

ized by the law to accept any grants of land, but only grants of money.

Mr. D. Foster called for the reading of the deed of trust or conveyance which had been so repeatedly referred to. This was accordingly read.

Mr. Giles said he was satisfied with the bill as it stood. The only difference between the substitute and the bill is this, that the bill provided for the conveyance of the property to the United States, whereas the substitute contemplates leaving the property as it is, under the direction of the commissioners. He agreed with the gentleman from New-Hampshire, that a good and legal conveyance could be made by the commissioners; but as the substitute had been agreed to, he saw no material difference in the actual operation of the thing; he did not think that there would be any hesitation on the part of purchasers, whether the sales were made by the commissioners, by themselves, or by direction from the President of the United States. He wished the discussion to proceed;—if the committee should think the objection of importance, the bill might be re-committed.

Mr. Nicholas adverted to the act of conveyance, recited a passage from which he said it was apparent the property stands precisely in the situation which gentlemen would wish it.

Mr. Havens said he did not perfectly comprehend the subject, but it appeared to him that there was an essential variation in the file of the deed of conveyance from that of the law for establishing the permanent seat of government.

Mr. Dayton said that from what had fallen from the gentleman from N. H. it appears that the commissioners were vested with the fee simple of the lots, if so, it was a total uncertainty whether the United States had or could have the least control over the property. If this was the case, he never would give his assent to the bill. The commissioners may refuse to sell or convey. The title to the property ought to be better understood. He considered the business as being highly important, and that the House ought to proceed with great caution and deliberation, and not decide without more information than they were at present in possession of.

Mr. Hillhouse proposed an amendment, the object of which was to place the subject on a footing that could not be misconstrued.

Mr. Brent, recurred to the law, and read the clauses, relative to the grants of land, and of money. With respect to the first, the law vests a discretionary power in the President to dispose of the property in such a way as to answer the several objects of the law, in the best manner. The deed of conveyance goes no further than this: Adverting to the deed, he said it expressly provides for the disposition of the net produce of the sales, as the President of the United States may direct; and the commissioners cannot make any use of it for any purpose that they are not authorized to by the President. Hence he concluded that there was no force in the objection drawn from the deed of trust, nor any ground for fear on this point.

Mr. Swift observed, that there appeared to be such a diversity of opinion relative to the nature of the deed of conveyance, that he conceived it was almost impossible for gentlemen to determine what was the actual state of the security, on which the loan is to be raised.—He moved therefore that the committee should rise.

Mr. Brent opposed the motion: he was rather disposed to attribute this desire of procrastination to a settled determination on the part of some gentlemen not to give their assent to the bill in any shape whatever.

Mr. Crabb said he admired the attention of the gentleman from Connecticut, in his watchful care over the treasury of the United States, but to what purpose is this delay? What is asked, it is simply to guarantee a loan, that is all. To what purpose then the flowers of rhetoric, and declamation. If gentlemen mean something more than they express, let them come forward and kick the bill out of the House. If they intend this, let them say so, and we shall then know on what ground we stand; we shall then be able to meet them on the ground of argument, but to what purpose are the amendments or amendments brought forward, but to perplex and deceive? Mr. Crabb then alluded to what had fallen from Mr. Williams, relative to the grants made to the federal city. Mr. Williams had insinuated, he said, that these grants were so far from a gift that they were a benefit to the donors. Mr. Crabb asked if the gentleman had never heard of the grants made by the states of Maryland and Virginia, seventy thousand dollars by the former, and 120,000 dollars by the latter? The gentleman said that he blushed as a republican at the grandeur of the federal edifices. I believe said he, that we shall look a good while before we see the gentleman blush.

The committee rose, and the bill was re-committed.—On motion four members were added to the committee.

Mr. Livingston brought in a report relative to the impressement of American seamen, which was twice read, and committed to the committee of the whole House on Monday next: Interim to be printed.

Mr. Dearborn moved that the committee on the loan bill, be instructed to this purport, that they enquire, whether any, and what alterations would be proper to be made in the plan adopted for the public buildings in the city of Washington, and to report.

Mr. Murray said he hoped the motion would not be agreed to. He conceived it was useless—No alteration could now take place without great waste and loss. The gentleman does not propose that the buildings should be pulled down. They are now raised and progressed to a considerable extent. They have not cost the United States any thing. They have progressed thus far, thro' the generous donations of two particular states, and he submitted it to the consideration of the gentleman whether it would be perfectly delicate to interfere in the plan, which had been adopted by those states.

Mr. Dearborn said if the committee, on enquiry, should not find any alterations advisable or practicable they would report accordingly. He thought there was no impropriety in the enquiry. With

the propriety of a full investigation into the subject became proper, and he did not conceive that in this situation of the business, it could not be considered as indicate, it was no more than adopting a proper mode to obtain information.

Mr. Crabb objected to the motion. He thought the proposed enquiry very improper. The law said he, has appointed the President of the United States to manage this business. Suppose the enquiry were to take place, and the buildings are found on too large a scale, shall they be pulled down, and smaller ones erected? If gentlemen were indulged, where would their enquiries end? He read the message of the President to the House on the subject, wherein he says the sale of the lots will be equal to the expense of the buildings. It would be well, he said, if gentlemen would gain a little more information on subjects, before they brought them forward. If this had been the case, he thought much of the debate which had occupied the House for several days might have been saved.

Mr. Dearborn acknowledged he lacked information, but that he had attended, without effect, to gain it from his accuser.

Mr. Bourne supported the motion. He conceived that it was strictly proper; the information may be of essential use in governing the decisions of the House in the future disposition of the bill. It is apparent that the supposed extravagance in erecting the public buildings has influenced in clogging the progress of the bill. Perhaps the suggestions which have been started are unfounded, if they are it will appear so. If not they may propose practicable retrenchments, in either case useful information will be obtained.

Mr. Murray hoped that the motion for this instruction to the Committee would not succeed.—The mover had wished for information upon the present state of the public buildings and to know their dimensions, to this he had nothing to oppose but the remark that if the information which was then on the clerk's table could not satisfy him, the time to obtain more from the city would be too long in all reason. On the table he could find the elevation of the Congress House and its dimensions, and he believed of the house for the executive also. Were the object of the motion to obtain this sort of knowledge through the committee, and that the only object, he should have considered it as merely unnecessary and opposed it as it would uselessly accumulate business for the committee and prove a source of delay; but he opposed this motion because it did not demand information merely, but the opinion of the committee whether any, and what alteration was necessary in those buildings. This being the motion he considered it as embarking the house in a principle new and dangerous to the city of Washington. It was the assumption of a power of controlling and of departing from a plan warranted by law, and to the implicit execution of which the faith of the government, through the President acting by his commissioners was completely and solemnly pledged. If you have a right to dictate alterations in any part of that city, then have those who have embarked their whole fortunes under the faith of the act of Congress from whose construction a discretionary power in the President upon this subject was deduced, been in a state of delusion. But he denied the power of the house to act in this way consistently with good faith. The President had the city laid off, he had power to do so. Men of taste, architects of ability and engineers were he presumed consulted as to the plan; sites were determined on for the public buildings; squares, streets and avenues were laid off, each object bore its relation to the other, so as to raise the value of the whole. Individuals have bought property there whose value must result from the completion of the place upon which they speculated. Defer, derange that plan and you do violence to that faith in which purchasers vested. If the motion seeks mere information it is proper. If it asks opinion, it implies a power of alteration and this will vitiate the spirit of the institution. If defects do exist, it is too late to rectify them, and it would be profusion to do it in the way he had heard.

Mr. Thatcher was in favor of general instructions to the committee, and not those of a minute and particular nature. He considered that a minute enquiry involved very extensive consequences, such as he believed were not contemplated by any person whatever.

Mr. Giles proposed a substitute of a more general nature. The motion before the House proposes that the committee should report opinions; his was for a report of facts.

Mr. Dearborn said the motion just read did not go far enough.

Mr. Swanwick was in favor of a minute enquiry into the whole business.

Mr. Gallatin thought that the report should contain not only a state of facts, but also of opinions founded on those facts. Mr. Gallatin said the motion of the gentleman from Virginia did not embrace the object so fully as that moved by the gentleman from Massachusetts. In reply to what had been said relative to the exclusive right to manage the business, on the part of the President, he remarked, that the law had made it the duty of the President to cause the buildings to be erected; and this he had a right to do without consulting the legislature while the expense was confined to the grants by the states of Maryland and Virginia.—But there was one check in the business, and that was in agitating the grant of money on the part of the Union; here the ground was changed, and a right on the part of the government to enquire into the business was the consequence. He was therefore in favor of the first motion, as it went to enquire into facts, but also provided for a declaration of opinions founded on those facts.

Mr. Coit hoped the motion would prevail. He recited some of the expenses which had taken place. These were so extravagant as to occasion great part of the opposition to the bill.

Mr. Giles here read his substitute, with some additions extending the compass of it.

Mr. Murray offered some further objections to the motion: The more he heard it disapproved, the more he disliked it.—He did

Mr. Crabb said he saw no use in the enquiry, but to produce endless and unproductive debates.

Mr. Cooper opposed the motion. He said that all the government had to do in the business was to guarantee the loan, and to secure the eventual reimbursement of it by the lots.

Mr. Sedgwick observed, that contemplating the removal of the government as settled by law, he had thought it but reasonable that the government should guarantee a loan for completing the public buildings necessary for the accommodation of congress on the principles which he had stated. But with respect to the size or elegance of those buildings, erected not at their expense, he very much doubted the propriety of investigating the enquiry proposed. It would, he conceived, have a very singular appearance for the government to say that these buildings are too large, too commodious, or too elegant. He did not care, for his part, how accommodating they were.

Mr. Dearborn's motion was agreed to, 42 to 38.

Mr. Giles's resolution being called for, it was put and carried, to the following effect:

"That the said committee shall be instructed to enquire into the state of the Public Buildings at the permanent seat of Government of the United States, into the expense already incurred in erecting, and the probable expense of completing the same."

Mr. New of the committee of enrolment, informed the House that they had this day laid before the President of the United States for his approbation, the act for the relief of Benjamin Strother.

Mr. Richards had leave of absence for one week. Adjourned.

* * * In the sketch of Wednesday's debates, in yesterday's Gazette, second column, 4th line from the bottom, in Mr. Giles's speech, for contrive read controul.

BENNINGTON, (Vermont.) January 30.
Philad. 5th Jan. 1796.

SIR,

I had this day the honor to receive your letter of the 20th ult. in behalf of the Bennington county convention, enclosing a resolution of that Convention of the same date, expressive of their wish that Mr. Smith and myself would use our best endeavors to obtain the sense of Congress upon the constitutionality of the late treaty with Great Britain. Impressed with the same sense of the value of that liberty and independence for which we have so successfully struggled, and in defence of which I have suffered so much, which you express: I cheerfully listen to the voices of my fellow citizens and friends, in the county of Bennington, upon the subject of the treaty—I regret the diversity of sentiment, productive of unhappy consequences, which has taken place upon that subject.—The question will undoubtedly come before Congress in the course of this session, and I shall without regard to party or place if it was only for my own satisfaction, most assiduously apply myself to the investigation of it? whatever may be the result of my enquiry; my own judgment must be my guide; for though I consider as you do, that I am placed here as one of the Representatives from the State of Vermont at large, and that it is the right of freemen, to become acquainted with the explications, and true meaning of the constitutions of government by them adopted, and as understood by their legal representatives. Yet as you have confided to me a trust, and delegated to me power, to act, I must faithfully exercise that power, according to my best judgment and ability; and when I have industriously employed my small talents to investigate any subject—have made up my mind and am called upon to act, I must decide and act as I should rationally conclude my constituents would do, were they acting with integrity and uprightness, under the same impressions and view of the subjects as I myself at the time possess.

I have a grateful sense of the confidence which you are pleased to repose in me, and consider it as an additional obligation to endeavor still to deserve it—I am sensible that as we have adopted the constitution, it is now to be considered as the expression of the will of the great body of the sovereign people, and as such it is the palladium of our liberty, and it would be treason to violate it.

I have the honor to be, sir,
With sentiments of esteem,
Your most obedient,
and humble servant,

D. BUCK.

P. S. As many in Vermont, whose opinions I respect, have already decided on the treaty, if I should have the misfortune in finally making up my opinion to differ from them in sentiment, I will do myself the honor to send you a statement of the reasons on which I found my judgment.

D. BUCK.

TIMOTHY BROWSON, Esq. }
Chairman of Bennington }
county convention. }

NORFOLK, February 15.

We understand the orders issued by the Governor of this state to detain the horses that were shipped for the West Indies, are countermanded by the Executive of the United States.

Philadelphia,
FRIDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 26, 1796.

The legislature of Rhode-Island has written to the legislature of Virginia on the subject of their amendments to the Federal Constitution, in which they inform them, in substance, that in their opinion, the Constitution has not been sufficiently tried to justify attempting to make the amendments they propose.

Yesterday, in the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. HAMILTON, late Secretary of the Treasury, made a most eloquent speech in support of the Constitutionality of the Carriage-Tax—He spoke for three hours, and the whole of his argument was clear, impressive, and classical. The audience, which was very numerous, and among whom were many foreign and many of the members of Congress, their continual attention

Yesterday the following Resolution, with the Preamble, passed the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

Whereas the people of the United States have, under their present Constitution, enjoyed many eminent advantages, in as much as they have thereby been secured in the blessings of liberty and domestic tranquillity, and have experienced from its influence an unparalleled degree of prosperity, especially in their agricultural and commercial pursuits: And whereas, it would be highly improper to risk a continuance of these inestimable blessings and advantages, by making any alterations in the said Constitution, by the operation of which we are thus prosperously situated, until some disadvantages are found to result therefrom; therefore Resolved, That it is unnecessary and improper for this House to take any measures to procure to the Constitution of the United States the alterations proposed by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

	Yeas.	Nays.
On the Resolution,	45	39
On the Preamble,	42	32

Our Jacobins have been called a faction. They complain of this, and say they are not a faction, but the people. So said the Jacobins of France. But the French nation were not always to be deceived by such means:—they drove these blood-drinkers out of their dens. The public opinion of this country, tho' abhorrent to the shedding of blood, is no less decisive against jacobinism. The mobs and absurd resolutions in the large towns, have been discontinued by the plain and sensible farmers; and thus jacobinism has been confined, with the yellow fever, to dark alleys and the neighborhood of unwholesome docks. The great interest of the country is peace; and the great body of the country people, as well as the men of worth, sense and property, in the sea-ports, have shewn a strong support of the measures that tend to preserve it. Faction has been defined an adherence to interests, inconsistent with the general interest: What then are clubs, to influence elections, and mobs, to overawe a peace-making government, but faction, rank faction? and as such to be detested and suppressed.

It turns out, that those who made the noise about the British Treaty are not the people. The signers of petitions are but as a drop to the ocean. So much clamour, so much lying, so much running, riding and mobbing, and so few names! what can prove more pointedly that the party is weak? Yet more proof to the same point is at hand, tho' it is not needed:—the States, Virginia excepted, raise their patriotic voices against the disorganizers.

Now, citizen Democrats, as the people are decidedly against you, will you persevere against the people? You say (when you expect to raise disturbance by saying it) the voice of the people is the voice of God! Respect that voice, so loudly and solemnly expressed—forebear to raise your wicked hands against this government which they appointed, and which you perceive they resolve still to maintain. You fancy you could delude a majority of one branch of Congress to stop the motions of that government, and to obstruct the lawful doings of the other two branches—will not the people hold you responsible for the anarchy and convulsion that will ensue? will they not in vengeance require their government at your paricide hands!

FOR THE GAZETTE OF THE UNITED STATES.

MR. FENNO,

ONE of the learned Counsel against the Constitutionality of the Carriage Tax, very candidly admitted, that Congress have full dominion over all the resources of the United States; but at the same time took infinite pains to shew the extreme difficulty of exercising this power with impartiality. He seems, however, to have lost sight of one maxim, which is, that in a choice of difficulties, the least exceptionable mode ought to obtain the preference. What tax, for instance, can be more congenial to our republican form of government, than the one calculated to reach the most wealthy class of people? Are they not better able to bear the burthen than the poorer class?—Again, What higher proof can be required of a man's ability to pay taxes than his file of living? Is there not good reason to conclude that he who keeps an equipage is richer than he who has none? most certainly.

The learned Counsel further observed—that the amount of the tax might operate to banish out of use the articles upon which it was laid. When experience shall prove this to be the result, it will be time enough to repeal the tax, provided the article itself is of public utility. But I will ask the learned Counsel, whether it is a fact within his own knowledge, that since the high duty imposed on playing Cards, there is one pack less used in Virginia—I might propose a similar question with respect to carriages. The truth is, that when people indulge themselves in bad habits, either from motives of pride or indolence, they are not to be easily restrained therefrom by taxation. For my own part Mr. Fenno, I should not be sorry to see the duty on carriages increased so as to amount to a prohibition; for I have no idea, that these citizens who cannot afford to ride, are to be suffocated in dry weather, with the dust raised by the carriage wheels of these pretended advocates of equality.

For LIVERPOOL,



THE SHIP
AMIABLE,
Daniel C. Tillinghurst, master;

A staunch, fast sailing cedar and live oak ship, now lying at West's wharf, next above Vine-street—will begin to take in her cargo in a few days, great part being ready to go on board—is intended to sail about the 10th of next month. For freight or passage apply to the Master on board, or to
JEREMIAH WARDER.

Who has for SALE,

Large Liverpool House COAL;
New and second hand CABLES and HAWSERS, from eight to fifteen inches;
And Sail-Makers Seaming TWINE.

February 26. 3taw2w

Canal Lottery Office,

Near the Bank of the United States,

Philadelphia, February 25, 1796.

STATE of the WHEEL:

1 prize of 30,000	30,000
5 do. 20,000	100,000
1 do. 10,000	10,000
2 do. 2,500	5,000
9 do. 1,000	9,000
13 do. 500	6,500
32 do. 100	3,200

With a proportionate number of 12 dollar prizes. The Public are informed, that from the above statement, and the Lottery being about two-thirds drawn, the Wheel is upwards of One hundred thousand dollars richer than at the commencement; and that in future the rise of Tickets will be progressive, after every day, or every other day's drawing, while the 30,000 dollars remains in the Wheel.

Wm. Blackburn, Agent,

The holders of fortunate Tickets of One hundred dollar prizes and upwards, will be paid cash for them, allowing a reasonable discount besides that expressed on the face of the Ticket.