as much trouble would be saved by this mode of procedure, that the request of the committee would be complied with.

Mr. Harper said, the reason why the form of this resolution differed from the other was, because it was of a very extensive nature, so left than to take into consideration the measures proper to be taken for the protection of our commerce and the defence of our country, which was supposed would require previous elucidation by a report, before specific measures were brought forward in the form of a bill. He had, however, no objections to comply with the request of the committee, as he believed they might be safely trusted with the discretion required. Indeed it was not contemplated, he believed, when the committee was appointed, that any thing respecting collectors, or collecting duties, would have come within its purview; but as they had thought otherwise, he hoped the liberty they asked would be granted.

Mr. S. Smith said nothing had been said about collecting duties, but of the duty of collectors, with respect to the law of 1794.

Mr. Gallatin would be glad to have further information on this subject. He wished to know whether what was meant to be brought forward respecting the conduct of collectors was mere matter of detail, or whether it involved any new principle; if it were the former, he should not object to the mode proposed, but if not, he should be against deviating from the usual mode of procedure.

Mr. Sewall said, the purpose which the committee had in view was to determine the question respecting the arming of merchant vessels. Before the last meeting of congress it would be recollected that the President of the United States had issued orders to prevent the arming of merchant vessels, except in certain cases. The committee were doubtful whether there existed any authority in the President, to issue these orders, the execution of which had been opposed in various parts of the United States. This subject had been under the consideration of the committee, and they thought it more expedient to report in detail, the regulations necessary in the form of a bill, than to report in any other form.—If the house wished the business to be done otherwise, they would, of course, refuse a compliance with the request.

Mr. Venable said, from the statements which had been made it appeared that the committee had had two subjects under consideration, one of which had been referred to them, and the other not; as if they wished to blend them together, and to bring in a bill at their discretion. The committee was appointed to report what means would be the best to be taken for the protection of our commerce; but the subject which they had brought before the house was, whether the revenue officers of the United States had performed their duty in respect to an existing law, which was a distinct thing, and entirely out of the reference which had been made to them. If the revenue officers had acted improperly, it was a subject necessary to be enquired into, on information being received through a proper channel. The attention of the committee ought to be confined to the business referred to them, and they should report accordingly. He was opposed to the motion, since it was wholly contrary to the practice of the house to go into details, before they had settled the principle upon which they were about to act.

Mr. Gallatin believed, when this committee was appointed, it was not intended that it should have the power of reporting by bill. The business of the other six committees appointed at the same time, and to whom this power was given, were wholly different in their nature from this. [He read the different resolutions.] The principle of the objects upon which these committees were appointed to act, had already been more or less settled in the house; but what was the business of this committee? It was no less than to report the measures proper to be taken for the protection of our commerce and the defence of our country. The President in his speech, had spoken at large on these subjects [Mr. Gallatin read an extract from the address of the President.] This reference, he said, embraced all the objects which had engaged the attention of congress during their extraordinary session; it did not only include arming of vessels, but also the raising of armies, building of a navy, erecting of arsenals, &c. that so far from giving this committee farther power, he thought the power already given them was too great, and that the subject should first have been discussed in a committee of the whole on the state of the union.—When principles of this importance were to be established, the business should be settled in the house. He should, therefore, be wholly opposed to granting the liberty required.

Mr. Rutledge did not think the committee had exceeded their powers in taking this subject under their consideration. They had nothing to do with the revenue officers; they would, of course, shew that the provisions already made respecting the arming of merchant vessels, had proved inadequate. Orders, it was well known, had been issued by the President of the United States to prevent the arming of vessels; but, in many instances, these orders had been protected against. The President had said merchants should not arm their vessels; the merchants had said, the President had no authority to forbid them. He thought this business should be looked into and adjusted; and he did not see upon what ground gentlemen could charge the committee with bringing forward projects. [Mr. Nicholas here interrupted Mr. R. and said he had no particular meaning in using the word projects.] Mr. R. said if there were any project in hand, he was unacquainted with it. He had not been in the house long enough to know whether the practice of reporting by bill was novel; but he believed it was not.

Mr. Sitgreaves said, the intent of the

appointment of Select Committees was, that they should produce facts and lay them before the House in a collected view; they might properly be called the *Pioneers of discussion*. The best mode of doing this, committees themselves must be the best judges of. Some subjects would be best presented in the abstract; others would require to be detailed. Suppose two cases, said he, before a committee—the one a proposition for private, the other for public arming. If the committee should propose the building of more vessels at the public expence, this would be unconnected with any detail; it would be a single question, and would require no light from the committee; but if the subject was a Private Armament, a plan would require to be detailed, before a judgment could be given upon it; as it would be proper to be permitted or restricted, according to circumstances. The committee, said he, on this account, ask to have the power to present the present business in such a view as to give the House the best means of determining on their proposition. The request ought, therefore to be complied with, since they are the best judges of the proper mode of presenting the subject, as they alone are fully possessed of the facts respecting it.

Mr. N. Smith was surprised that any gentleman should be opposed to giving the Committee leave to report by bill; because, in doing this, they could not possibly do any harm, though they might give themselves unnecessary trouble. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Gallatin) seemed to think the principle could not be discussed when a subject was in the form of a bill; but this was not the case. It was true that the principle of a question was frequently determined before a bill was brought in; but it might just as well be done afterwards and if the principle were objected to, the Committee would, of course have lost their labour. He thought when a Committee were willing to risk this trouble, the House could have no reasonable objection to it. It might be, as had been represented by the gentleman last up, that the principle of a subject could not be judged of, without the detail; when a Committee fore-saw this, it was certainly their duty to report in detail.

Mr. Thatcher did not understand the ground upon which this motion was opposed. It was certainly no new practice. The plan for establishing a new militia system, had been reported in a bill, as an illustration of the report. He hoped the Committee would be allowed to report their detail in a bill.

Mr. J. Williams was opposed to a report by bill. The powers granted to this Committee, he said were very extensive, which would be discussed, and adopted, and a bill ordered to be brought in, or rejected, as was thought proper. The Committee of ways and Means had the subject of Revenue generally referred to them; they gave their opinion, from time to time, as to the best mode of raising revenue, but they had no general power given them to report by bill; he hoped the same course would be observed by this Committee.

Mr. Nicholas (having obtained leave to rise the third time) said this question was important, not only as it related to the business before the house, but with respect to their general proceedings. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Thatcher) had spoke of a bill accompanying a report, in the case of the militia system, as an illustration of it. If this would satisfy the Committee, they could do this in the present case. He was surprised that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Sitgreaves) should not consider this an abstract question. At the last session, it had been considered as an abstract question, and rejected. And could any gentleman say, that at this time, when our connection with the world is much happier than it was six months ago, this question ought not to be considered abstractedly? What, said he, should we have thought of the committee, if they had asked for leave to bring in a bill to build ships of the line; to erect fortifications; to raise armies, &c.? Would these propositions have been considered as mere matters of form? On the contrary, would not the house have revolted at such a proceeding? They certainly would. They would have thought it proper, first to have enquired whether our means were adequate to effect these schemes. Yet they were, all at once, asked for this power, by the present proposition. In the last session, the house proceeded very differently. A resolution was laid upon the table and committed to a committee of the whole and there fully discussed, and solemnly rejected; but they were now inclined to treat the business with more levity. He trusted, however, the house would not consent to this mode of proceeding.

Mr. Otis said the present motion was opposed on account of its novelty, though he believed the novelty would more properly attach to the opposition. He believed there never had been an instance, whether the subject was of great importance or otherwise, in which, when a request like the present had been made that it had been refused. Was it then right, because such a proposition was made, to speak of the movers of it, as if they were about to propose the building of a Naval Force, or the raising of armies in battle array? He thought not, and insisted upon the propriety of the proposed privilege being allowed, which he believed, so far from being used improperly, would be the means of keeping out of view the abstract question of arming, which was not necessary at present to be touched.

Mr. Isaac Parker was in favour of granting the leave asked for, as it appeared to him to have been the practice of the house.

Mr. Varnum insisted upon it that it had never been the practice of the house to take up great national questions, until the principle had been decided upon in committee of the whole. It had been said leave had never been refused in a similar case; but he believed it had never been asked. It was well known there was a great difference of

opinion in the house on the subject of arming. The President had again recommended to them, all the measures with respect to that business, that he had before suggested, and they were about to give the power to a committee to report bills upon all of them. It had been said by a gentleman before him that the President had done wrong in forbidding the arming of vessels.

Mr. Rutledge denied having so expressed himself; he had said that the Merchants had said so.

Mr. Varnum observed it was intimated the President had been wrong in issuing the order; and if a bill was brought in on the subject he supposed the conduct of the President would be impeached by it. He trusted, therefore, this business would not originate in the form of a bill.

Mr. Dana was ready to give the Gentleman last up due credit for his solicitude with respect to the President of the United States—but he could not be ignorant that the law was doubtful as to its construction, and it was proper that this doubt should be removed; and would it, he asked, be any imputation on the conduct of the President to pass a law to say what was the true construction of the former law? Certainly not.—Mr. Dana referred to what had fallen from Mr. Nicholas in objection to the business being introduced by a bill; there was no doubt, he said, but if that were the case, that gentleman's ingenuity could introduce something to produce a discussion of sufficient length, as it would be recollected he had furnished a debate of three weeks by a single proposition to amend an answer to the President's address at the last session. He was confident that as the committee had asked for leave to report by bill, it ought to be allowed, and denied that the present was an abstract question.

Mr. Gallatin allowed that it had been the practice of the house to grant the power to report by bill, when it was asked; but he knew of no instance where a committee, appointed for general purposes, had asked this leave. They had several standing committees; but they never came forward at the beginning of a session to ask leave to report by bill. He had already said that he thought this committee improper, and he repeated that at no time did he recollect business of so important and general a nature being referred to a select committee; the proper reference would have been to a committee of the whole on the state of the union. As this committee had been appointed, he should not now, however, move to have it discharged. If it were wished to report a bill on the specific subject mentioned, if the motion was so expressed, he should not object to it. In regard to the general proposition he did not wish to see it at present discussed. He believed the fate of the present negotiation must decide the opinion of the house on this subject. If it terminated as they all hoped, the subject of arming would naturally drop; but if not, and the depredations on our commerce were continued, there would be no difference of opinion about arming our merchant vessels, at least if not going further. He wished, therefore, that this subject might not at present come under discussion.

Mr. Thatcher again spoke at considerable length in favour of the motion.

Mr. Findley was opposed to this mode of proceeding. It was cutting off a part of their deliberations on important matters, and he should be sorry to see the ordinary mode of doing business, in this respect, changed.

Mr. S. Smith was certain, if the committee had foreseen that this motion could have produced so long a debate, it would not have been made. They thought it the best way of bringing the business before the House; he was indifferent which way it was done. Before the last session, he said, the President had issued orders to prevent the sailing of any armed vessels, except to the East Indies—Congress took up the subject, and it seemed to be admitted, on all sides, that there was a natural defence in Merchants to prevent their vessels being taken. The subject of the President's order was taken into consideration; and he believed it was generally allowed that the President was not authorized by law to issue this order. This being the general opinion, it was conceived by Merchants that they might, as heretofore, arm their vessels in their own defence.—Some ships, however, attempting to clear out, were stopped by the Collectors. A new order was issued by the President, which gave a further privilege of arming vessels to the coast of Africa. Injurious consequences had arisen from this. He knew a vessel which sailed from the United States to the coast of Africa, armed for gold dust and ivory, which was attacked by a British armed vessel, but instead of being taken, she took the British vessel. The consequence was, the captain was prosecuted for piracy and thrown into gaol. This, Mr. Smith said, was a breach of neutrality, which called for a law to prevent it. The Committee thought they could effect the business in the best manner by a bill, and therefore asked leave to bring it in.—Mr. Smith was of opinion Merchants had a right to arm their vessels, and he thought this right was countenanced by the act for prohibiting the exportation of arms, as arms on board of merchant vessels, for the purposes of defence, were excepted from the operation of the act.

Mr. Venable had no objection to allow a bill to be brought in upon a particular subject, but could not agree to the leave being granted.

Mr. Sitgreaves, Mr. Gallatin, Mr. Otis, and Mr. Varnum each made a few observations as to this mode of proceeding.

Mr. Pinckney said, much had been observed as to precedent; he did not know what had been the practice, but he believed it was within the power of the house to agree to the motion, which he thought desirable. He took notice of and answered the objections to this mode of acting. By bringing in a bill, he said, they should prevent the abstract question from being agitated. In general, he thought the house should avoid abstract questions, as many errors arose from this mode of acting. Besides, if the question was particularly striking, it might not be clearly understood and in consequence rejected. The gentleman from

B. A. L. L.
MR. BYRNE'S first Ball will be this Evening, 12th December, at O'Eller's Hotel, when several new Country Dances for the ensuing season will be introduced, composed, and figures adapted, by Mr. Byrne, for the amusement of the company in general.
The Dancers to be opened at six, and the Ball to commence at seven. Gentlemen's Tickets one dollar each, to be had at O'Eller's—Ladies' Tickets, gratis, for the season, of Mr. and Mrs. Byrne, No. 114, north Sixth Street. Dec. 8.

The City Dancing Assembly,
is unavoidably postponed till the 14th inst.—Dec. 2.

For Sale by the Subscriber,
12 Tails Coffas
40 do. Basses
11 do. Mamoodies
17 do. Chinz
7 do. Tow'ery
5 do. Gorah
25 do. Moragungoes
3 do. Check Stripes
2 do. Guzzie
1 box Dispers
7 do. Umbrellas
25 pipes fine Cardinal Madeira Wine, of the vintage 1795.

MORDECAI LEWIS.
December 4. 307 47

Imported in the brig Eliza,
Capt. HASTIE, from Bourdeaux;
Clear in cases of a very superior quality, White Sauterne Wine in Cases,
Olive Oil in bottles of 12 bottles each,
White and coloured Kid Gloves,
do. do. Bill do.
A few pipes of Bourdeaux Brandy,
For Sale by
JAMES LATIMER, Jun.
71, South Wharves.
Who has also for Sale,
A few qr. Casks Old Sherry Wine.
Dec. 3. d2w

JUST RECEIVED,
(via New-York)
AND NOW OPENING, BY

GEORGE DOBSON,
No. 25, South Third Street,
An extensive and general assortment of

HABERDASHERY, viz.
Rich London mixed Pins
Common do. do.
Mahonic's paper, patent
white chapel Needles
Nuns Thread no. 6 to
40, regularly assorted
Lille do. no. 130 to 500,
regularly assorted
Coloured do.
Black sewing Silks
Coloured do. and Twist
Silk and cotton Wires
Do. do. Ribbands
shirt Moulds and Wires
Black brush Feathers
And a complete assortment of Goods, suitable to the present and approaching season, at reduced prices
Dec. 6. dtf

FOR SALE,
By JOHN MILLER, JUN. & Co.
No. 8, Chestnut Street,
One hundred and eighty bales
BENGAL GOODS,
Amongst which are,
Currahs Mamoodies
Bassas Sannas
Guzzahs Tania Coffees
Guzzies Emerites
Blue Cloths Calicoes
Palampoons Romall Handkerchiefs
Amongst them are a great proportion of the manufactures of Patna.
December 1. S

THE PARTNERSHIP OF
Richard & James Potter,
is this day dissolved, by mutual consent. All persons indebted to the said firm, are requested to pay the same to either of the subscribers; and all persons having any demands against them, are requested to send their accounts for settlements.
Richard Potter,
James Potter.
December 9. S

URIAH SMITH,
No. 20, north Third Street—HAS FOR SALE,
A neat and general assortment of
Broad Cloths, Kerseys, Napts
and Drib Coatings. ALSO,
A variety of Gentlemen's fashionable fancy Wash-coating, silk Hosiery, &c.
December 5. *codw

PROPOSITION.
A handsome and roomy house, with a quantity of good land, within a few miles of this city. A house in an eligible situation, and several Lots in the city.
A valuable body of Land on the river Ohio. Also, many tracts of fine Lands (military rights) lying near the Ohio, on the Miami and Sioto Rivers.
Titles are all clear, and will be made with unexceptionable security.
A resident of this city is desirous of exchanging this property for Goods—East or West India would be preferred.
If the specie value of those Lands at a distance, cannot be ascertained satisfactorily, they shall be rated at such a price as the purchaser may have at his option to return them at the fixed price with interest, at the expiration of twelve months.
Notice left with the Editor shall be attended to.
December 6. S

Philadelphia and Lancaster Turnpike Company.
THE Stockholders are hereby notified, that the annual Election for Officers for the ensuing year, will be held at the Company's Office in Philadelphia, on the second Monday in January next, at 10 o'clock, A. M. Wm. GOVETT, Sec'y.
December 7. 218 m&w7j

French Circulating Library.
JOSEPH E. G. M. De LA GRANGE,
No. 116 Walnut Street,
INFORMS those who wish to resort to the only means of becoming perfect in the French Language, that he has just opened his LIBRARY, consisting of upwards of 1250 volumes, the best calculated to afford either useful instruction, or pleasure. The conditions, together with a catalogue of the Library, may be seen at every book-seller's in town.
N. B. All translations from and into the French, English and Spanish Languages, executed with accuracy and dispatch. COIM NOV. 15.

Geentel Boarding & Lodging.
A Family may be accommodated at a Drawing Room, two Bed Chambers, and suitable accommodation for servants—at No. 53, north Fourth Street.
Dec. 5.—118