

Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FEBRUARY 18.

Mr. Lattimore observed, that in addition to the various objects embraced by several petitions which had been referred to the committee on public lands, relative to lands in the Mississippi territory, there were others, an attention to which seemed necessary, as well to do justice to individuals, as to facilitate the execution of the business of the land office west of Pearl river. In order, therefore, that the subject might undergo a proper investigation, he begged leave to offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That the committee on public lands be instructed to enquire—

Whether it be expedient to confirm any claims to lands in the Mississippi territory, founded upon warrants or orders of survey, which were not inhabited and cultivated on the 27th day of October, 1795, agreeably to the first section of the act, entitled "An act regulating the grants of land, and providing for the disposal of the lands of the U. S. south of the state of Tennessee."

Whether it be expedient to repeal so much of the first section of the said act, as precludes persons under the age of twenty-one years, and not heads of families, from the benefits of the provisions of the section aforesaid.

Whether it be expedient to make provision by law, for reimbursing pre-emption claimants in such sums as they may have paid to the U. States in the event of their being evicted of the lands for which such sums may have been paid, by a judicial decision in favor of any grant not derived from the U. S.

Whether it be expedient to invest the commissioners west of Pearl river, with such extensive equitable jurisdiction, as may enable them to guard, on the one hand, against the admission of claims, which may be supported by a literal construction of legal provisions, though founded in fraud; and to confirm, on the other hand, those which may not be thus supported, though founded upon principles of justice and equity: And also,

Whether any, and if any, what further amendments ought to be made to the act aforesaid: And that they have leave to report by bill or otherwise.

FRIDAY, Feb. 14.

The bill allowing Gen. Rapp and his associates to locate a township of land in the Indiana territory on certain conditions, was read a third time.

Mr. Jackson moved to recommit the bill.

Messrs. Jackson, Merrivether, Ely, Olin, and Clark advocated, and Messrs. Smilie, Sloan, Nicholson, Conrad and Leib opposed this motion; which was carried, and the bill referred to a committee of the whole House on Monday, Ayes 62—Nays 53.

Mr. J. C. Smith, from the committee of claims reported that it was not proper to take any order on the petition of Wm. Lambert, in which report the house concurred.

Mr. Garnett, from the committee charged with a variety of memorials from the Indiana territory, &c. made a detailed and interesting report, which concludes with resolutions recommending the following measures:

1. That the 6th article of the ordinance of 1787, which prohibits slavery in the Indiana territory be suspended for 10 years, so far as to admit the introduction of slaves born in the U. States.

2. To extend the elective franchise in that territory to all white citizens of 21 years of age, who have resided there in a certain time.

3. That it is inexpedient to annex part of the Indiana territory to the state of Ohio.

4. That it is inexpedient to divide Indiana into two territories.

Referred to a committee of the whole on Tuesday.

Mr. Sloan from the committee to whom was referred the bill imposing a duty of ten dollars on every slave imported into the U. States reported a bill, with sundry amendments.

The principal feature of the amended bill is a provision, in the case of smuggling slaves into the state of South Carolina, that the secretary of the treasury shall be authorized to remove them into some other state and hire them out for a term of years.

Mr. Jackson moved to reject the bill.

This motion after a short debate, was negatived, and the bill referred to a committee of the whole.

IN SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 13, 1866.

Agreeably to notice given yesterday, Mr. Adams asked and obtained leave to bring in a bill to prevent the abuse of the privileges and immunities enjoyed by foreign ministers within the United States, which was read and passed to the second reading.

A BILL,

To prevent the abuse of the privileges and immunities enjoyed by foreign ministers within the United States.

BE it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the passage of this act, if any foreign ambassador, minister, or other person, entitled to enjoy within the United States the privileges and immunities of a foreign minister, shall commit any violation of the municipal laws which, if committed by a person amenable to the ordinary judicial authority of the place,

where such ambassador, minister, or other person, may be at the time of committing such offence, would be indictable by a grand jury, and punishable by death, by corporal punishment, or by imprisonment or confinement to labor, the president of the United States, upon application made to him by the executive authority of the state or territory where such offence may be committed, or upon the complaint to him of any person injured or aggrieved by such offence so committed, and upon proof of the facts, satisfactory to the said president, being furnished to him in support of such application or complaint, shall be, and hereby is authorized to demand of the sovereign of the said offending ambassador, minister, or other person, justice upon the offender, and reparation to any person or persons thus injured or aggrieved; and in case of the refusal or neglect of the said sovereign, to comply with such demand for justice and reparation, the president of the United States is hereby further authorized to order such ambassador, minister, or other person so offending to depart from the United States, and the territories thereof; or to send him home to his sovereign, according to the aggravation of the offence, and at his said president's discretion.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That from and after the passage of this act, if any foreign ambassador, minister or other person entitled to enjoy within the United States the privileges and immunities of a foreign minister, shall within the United States or the territories thereof, commit any act of hostility or enter into any conspiracy against the government of the United States, or shall personally insult or treat with disrespect the president of the United States for the time being, the said president shall be, and is hereby authorized at his discretion, to order the said ambassador, minister, or other person so offending to withdraw from the seat of government and the territory of Columbia, or to depart from the United States and the territories thereof; and in case of refusal or neglect by such ambassador, minister or other person as aforesaid, to obey such order within a reasonable time, of which the said president shall judge, the said president shall be, and is hereby further authorized to send the said ambassador, minister, or other person as aforesaid, home to his sovereign; and in either case to demand of the said sovereign, the punishment of such offending ambassador, minister, or other person as aforesaid, according to the nature and aggravation of the offence; and conformably to the laws of nations.

Sec. 3. And be it further enacted, That in every case, when the president of the United States shall, under the authority of this act, order any foreign ambassador, minister, or other person entitled to enjoy within the U. States the privileges and immunities of a foreign minister, to withdraw from the seat of government and the territory of Columbia; or to depart from the United States, and the territories thereof; or shall send any such offending ambassador, minister, or other person as aforesaid home to his sovereign; the said president shall, in the order given to such ambassador, or other person as aforesaid to depart, or to withdraw, signify the offence upon which such order shall be founded; and shall assign to the sovereign of the said ambassador, minister, or other person as aforesaid, the reasons for which such order shall have been given, or for which the said ambassador, minister, or other person as aforesaid shall be sent home; particularly specifying that such proceedings are not on account of any national differences, but on account of the personal misconduct of such ambassador, minister, or other person as aforesaid.

On Friday the Senate resumed the consideration of the following resolution:

2. Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to "demand & insist upon the restoration of the property of their citizens, captured and condemned on the pretext of its being employed in a trade with the enemies of Great Britain, prohibited in time of peace; and upon the indemnification of such American citizens, for their losses & damages sustained by these captures & condemnations;" and to enter into such arrangements with the British government, on this and all other differences subsisting between the two nations (and particularly respecting the impressment of American seamen,) as may be consistent with the honor and interests of the United States, and manifest their earnest desire to obtain for themselves and their citizens by amicable negotiation, that justice to which they are entitled.

Messrs. Worthington, Adams, S. Smith, Adair, Pickering, Bayard, Tracey, Anderson, and Maclay delivered their sentiments.

When a motion to recommit the resolution for the purpose of amending it, was lost; Ayes 15, Nays 16

Mr. Worthington then moved to strike out the words quoted from the 2d to the 10th line.

Messrs. S. Smith and White opposed the motion, which was disagreed to; Yeas 13, Nays 16.

Mr. Thurston moved to postpone the resolution for the purpose of previously taking up and acting upon the third, which prohibits the importation into the United States of a variety of articles, the growth, produce, or manufactures of Great Britain, after the day of next, unless equitable arrangements shall be made between the United States & Great Britain.

This motion was lost; Ayes 13.

Messrs. Israel Smith and Bradley then spoke against agreeing to the resolution. The principal ground taken by them was that it became the Senate to take stronger ground, and to adopt vigorous measures, before they requested the executive to resume negotiation.

Mr. Tracy advocated the resolution. He did not think negotiation exhausted. He thought it became the Senate to make one further attempt towards negotiating our differences, before a resort was had to warlike measures. The President would be enabled to take this step, by the Senate, who were a branch of the war declaring power, expressing their support of the measures he had taken, at the same time that they requested a renewal of the negotiation.

Mr. Moore, moved to strike out the words "and insist," which motion prevailed.

Mr. Worthington said that, so modified, he should vote for the resolution.

Messrs. Logan, Kitchell and Pickering spoke in favor of the resolution, and Mr. Israel Smith, against it; when after some verbal amendments, the question was taken upon it, by Yeas and Nays, and the resolution carried—Yeas 23—Nays 7.

In the course of the remarks offered by different gentlemen, the principal source of difference appeared to be, whether it was proper under existing circumstances to request the Executive again to resort to negotiation. Those gentlemen who opposed the resolution thought it became the government to take higher ground; to arm the President with the means of enforcing a compliance with our just demands, and to leave every thing else to his discretion. On the other hand, it was thought by the friends of the resolution most eligible, that the President, supported by the legislature, with whom resides the constitutional right of declaring war, should make one more solemn appeal to the justice of Britain.

The third resolution remains yet to be acted upon.

MR. MADISON'S MOTION

For commercial restrictions, in a committee of the whole House, on the report of the Secretary of State, (Mr. Jefferson) on the privileges and restrictions on the commerce of the United States, in foreign countries—Made January 3, 1794.

Resolved, as the opinion of this committee, that the interest of the United States would be promoted by further restrictions and higher duties, in certain cases, on the manufactures and navigation of foreign nations employed in the commerce of the United States than those now imposed.

1. Resolved, as the opinion of this committee, that an additional duty ought to be laid on the following articles manufactured by European nations, having no commercial treaty with the U. States.

On all articles of which leather is the material of chief value, an additional duty of per cent. ad valorem.

On all manufactured iron, steel, tin, pewter copper, brass, or articles of which either of these metals is the material of chief value, an additional duty of per cent. ad valorem.

On all articles of which cotton is the material of chief value, an additional duty of per cent. ad valorem.

On all cloths of which wool is the material of chief value, where the estimated value on which the duty is payable, is above per cent. ad valorem; where such value is below an additional duty of per cent. ad valorem.

On all other articles of which wool is the material of chief value, an additional duty of per cent. ad valorem.

On all cloths of which hemp or flax is the material of chief value, and of which the estimate value on which the duty is payable is below an additional duty of per cent. ad valorem.

On all manufactures of which silk is the material of chief value, an additional duty of per cent. ad valorem.

2. Resolved, as the opinion of this committee, that an additional duty of per ton ought to be laid on the vessels belonging to nations having no commercial treaty with the U. States.

3. Resolved, as the opinion of this committee, that the duty on vessels belonging to nations having commercial treaties with the United States ought to be reduced to per ton.

4. Resolved, as the opinion of this committee, that where any nation may refuse to consider as vessels of the U. States, any vessels not built within the U. States, the foreign built vessels of such nation ought to be subjected to a like refusal, unless built within the U. States.

5. Resolved, as the opinion of this committee, that where any nation may refuse to admit the produce or manufactures of the United States, unless in vessels belonging to the United States, or to admit them in vessels of the U. States, if last imported from any place not within the U. States a like restriction ought, after the day of next, to be extended to the produce and manufactures of such nation, and that, in the mean time a duty of per ton extraordinary, ought to be imposed on vessels so importing any such produce or manufacture.

6. Resolved, as the opinion of this committee, that where any nation may refuse to the vessels of the United States, a carriage of the produce or manufactures thereof, whilst such produce or manufactures are admitted by it in its own vessels, it would be just to make the restriction reciprocal; but inasmuch as such a measure, if suddenly adopted, might be particularly distressing in cases which merit the benevolent attention of the United States, it is expedient for the present, that a tonnage extraordinary only of be imposed on the vessels so employed; and that all distilled spirits imported therein, shall be subject to an additional duty of one part of the existing duty.

7. Resolved, as the opinion of this committee, that provision ought to be made for liquidating and ascertaining the losses sustained by citizens of the U. States, from the operation of particular regulations of any country, contravening the law of nations, and that such losses be reimbursed in the first instance, out of the additional duties on the manufactures, productions and vessels of the nation establishing unlawful regulations.

FROM THE AURORA.

POCKET MONEY!

It appears that the Hungarians have found out, that there is a price paid for their legs and arms, as was formerly in the war of the American revolution set upon the heads, legs and arms of the Hessians.

It was that orthodox royalist Edmund Burke, who compared Hesse and Brunswick to shambles—and reprobated with an eloquence that was irresistible, the barbarous traffic carried on in men; the letting out for a sum of money, for a given number of guinees, men for the purpose of cutting American throats, in support of the government of the most religious prince George III; the price was at the beginning, only £. 20 sterling for the Hessian carcass dead, and if living with the loss of an arm the price was reduced to £. 10 sterling, if a leg; the price was £. 20, that is, the dead carcass brought the price of Brunswick more pocket money, than a leg or an arm lost; and even a leg or an arm lost was more productive than the whole individual alive.

It was on this account that the Hessians and Hanoverians during the American revolution; were constantly placed in the post of danger; where the greatest quantity, of legs, arms, & dead carcasses was likely to be made; for as the object was to provide pocket money for these christian princes; the more danger, the more honor, and the more pocket money.

What a balancing of accounts that must have been, which took place after the war of our revolution; the capture at Trenton was indeed a fortunate capture for the poor Hessians; and even for the prince of Hesse; for he was paid by England as for so many dead men.

The French revolution put an end to the princely Hessian traffic in human carcasses; but we find that one market yet remains open for this trade—it now appears that the king of England, and he is allowed on all hands to be more attached to the church (of England) than any of his predecessors from Henry VIII. downward—this religious king has entered into an agreement, and formed a tariff, with one of the electors of Germany, to wit the elector of Hanover—do not start reader it is a matter of fact! a tariff for the supply of live carcasses; it is only a renewal of a former contract between the same two governments for the like ends, which took place in 1794; whereby the elector of Hanover agreed to furnish the king of England with some twenty thousand white negroes, natives of Hanover, who were to be employed on the plains of France and Holland, to work in blood in the support of the religion and liberties of Europe.

This is sporting with serious things—the reader will say; but those who will say so, must feel the severity of this sport; they will see, that when we touch this bloody theme—this impious scoffing of the majesty of Heaven; the blasphemy which fasts and prays and effects the love of God and man, and the practice of morality; and at the same time makes such contracts for such purposes; they who are shocked at our sporting with serious things, will feel angered only by its truth, and its irrefutable severity.

During our revolution—during the French revolution—and at this time—a contract was and is in force, on the one part the king of England is the contractor, and on the other part the elector of Hanover is the contractor; the latter lends to the former, say 40,000 men, with the conditions annexed, that the king and parliament of England pay for the food and raiment, and the materials for murder of these white negroes; and the lords and commons and the whole bench of bishops, did in the two former instances, make a due and legal ratification of the contract and a provision by law therefor—with this further condition, that for every Hanoverian killed in the service of the king of England, the elector of Hanover should get 130l. sterling, (the price of the commodity has been enhanced to 40l. since)—and so in proportion for—the sicces.)

This advance of price was not an act of the prince of Hesse;—no, he was not so selfish; it was the elector of Hanover who, without considering or making any allowance for the sensibility of the most pious and religious king in Europe, his majesty George III. whom all the world agrees has immortalized his reign—the elector of Hanover it was that insisted, on advancing the price of white Hanoverian negroes 25 per cent. there was a great deal of higgling about it—but it was at length settled (sometime before the duke of York was at Dunkirk) that the price should be 40l. a carcass.

Now the black negroes imported from the vital colony at Sierra Leone, with the stamp of Wilberforce upon them, sell at 200 to 500 dollars; so that the black negro of Africa is rather above par in the carcass market—And let us not do the dealers in black stock too much injustice—the traffic is black and abominable enough—but surely those who are admirers of the traffic in Hanoverian negroes—and the higgling about the prices of heads, legs and arms; are the last who should deprecate the black! Yet we know that among the most ardent sticklers

for black emancipation (and if they were consistent their ardor would be entitled to honor and veneration!) among these sticklers for the emancipation of the blacks—we find the most ardent admirers and advocates of the white negro traffic carried on between the king of England and the elector of Hanover.

Who does not recollect the accounts in the British Gazettes of 1794 and 1795, of the triumphs of the Hanoverian general Walmoden—and their forced marches, and above all their forced retreats, through Holland—who can reflect on the effect without a sigh—the pocket money which the king of England paid to the elector of Hanover on this occasion, was in proportion to the valor of Walmoden; who was always the first in action, and the dexterity of English manoeuvre was such that the Hanoverians under the gallant Walmoden were always the last out—if they could get out—for of 35,000—about 13,000 only got back—the rest took possession of Holland or Flanders, six feet a man, and were paid for to the elector of Hanover, 40l. a head!—23,000 Hanoverian white negroes at 40l. a head, 920,000l.—this may be only, say four millions of dollars.

Did this money go to the wives, or the mothers, the fathers, or the brothers, or even to the children of those who had been killed in Holland and Flanders under the gallant Walmoden? No. Where did it go then?

Into the pocket of the elector of Hanover!

And who paid the money?

The unfortunate people of England.

And who is the elector of Hanover?

The king of England—the principal on both sides of the contract.

What shall we say to these things!

THOMAS PAINE said long ago—that monarchy was the "master fraud" of all frauds.

Yet, what is more common than The same persons who admire the Hanoverian contractor, admire T. Paine.

These contradictions of character form a cruel and sad satire on mankind; but they form useful matters for reflection to every man who has a spark of real christian charity and sobriety in him.

The Hanoverian general Walmoden always covered the retreat—literally with whole battalions of 40 pounders.

These 40 pounders always explained the change of a manoeuvre, if the 40 pounders were in the rear, and the French in front, then the gallant duke of York, countermarched or changed front, or formed a column on his left—we recollect an instance, there were 2000 of the 40 pounders killed in one battle, this was 80,000l. sterling, or 360,000 dollars, for only one day's work—pocket money.

Our readers must recollect an account of the royal feast at Frogmore in England; little more than a year since we published it, all the feast—all the vintages—all the liquors, were served up in vessels of gold.

The number of persons confined for debt at the same moment in England was said to be 21,000.

But when the elector of Hanover could get 360,000 dollars for one day's killing of Hanoverian white negroes—can it be surprising, on the one hand that he should have feasts at Frogmore with vessels of gold.

Or, that 20,000 men should be in debt and in prison.

The Hanoverians from 18 to 40 years of age, are again called into the field—and as the tariff stands at 40l. a head; should Bonaparte cross from Olmutz to Dresden, and it is little more than half the distance from Ulm to Vienna; it is impossible to foretell what quantity of pocket money the elector of Hanover would have—but there is no doubt that we should hear of the loyalty, the fidelity to their prince, and the death of thousands of unfortunate Hanoverians—of men who when they are not in the field, are not possessed of arms nor trusted, loyal as they are, with their own defence.

We cannot avoid just remarking what a satire on despotic governments, is the capture of the arms at Ulm, at Vienna, at Inshbruck, at Brennuau, at Bruun:—In a despotic government the people are not trusted with arms in their own hands; they are laid up in magazines; the people therefore are ignorant of the use of arms, and conscious that they are not trusted; that their government is a master fraud, and their governors therefore afraid to trust them.

NEW YORK, Feb. 15.

Latest foreign news.—In addition to the articles furnished by Charleston papers received at this office, we have to add, that the London Courier of the 19th December is received in this city, stating that, in consequence of the shipwreck of the Messenger from Lord Harrowby, his dispatches had not come to hand. A Hamburg Mail, however, was received on the 19th, confirming the account of the Austro-Russian Victory, and detailing a few additional particulars. It is stated, that on the 2d of December nothing decisive was accomplished; but the centre of the Russian army gave way—that on the 3d and 4th the Russian forces renewed the engagement with much spirit and with considerable success; and that on the 5th the Allied Armies rushed forward to attack with redoubled vigor; the action was carried on principally at the point of the bayonet and the sabre—Alexander, of Russia, on this memorable morning, rode in front of his embattled ranks, (exposed to the cannon of the