

To be Sold by Auction,
At the Coffee House on Thursday Evening, June 29th, at 8 o'clock, the following Lots of ground, situate on Sixth Street, opposite to the State House Garden: viz.
Lot 1. Beginning at the South East corner of George and Sixth Streets, 21 feet wide and 133 feet deep.
2. adjoining lot 1, 20 feet wide, 133 feet deep.
3. adjoining lot 2, 19 feet wide, 130 feet deep.
4. adjoining lot 3, 19 feet wide, 130 feet deep.
5. adjoining the fourth side of the loganian library, 23 feet wide, 130 feet deep.
These lots are bounded on the westward by the 30 feet alley that runs from George to Walnut Street, of which alley they have the privilege.
Conditions of sale, one fourth cash, the remainder in approved notes at 4 and 6 months, with interest.
Footman & Co. Auctioneers.
June 23.

The Commissioners
FOR carrying into effect the sixth article of the treaty of amity, commerce and navigation, concluded between his Britannic Majesty and the United States of America, on the 19th day of November, 1794, having this day constituted their Board, pursuant and agreeably to the said treaty, do hereby give notice, that they are ready to proceed to business accordingly, and they desire that all claims under the said article (which so far as the said treaty describes the cases thereby provided for, is heretofore amended) may be lodged with their Secretary without delay.
They further desire that all such claims may not only state in what manner the said cases come within the description of the said article, but also specify the facts and the nature of the evidence by which the claimants respectively undertake to substantiate the same.
Extract from the said article.
"Whereas it is alleged by divers British merchants, and others his Majesty's subjects, that debts to a considerable amount, which were bona fide contracted before the peace, still remain owing to them by citizens or inhabitants of the United States; and that by the operation of various lawful impediments, since the peace, not only the full recovery of the said debts has been delayed, but also the value and security thereof have been in several instances impaired and lessened, so that by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, the British creditors cannot now obtain and actually have and receive full and adequate compensation for the loss and damages which they have thereby sustained: It is agreed that in all such cases where full compensation for such losses and damages cannot for whatever reason be actually obtained, and had received by the said creditors in the ordinary course of justice, the United States will make full and complete compensation for the same to the said creditors: but it is distinctly understood, that this provision is to extend to such losses only as have been occasioned by the lawful impediments aforesaid, and is not to extend to losses occasioned by such insolvency of the debtors or other causes, as would equally have operated to produce such loss, if the said impediments had not existed; nor to such losses or damages as have been occasioned by the manifest delay, or neglect, or willful omission of the claimant."

By order of the Board,
GRIFFITH EVANS,
Secretary.
Philadelphia, Commissioners' Office,
No. 3 fourth Sixth Street, May 29,
1797. J 6-5 fm

THE SUBSCRIBER having been appointed by the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of his Britannic Majesty, General Agent for assisting British creditors, and such particular agents as they may specially authorize, in prosecuting their claims before the commissioners for carrying into effect the sixth article of the Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation between his Britannic Majesty and the United States of America, hereby gives notice that he has opened his office at his house the fourth east corner of Chestnut and fifth streets, Philadelphia, where he is ready to receive all claims or instructions for claims with the vouchers and documents thereof, for the purpose of bringing forward the same agreeably to the rules and orders which the board may think proper to prescribe.
And as it will be for the interest of all concerned, that the several claims be so stated, and supported, as to prevent the delay which would arise from the necessity of obtaining further information, or additional materials, from persons residing at a distance, the general agent thinks it his duty to add, (for the direction chiefly of those who, not having employed particular agents, may leave the prosecution of their claims to his charge and management) that all such claims ought to be particularized so far forth as the proper description and situation of the creditor or claimant, and original debtor, respectively.
1st. The date or nature of the original contract or debt.
2d. When, in what manner, and to what extent, the creditor or claimant was prevented or impeded, by the provision, operation or defect of law, the decisions and practice of courts, or restraint of execution, from recovering payment of the debt in question.
3d. The loss and damage incurred or sustained, in consequence of such impediments, whether the same may have arisen from the insolvency, change of situation, or death of the debtor, the loss of legal remedy from lapse of time, or other causes impairing the value and security of the debt, which would not have operated if such impediments had not existed.
4th. The particular grounds and reasons on which the claimant maintains, in the terms of the treaty, that "by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, the creditor cannot now obtain and actually have and receive full and adequate compensation" for the losses and damages so sustained.
The general agent thinks it his duty further to suggest that the several claims ought to be accompanied and supported by the affidavits of the claimants duly sworn and regularly attested, both as to the existence of the debts claimed, and such other circumstances as may be within their own knowledge respectively. And wherever the claimants in stating the nature of their evidence (which must in every instance be the best of which the case is capable) have occasion to refer to the testimony of witnesses, it will be proper to apprise the general agent of the names and places of residence of such witnesses and the facts to be established by their testimony.
Wm. Moore Smith.
Philadelphia, June 28, 1797.

A Cow Stolen
FROM the owner at the corner of Ninth and Arch streets. She is a deep red brindle with some white, about ten years old and very gentle. The person who secretes her had best turn her out, as, if legal evidence can be obtained, he may expect a rigorous prosecution. TWO DOLLARS reward will be given to any person who will deliver the Cow, or give such evidence against the person keeping her, that he may be convicted of the fact. Apply at
No. 218, Arch Street.
June 9. taw3w.

Imported in the Ship Pigou,
And for sale by John Morton, No. 116, South Front Street,
Hyson
Hyson Skin
Young Hyson } TEAS
Imperial
April 20. totf

C O N G R E S S .
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
May 31.

Debate on Address, reported in answer to the President's Speech.
Mr. DAYTON, (the Speaker) said that the tedious length of debate and unprofitable waste of time which the first amendment occasioned, had determined him to submit his proposition to the Committee and without troubling them with any comments to leave it to its fate. The criticism which it had provoked from the gentleman from South Carolina would have justified him in departing from that determination, even if there had been no other inducement, but as several gentlemen had desired a modification of his motion, he rose more immediately to gratify them, as he found he could do it without affecting the principle.
Mr. DAYTON here particularly pointed out the alteration which he consented to make in his amendment; which being accordingly made and read by the Chairman,
Mr. DAYTON said that he trusted that all parts of the house were impressed with the importance of their being united at a time and upon an occasion so critical, when the eyes of a considerable part of Europe were turned upon them, and when they had been informed that their Addresses to the President, far from passing unnoticed, had probably already influenced the conduct of some of the European powers towards the United States.

With this information before them, he hoped that gentlemen would not obstinately persist in maintaining their ground without yielding in the least to each other, and in resisting all advances towards accommodation, especially when it appeared that their difference was confined to words, or at most, to forms, and that in substance they were almost all agreed. From all parts of the committee a disposition had been avowed to place France on grounds as favorable as other countries, and not a wish had been uttered to the contrary even by the member from S. Carolina until yesterday. Believing himself that the United States were thus favorably disposed towards that Republic, and very much preferred an honorable accommodation to an unprofitable warfare with them, he had thought it his duty to offer an amendment avowing such principles. He had before said, and now repeated, that he was desirous of maintaining peace, so long as it could be effected without the loss of independence, or national dishonor. He trusted that he should not be charged with a want of zeal in the cause, if he did not particularly answer the arguments and follow the footsteps of those gentlemen who had taken it upon themselves to arraign France like a culprit at their Bar, and to compel the committee to fit, as it were, in judgment upon the conduct, the motives and the designs of that Republic, not in relation to the United States whose interests alone were confided to the care of their Representatives, but in respect to the nations of Europe, who had been leagued for her destruction, and with whose internal regulations and political connexions that house had nothing to do. If truth had permitted, decency, Mr. D. said, should have forbidden the members to address the nations of Europe, & to say to one nation, you are enslaved; to another, you are oppressed, and to a third, you are deceived, and your monarch held in leading strings by the French Republic under the semblance of Friendship. Policy and decorum should equally have restrained gentlemen from such reflections at a time when Representatives from those very nations were received and accredited as the Ministers of Nations, sovereign and independent as ourselves, and permitted not only to reside in our Metropolis, but to sit within their walls and listen to their debates. If they were discussing the means of maintaining the balance of Europe, and were deliberating into which scale the United States would throw themselves as *make weights*, then indeed such observations might be more pertinent and justifiable, but as the question really was, *by what means the peace of this country should be honorably preserved*, he could not see the propriety of such reasoning. Mr. Dayton hoped he should not be accused of want of spirit, if he did not assume the high tone of menace which some gentlemen had done, if he did not talk of war, as a mere matter of pastime, or of conquering whole provinces, as if they had only to walk over and make them their own, or of buckling on the armour of hostility, and of dying in the last ditch. He had conceived that this country might exhibit becoming firmness, without rushing into intemperance and that they might shew a proper spirit of resentment without exhibiting the rage of a madman. Fortunately for them, it was not necessary that they should crouch as suppliants at the feet of a master and hold out a *carte blanche*, to have inscribed on it the terms of their submission and peace, nor on the other hand to assume the posture of Gladiators and found the trumpet of defiance. He nevertheless felt the full force of the indignity which had been offered us in the rejection of our minister, and he owned that he could not calmly hear the French Republic addressing the United States in terms the most imperious and saying "this law you must repeal, these decisions you must rescind, those engagements you must annul before we can have further communion or intercourse with you." Such language was unwarrantable and insulting. But a desire, still if possible to conciliate, rather than to make war, and a sense of gratitude, not yet extinguished in his breast, induced him to moderate his indignation, although it did not prevent his resisting such improper attempts to interfere in the Government. The recollection of what France had been to us, in times the most critical, would incline him still to address her, and to say, "You Frenchmen were our first, you have been our best Ally. You alone came forwards to our assistance, at a time when that

country who called herself our mother, and whom we had been proud to acknowledge as such, not only threw us from her protection but endeavoured to reduce us to unconditional submission. When every other nation fled from our alliance, and all other people avoided any intercourse, treating us rather as rebels than as men struggling for our just rights, then you, people of France, or (if gentlemen prefer it) your monarch, strong in your strength, rich in your wealth, supported by your will, nobly held out a helping hand for our protection, and acknowledged and granted our Independence. Then was signed that compact which united your fate and interests with ours. But if owing to change of circumstances, that treaty operates now to your injury, we will no longer hold you to its observance. That which you generously granted in 1778 as a pledge of friendship, we as liberally restore to you in 1797, when it is in your opinion unequal, and has become a source of disgust to you. We agree that it should be cancelled. Our laws made for the preservation of our neutrality and peace we cannot repeal, the decisions of our courts we cannot rescind, our engagements with foreign powers we cannot violate, but we freely consent to cancel that compact subsisting between us, which prevents your participating in the favors granted to Great-Britain in the treaty of 1794. This obstacle removed, the three articles of Mr. Jay's treaty, viz. that of neutral ships not protecting enemy's property, that regulating what shall be contraband, and the provision article can be extended to you." This, Mr. Dayton said, was the language which he conceived to be most proper and dignified on the present occasion. He, however, resisted the construction which had been put upon the second article of the treaty of 1778, and had been the pretext for passing the decree of the 2d of March, and by no means admitted that France could claim those favors as a right. Altho' he could never consent to repeal the act of Congress of 1794, nor to violate in the least our engagements and treaties with other nations at the requisition of France, or any foreign power, because the independence, the honor and good faith of the U. States forbade it; yet he should rejoice to learn that our government would think proper to offer at the very commencement of the negotiation to annul the French treaty, in which their minister says they find only disadvantages. This he believed would be found to be the truest policy also in respect to all other nations whose treaties with us should, from change of circumstances, cease to be equal and reciprocal. They would otherwise be the sources of hostility rather than of friendship and good neighbourhood. The amendment which he offered to the committee of the whole had expressed a hope to that effect, that the disposition (which was not questioned) in our government to place France on grounds as favorable as other countries, joined to a mutual spirit of conciliation, would produce an accommodation compatible with our engagements, rights, honor and interests. If he had believed that such a disposition did not exist in this country, or that the expression of a hope that it would effect an accommodation, could be fairly construed into an improper interference with the executive authority, he should have been among the last to advocate a motion of such tendency, but on the contrary it contained in it nothing dictatorial or imperious, and as the speech of the President invited them to give an opinion relatively to the contemplated negotiation, he was persuaded that it was not liable to any constitutional objection; and that it might have a conciliatory effect. After making these general remarks, Mr. Dayton said it might be proper to take some notice of the objections of the gentleman from S. Carolina (Mr. Smith) which were at conflict with each other. He said "France would be offended at the proposal;" if that were true, then agreeable to the doctrine of his colleague (Mr. Harper) it would inspire them with respect for us; but he added also that France would "laugh at the proposal" this was indicative of contempt, and Mr. D. did not see how they could look upon it with such opposite sensations at the same time. The same gentleman went on to say that to place France on grounds as favorable as other countries, would be to put her on a worse footing than she then stood, and yet in almost the next breath he declared, that the representatives would betray the interests of their constituents if they did not demand from that Republic some compensation in return for granting them such favors. These were inconsistencies which the gentleman must reconcile before he could be entitled to a more particular answer. Mr. Dayton then took notice of what had been urged against his amendment, as improperly dictating to the Executive, and as a violation of the constitution, and shewed that it was neither the one nor the other. He concluded with saying that such a sentiment might have an influence in preparing the way for the favorable reception of their negotiators, and prove the harbinger of peace between the two countries.

THURSDAY, JUNE 22
(Concluded from yesterday's Gazette.)
Mr. OTIS did not think that the object of the mover of this amendment would be obtained by it, since he believed vessels would be as much exposed to danger within as without the jurisdiction of the United States. He trusted they should leave this business to the President; for whatever personal objections gentlemen might have to him (because he was not the man of their choice) he believed the people at large would be willing he should have this power. Indeed he thought whatever it might display of candour in the gentleman to say they had no confidence in the first officer of Government, it had very little of discretion in it. It was to destroy one of the objects of the session, which was to shew to the world that we were not a divided people.
Mr. O. did not say that Congress had not

a right to designate the object of this force; but he believed it would not be convenient; for, said he, suppose either of the Barbary States were to declare war against us (and they all knew there was no certain reliance upon their observance of treaties) should not the President have a right to send those vessels into the Mediterranean? Or suppose we wanted to send an Ambassador to a foreign country, or dispatches to our Minister residing there, shall we, said he, limit his power in this respect?
He denied that the House had expressed an opinion favorable to a limitation of the employment of the frigates, by their decision upon the subject of the galleys: The equipment of the galleys was an extraordinary measure, intended for temporary exigencies, and as it was a new force placed in the hands of the Executive, it might be proper to avow its destination, and thus avoid the appearance of hostile intentions. But the frigates were an ordinary peace establishment, provided long before our confederacies with the French; a law had passed the last session for completing their equipment, in which no mention was made of the mode of employing them; in making provision for manning and sending them to sea, we exercised a right in the regular course of legislation, for which we were not accountable; and if the amendment prevailed, he thought three wooden towers would be quite as useful as confidence.
It seemed to be the object of gentlemen, Mr. O. said, to hang a dead weight upon every measure, to prevent any thing effectual from being done, that an idea might go abroad that the President had called them together unnecessarily. If gentlemen could succeed in this, the people might adopt their opinion, and believe the President was unworthy of their good opinion.
He thought when all the world was in arms, and we did not know how soon we might be involved in the calamity, it behoved us to be upon our guard, and to give the President such powers as should enable him to take proper measures of defence against any attack that might be made upon us.
Mr. MAON thought every thing which had been introduced about confidence, or the want of it, in the President, was extremely irrelevant and improper. For gentlemen to charge others with a want of confidence in the President, because they happened to disagree in opinion, was extraordinary conduct. His reason for proposing the present amendment, was to prevent these vessels from being sent to the Mediterranean or the West Indies. He read an extract from the law in 1794, to shew that the object of the frigates was there designated to be against the Algerines. His object was now that they should be employed on the coast, and no where else. If a provision of this kind was not agreed to, they knew, from his speech, upon what business the President would employ them. He had given his opinion to the House with candour, and he wished the House to be equally explicit.

Mr. CALLAHAN observed it seemed to be the opinion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, that if they defined the object upon which these vessels were to be employed, they should be chargeable with disrespect to the President. We have, or we have not a right, said Mr. G. to define the object. If we have not the right, we ought not to exercise it; but if we have the right, there could be no disrespect shewn to the President by an exercise of that right. It might be improper, but could not be disrespectful. If once such an argument as this were admitted, it would be introduced on every occasion when it would have weight. Indeed the gentleman said that such an assertion was likely to have its weight on this question, and therefore introduced it. He wished to know whether the clause from the Senate did not define the object; and if so, whether that body could be charged with wanting respect for the President?
The object of the frigates had never been defined, for a good reason; because they were never ordered to be manned till now. The gentleman from S. Carolina had said they were not to be used for any hostile purposes whatever. He wished to know how they were then to be employed? He thought they would be somewhat expensive *packet boats* to carry dispatches abroad. He knew only of two purposes for which they could be used, viz. to be held in readiness in case of war, and in the mean time to be employed in some purpose or other, which he thought should be defined, and not left in doubt. He therefore hoped the amendment would be agreed to.
Mr. DANA said, admitting that they had a right to define the object of this armament, it was no reason why they should insist upon exercising it. He agreed that they had the right. He had no objection to leaving the business to the President, except that, if the vessels were employed in conveying our commerce, he should have wished to have shared the responsibility with him. He denied that the danger which had been predicted could arise from the disputed articles in the French treaty, as the President had a right to give such instructions to the commanders on that subject, as he saw proper.
Mr. W. SMITH thought the proposition vague, since it did not say the vessels should not be used in any other way. Gentlemen were begging the question, when they said, that if the business were left with the President, the consequence would be that the vessels would be employed as a convoy, since he did not believe they were equal to that object. It was his wish that the hands of the President should not be tied, and that it extremely imprudent at the present time to discover a want of confidence in the Executive.
Mr. KITFERA had often seen that House attempt to take powers which did not belong to it. He thought this one of those cases. They had power to raise an army and navy, but the use of them lay with the President.

Mr. S. SMITH said they had been called together, because the French had committed depredations on our commerce, and refused to receive our Minister. He took notice of the different acts which they had passed this session, till he came to this, which, in his opinion, if our vessels went out to sea, would lead to war, and therefore he wished to have them limited.
When our Council were in France, said Mr. S. the French Directory will ask: For what are you arming? Your Congress has been called together for the express purpose of taking measures against us. They would add, "Disarm, or we will not treat with you." He trusted they should not put it in the Power of any branch of government to plunge us in war. It had been said by the gentleman from S. Carolina, that we were to force our way into the rebel ports in the West-Indies; if so war must be the consequence.
Mr. BROOKS was surprised to hear a gentleman declare that we were brought to such a situation that we could not take up arms in our own defence, without offending a foreign nation. He was the more affected at the declaration, because it came from an American Soldier. "Mr. Barras says the gentlemen will say to the commissioners, 'Go home and lay down your arms, and we will then treat with you.'" He hoped the gentleman would retract this humiliating sentiment.
The question was put and negatived 52 to 44. The committee then rose and had leave to sit again. Adjourned.

The bill for raising a Provisional Army had been rejected in the Senate, by a majority of three votes.
FRIDAY, June 23.
A message from the Senate informed the House, that they had passed a bill making a detachment of the militia of the United States; and also a bill preventing the registering of vessels taken by any foreign vessels, and afterwards purchased into the United States, except to the original owner, with amendments. The amendments were taken up and agreed to.
The House again went into a committee of the whole, on the bill providing for the protection of the trade of the United States, when
Mr. VENABLE renewed his motion to alter the sixth section of the bill, so as to fix the wages to be allowed to the petty officers, midshipmen, seamen, ordinary seamen, and marines, instead of leaving it to the President to fix them, on the ground of its being legislative and not executive business.
This motion was opposed, from the circumstances of wages being so fluctuating as to make it impossible to say now what would be a proper rate of wages to be given when the vessels were ready to receive their men; and as the sum was fixed not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars per month, no mischief could arise from leaving the business with the executive.
The question was put and negatived, 48 to 37.
Mr. PARKER moved to add two new sections to the bill: the first was "to authorize the President of the United States, if he deem it necessary, to increase the strength of the revenue cutters, so as that the number of men do not exceed to each in order to defend the sea-coast, and to repel any hostile vessels, and to protect the commerce of the United States within the jurisdiction thereof, having due regard to their duty in the protection of the revenue."
The second section provided, "That the additional compensation allowed to the men employed in the revenue cutters, by an Act of May 6, 1796, should be extended to the additional men proposed to be employed."
Mr. NICHOLAS wished, instead of the words "if he deem it necessary," in the first clause, to introduce those used on a former occasion, when the galleys were under consideration, viz. "if circumstances shall hereafter arise, which, in his opinion, shall render it expedient."
Mr. W. SMITH saw no difference between the two phrases, except that the one proposed was not so well expressed as the original. He wished the gentleman to say in what the difference consisted.
Mr. NICHOLAS said, that by the words as they now stood, they referred to the President what it was their duty to determine for themselves. He wished to have an eye to any future occasion which might arise; but if the clause passed as it now appeared, the President might immediately go into the business.
Mr. PARKER consented to adopt the words of Mr. Nicholas.
Mr. S. SMITH and Mr. PARKER introduced two or three small amendments, which related to the number of lieutenants, sergeants, corporals, &c. to be employed, which were agreed to.
The bill having been gone through,
Mr. R. WILLIAMS proposed to amend the first section of the bill, by adding, after empowering the President, should be deemed it expedient, to cause the frigates to be manned and employed, "provided they shall not be employed as convoys."
Mr. GILES hoped this amendment would be agreed to. He wished to define the object for which these vessels should be employed, that there might be no misunderstanding on the subject. Mr. G. insisted that the French nation had a right to enquire of our commissioners for what we were arming? And if this amendment were agreed to, it would be a sufficient answer.
Mr. W. SMITH said, if this amendment were agreed to it might go farther than it was meant to go. The frigates might not be able to protect the trade of the United States at all. He did not suppose they would be employed in conveying our vessels to the West-Indies; but if this provision passed, it would not be possible for them to protect our trade from the capes of the Delaware to the capes of Virginia.
Mr. S. differed in opinion from the gentleman last up that the French nation had a right to take umbrage at our arming. When

country who called herself our mother, and whom we had been proud to acknowledge as such, not only threw us from her protection but endeavoured to reduce us to unconditional submission. When every other nation fled from our alliance, and all other people avoided any intercourse, treating us rather as rebels than as men struggling for our just rights, then you, people of France, or (if gentlemen prefer it) your monarch, strong in your strength, rich in your wealth, supported by your will, nobly held out a helping hand for our protection, and acknowledged and granted our Independence. Then was signed that compact which united your fate and interests with ours. But if owing to change of circumstances, that treaty operates now to your injury, we will no longer hold you to its observance. That which you generously granted in 1778 as a pledge of friendship, we as liberally restore to you in 1797, when it is in your opinion unequal, and has become a source of disgust to you. We agree that it should be cancelled. Our laws made for the preservation of our neutrality and peace we cannot repeal, the decisions of our courts we cannot rescind, our engagements with foreign powers we cannot violate, but we freely consent to cancel that compact subsisting between us, which prevents your participating in the favors granted to Great-Britain in the treaty of 1794. This obstacle removed, the three articles of Mr. Jay's treaty, viz. that of neutral ships not protecting enemy's property, that regulating what shall be contraband, and the provision article can be extended to you." This, Mr. Dayton said, was the language which he conceived to be most proper and dignified on the present occasion. He, however, resisted the construction which had been put upon the second article of the treaty of 1778, and had been the pretext for passing the decree of the 2d of March, and by no means admitted that France could claim those favors as a right. Altho' he could never consent to repeal the act of Congress of 1794, nor to violate in the least our engagements and treaties with other nations at the requisition of France, or any foreign power, because the independence, the honor and good faith of the U. States forbade it; yet he should rejoice to learn that our government would think proper to offer at the very commencement of the negotiation to annul the French treaty, in which their minister says they find only disadvantages. This he believed would be found to be the truest policy also in respect to all other nations whose treaties with us should, from change of circumstances, cease to be equal and reciprocal. They would otherwise be the sources of hostility rather than of friendship and good neighbourhood. The amendment which he offered to the committee of the whole had expressed a hope to that effect, that the disposition (which was not questioned) in our government to place France on grounds as favorable as other countries, joined to a mutual spirit of conciliation, would produce an accommodation compatible with our engagements, rights, honor and interests. If he had believed that such a disposition did not exist in this country, or that the expression of a hope that it would effect an accommodation, could be fairly construed into an improper interference with the executive authority, he should have been among the last to advocate a motion of such tendency, but on the contrary it contained in it nothing dictatorial or imperious, and as the speech of the President invited them to give an opinion relatively to the contemplated negotiation, he was persuaded that it was not liable to any constitutional objection; and that it might have a conciliatory effect. After making these general remarks, Mr. Dayton said it might be proper to take some notice of the objections of the gentleman from S. Carolina (Mr. Smith) which were at conflict with each other. He said "France would be offended at the proposal;" if that were true, then agreeable to the doctrine of his colleague (Mr. Harper) it would inspire them with respect for us; but he added also that France would "laugh at the proposal" this was indicative of contempt, and Mr. D. did not see how they could look upon it with such opposite sensations at the same time. The same gentleman went on to say that to place France on grounds as favorable as other countries, would be to put her on a worse footing than she then stood, and yet in almost the next breath he declared, that the representatives would betray the interests of their constituents if they did not demand from that Republic some compensation in return for granting them such favors. These were inconsistencies which the gentleman must reconcile before he could be entitled to a more particular answer. Mr. Dayton then took notice of what had been urged against his amendment, as improperly dictating to the Executive, and as a violation of the constitution, and shewed that it was neither the one nor the other. He concluded with saying that such a sentiment might have an influence in preparing the way for the favorable reception of their negotiators, and prove the harbinger of peace between the two countries.

THURSDAY, JUNE 22
(Concluded from yesterday's Gazette.)
Mr. OTIS did not think that the object of the mover of this amendment would be obtained by it, since he believed vessels would be as much exposed to danger within as without the jurisdiction of the United States. He trusted they should leave this business to the President; for whatever personal objections gentlemen might have to him (because he was not the man of their choice) he believed the people at large would be willing he should have this power. Indeed he thought whatever it might display of candour in the gentleman to say they had no confidence in the first officer of Government, it had very little of discretion in it. It was to destroy one of the objects of the session, which was to shew to the world that we were not a divided people.
Mr. O. did not say that Congress had not

a right to designate the object of this force; but he believed it would not be convenient; for, said he, suppose either of the Barbary States were to declare war against us (and they all knew there was no certain reliance upon their observance of treaties) should not the President have a right to send those vessels into the Mediterranean? Or suppose we wanted to send an Ambassador to a foreign country, or dispatches to our Minister residing there, shall we, said he, limit his power in this respect?
He denied that the House had expressed an opinion favorable to a limitation of the employment of the frigates, by their decision upon the subject of the galleys: The equipment of the galleys was an extraordinary measure, intended for temporary exigencies, and as it was a new force placed in the hands of the Executive, it might be proper to avow its destination, and thus avoid the appearance of hostile intentions. But the frigates were an ordinary peace establishment, provided long before our confederacies with the French; a law had passed the last session for completing their equipment, in which no mention was made of the mode of employing them; in making provision for manning and sending them to sea, we exercised a right in the regular course of legislation, for which we were not accountable; and if the amendment prevailed, he thought three wooden towers would be quite as useful as confidence.
It seemed to be the object of gentlemen, Mr. O. said, to hang a dead weight upon every measure, to prevent any thing effectual from being done, that an idea might go abroad that the President had called them together unnecessarily. If gentlemen could succeed in this, the people might adopt their opinion, and believe the President was unworthy of their good opinion.
He thought when all the world was in arms, and we did not know how soon we might be involved in the calamity, it behoved us to be upon our guard, and to give the President such powers as should enable him to take proper measures of defence against any attack that might be made upon us.
Mr. MAON thought every thing which had been introduced about confidence, or the want of it, in the President, was extremely irrelevant and improper. For gentlemen to charge others with a want of confidence in the President, because they happened to disagree in opinion, was extraordinary conduct. His reason for proposing the present amendment, was to prevent these vessels from being sent to the Mediterranean or the West Indies. He read an extract from the law in 1794, to shew that the object of the frigates was there designated to be against the Algerines. His object was now that they should be employed on the coast, and no where else. If a provision of this kind was not agreed to, they knew, from his speech, upon what business the President would employ them. He had given his opinion to the House with candour, and he wished the House to be equally explicit.

Mr. CALLAHAN observed it seemed to be the opinion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, that if they defined the object upon which these vessels were to be employed, they should be chargeable with disrespect to the President. We have, or we have not a right, said Mr. G. to define the object. If we have not the right, we ought not to exercise it; but if we have the right, there could be no disrespect shewn to the President by an exercise of that right. It might be improper, but could not be disrespectful. If once such an argument as this were admitted, it would be introduced on every occasion when it would have weight. Indeed the gentleman said that such an assertion was likely to have its weight on this question, and therefore introduced it. He wished to know whether the clause from the Senate did not define the object; and if so, whether that body could be charged with wanting respect for the President?
The object of the frigates had never been defined, for a good reason; because they were never ordered to be manned till now. The gentleman from S. Carolina had said they were not to be used for any hostile purposes whatever. He wished to know how they were then to be employed? He thought they would be somewhat expensive *packet boats* to carry dispatches abroad. He knew only of two purposes for which they could be used, viz. to be held in readiness in case of war, and in the mean time to be employed in some purpose or other, which he thought should be defined, and not left in doubt. He therefore hoped the amendment would be agreed to.
Mr. DANA said, admitting that they had a right to define the object of this armament, it was no reason why they should insist upon exercising it. He agreed that they had the right. He had no objection to leaving the business to the President, except that, if the vessels were employed in conveying our commerce, he should have wished to have shared the responsibility with him. He denied that the danger which had been predicted could arise from the disputed articles in the French treaty, as the President had a right to give such instructions to the commanders on that subject, as he saw proper.
Mr. W. SMITH thought the proposition vague, since it did not say the vessels should not be used in any other way. Gentlemen were begging the question, when they said, that if the business were left with the President, the consequence would be that the vessels would be employed as a convoy, since he did not believe they were equal to that object. It was his wish that the hands of the President should not be tied, and that it extremely imprudent at the present time to discover a want of confidence in the Executive.
Mr. KITFERA had often seen that House attempt to take powers which did not belong to it. He thought this one of those cases. They had power to raise an army and navy, but the use of them lay with the President.

Mr. S. SMITH said they had been called together, because the French had committed depredations on our commerce, and refused to receive our Minister. He took notice of the different acts which they had passed this session, till he came to this, which, in his opinion, if our vessels went out to sea, would lead to war, and therefore he wished to have them limited.
When our Council were in France, said Mr. S. the French Directory will ask: For what are you arming? Your Congress has been called together for the express purpose of taking measures against us. They would add, "Disarm, or we will not treat with you." He trusted they should not put it in the Power of any branch of government to plunge us in war. It had been said by the gentleman from S. Carolina, that we were to force our way into the rebel ports in the West-Indies; if so war must be the consequence.
Mr. BROOKS was surprised to hear a gentleman declare that we were brought to such a situation that we could not take up arms in our own defence, without offending a foreign nation. He was the more affected at the declaration, because it came from an American Soldier. "Mr. Barras says the gentlemen will say to the commissioners, 'Go home and lay down your arms, and we will then treat with you.'" He hoped the gentleman would retract this humiliating sentiment.
The question was put and negatived 52 to 44. The committee then rose and had leave to sit again. Adjourned.