must be kept up even in peace. I never yet have voted for a regular army or soldier in time of peace. Whenever an opportunity has offered, I have voted them down, and so long as God, I will as long as I live. And so long too I am disposed to stand our own arms. Lay aside this bill and appropriate half a million for arms, and I will vote with you. Look at the regular armies which exist against the Indians. Look at their defeats, and the money which has been spent. The state of Kentucky alone of the U. S. and our regulars and militia, for Nebraska west of the Indians—and yet we talk of regular troops. These troops be supported in sufficient number to repel attack without endangering liberty.

If you are disposed to support liberty be content with regular troops if you dare. However disposed for peace the time must arrive when we cannot avoid war and the moment which consigns the sword of defence to mercenary troops destroys the noble shield of freedom. I have been led further on this subject than I intended to go, as I rose only to reply to the gentleman from N. York; and before he makes his remarks on the subject, I would advise him to apply to the Secretary of War to know how many cannon there are on good carriages in the city of N. York. Contrast the way you have walked in the past and seen one cannon, cannot propel so far what in the real war time.

Mr. MASTERS said he had not said there was but one cannon in New York, but there not but a few, and that would be found to be the fact. He has seemed the gentleman wanted an inferior, unless an equal situation. He has told the House that he had voted down every soldier, and by God he would. I would, said Mr. M., that the gentleman had here shown his superior skill as a statesman. I will not contend with militia; I believe them a brave set of men, and will they were armed as long as we want some regulars. I do say that the nation is not in a state of defence against any. No assertion can convince me to the contrary; for from facts we know that we are not in a state of defence. These are facts which cannot be controverted, notwithstanding the gentleman's declaration.

Mr. R. R. WILLIAMS observed, that after what had been said by the gentleman from Virginia as to the superiority of the militia he did not nothing more than brand it in it, and that he should like to hear it over again. The gentleman from Virginia had told them true; this measure had often been before the House, and as often been attempted to be made the entering wedge to a standing army. My honorable colleague, said Mr. W., has given some reasons in favor of the bill. The same reasons would operate for raising 3000 men, why 30,000 may be raised. If 3000 men were to prevail, might not, he inquired, from Congress in which he hoped will long continue, a standing army of 30,000 men. A United States have place at this time both present and in the history, when stand the fact in relation to some cannon; but as the blame may fall upon the Secretary of War he will observe that the cannon were under the charge of the Secretary of War, and not; and that against those where what they took did not take place of Fort Mimms and the fault rests with him. I understand the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Southard) to urge the propriety of raising an additional force to defend our seaboard cities. We ought not to be at a loss to know what we shall believe for that purpose. The probability is that who to employ has usually subsided. I understand the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Vance) to put into a bind our frontiers against the Indians. But was not the fact that he was employed to prevent transgressions of our people in the Indian country, and not to pledge our protection on us? I think it was so.

Mr. R. W. Williams said that this debate had taken rather a curious course, for they were discussing a war hypothetical, because, forsooth, the gentleman opposite proposed a military force, and the gentleman from Ohio, who had spoken had gone into a discussion of a regular establishment, thing could more fitting show the propriety of raising, while the proposed establishment, and the war establishment was decided on. For myself, said he, I would rather think it ridiculous for the gentleman to come here and vote for 30,000 of a regular army on one side or militia on the other. These measures, he saw, in fact, had, as it were, been dispensing to attend to the subject now before the House. It was by no means, he said, his intention to subscribe the doing of such a number of men as the gentleman had. At the purpose before we determine what shall be done in peace. I do not agree with the proposition from Virginia (Mr. Rogers). I think if we have recourse to the militia, we have a sufficient force for military, and that we ought to adopt, rise the business, as they at this Congress tell us of arming the militia, it is little more than a phantom. I believe, said with respect to the idea of giving the people protection with them arms, it will more fitting. Have we very few effective men in the country cannot who have not arms. They have arms and which they can manage much more than any arms that Congress them. When it is suitable to get arms I shall have no objection to place them in the hands of the militia. But to talk of arming the militia when we are talking of raising a military force is irrelevant. I think the committee should rise in this subject to be intended as an measure of the peace establishment, & take up a measure adapted to prepare for war, and therefore I wish the peace establishment to lie the table, and immediately to take up the bill to raise a permanent army. If we do this, the reason properly that bill can be raised, if we have peace it will be time enough then to determine how or against an addition to the peace establishment. Let us examine the subject as it present itself; when in war, let us adopt war measures; when at peace, we may adopt peace measures. There are my impressions; and I hope some force to them. I hope will rise, and for this a great reason is the very uneasy which this discussion has raised.

Mr. GARDNER hoped the committee would not rise. Reason had been given why the bill of its question in favor of the raising of the militia; that the bill might not be put to sleep in that way by a refusal again to consider it. Instead of putting to sleep sleep wise, we now rather the fashion, he hoped it would be decided on principle; that they would go on with it and decide on its merits. As to the principle of the bill he could not see clearly, easily perceive the necessity for the additional force contemplated by the bill, and he would not see any possible danger to arise from it. In the Atlantic states, said he, we do not, he hoped, want an augmentation of the peace establishment. The country being pretty fully inhabited protection itself a power to repel assault. But in regard to the western frontier, and on our frontiers, so defenceless and exposed, the militia would be component for defence and protection. They ought to have a force adequate to not to prevent, at least to repel to transgressions of the Indians. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Vance) in our duty demand, said he, to the people of the country have not in themselves the means of protection from the Indians; and being so exposed to the country after it is over-run, in doing so you will have to march a force in the country, and protection you have left defenceless, who have approached you with supplications and tears. I, said he, for one, will myself responsibility of this kind. I do protection to the country, and every individual however mean or object his condition; and where-ever there is a single individual the whole community is secured. I wish particularly, from the alarms in the western country, that we ought to establish a force which shall be sufficient to repel internal as well as external aggression. I have heard from that country, all cause of national alarm; and I hope, said that we are as much alive and sensible to their interests as to our own—that we consider the Indian country as one great political body, every part of which it is our duty to protect. We have, said he, the government, and will leave to conspirators little hope of succeeding in attempts to overthrow the government. If you act otherwise you open a door to the wildest conspiracies. In every point of view therefore an augmentation of the standing military force is necessary, and necessary. I am as hostile to a standing army as any gentleman; but I do not feel every the apprehension and execution of a standing army. There would be but little fear of our being employed to attack individuals; and there is no evil to apprehend from augmentation. Independent of considerations of immediate danger, we ought not to adhere too closely to the principle of not augmenting or lessening our military peace establishment. This is not an age of the world in which public measures are to be indulged. If in other ages it has happened that liberty has been overset by a standing military establishment, we do know that in the age in which we live power and might sway the destinies of the universe. We know that no nation is secure except it be strong, not strong enough to be in a condition to exercise its power. However pleasing it be to indulge in pacific measures the time, he was must be powerful and in a situation to exercise our power, or we are not secure. Nothing of the can secure us. In every measure therefore, which has for its object this security I shall readily concur. I am not converted in detail—but I will leave to others. It is unnecessary at this time to throw off our political, constitutional and philosophic character, and assume one more commanding, which I can by justice yet by the fears which it inspires may be preserved. On the one side I shall be ready to vote against opposes standing force in every shape, and on the other I think those wrong who oppose the militia. The militia be employed and both to good purpose, but we should always have in view the peculiar circumstances of the country. It is not enough to be talking about the insult on the Chesapeake or to be dealing out anathemas against the British nation. This may produce a true spirit, but that feeling which is necessary for the protection of the country, I fear, will be lost, or by to listen to the trifling in. jury which we might receive from a standing force when the public good requires it. We should therefore not only talk but act, that before the moment arrives in which we must meet the calamities of war we may be prepared for it as much as in our power. If we raise this force the expense will be but little for comparatively we will rise, and pay if exempt from the burthens attendant on a state of war. We have no fear our present force, the idea of our citizens which may be indulged in the country cannot be regained. The maxim will not do that justice may rely on the militia. Let it be left to others, but others are not so to us. Power only can ensure justice. The same principle that allowed fortifications on our sea shore, I would go still further and allow them for protection of the western country. My only objection to the bill is that the amount of force to be raised is doubtful what the bill provides.

Mr. DANA said perhaps it might be thought by some gentlemen always to vote against measures which seemed to emanate from the Senate. He had heard a person who always voted against the measures of the Senate on the grounds of money. It is a safe course to pursue, said he, when the question is popular, he will be exempt from reproach; if it unpopular no injury will fall with him for it. I cannot boast as the gentleman from Virginia, that I have always voted against regular troops, that I have always voted against the militia. I have not so much confidence in my own wisdom as to suppose that I have had such an uniform opinion that I never will vote against the militia, or against regulars, as that every country which has lost its liberty has lost it by a standing army, and that a country which has not a standing army is free. Does the gentleman mean to say that no country can be free without a standing army? I would apply to any man of them, and I would ask them if they would not be well armed, and he would tell me that for garrison duty they are peculiarly fitted. I would not be understood to vote on the frontiers, taking care of the Indians, and protecting the rights of constant, regular, and preserving the national tranquillity. I would not be of all modes of garrisoning posts the most well adapted to preserve the tranquillity and disaffectedness to the people—at least such is the opinion I have been led to form. As regards arms at fixed stations, you certainly have a right to expect to be provided with them; & certainly as regards improvements, I think it is the duty of the country, you want some more them.—Need the House be reminded of the necessity of keeping those positions which command great portions of the country in a state of perfect preparation? Need any one be informed of the importance of the Mississippi? Need any one be informed of the importance of the Mississippi? Need any one be reminded of the importance of the Mississippi? Need any one be reminded of the importance of the Mississippi? Need any one be reminded