

May 21 1796 p. 2

permission to embark in this service of humanity and of danger. In vain did this brave officer assailed by his company, attempt to board the hulk. All their efforts were frustrated by the violence of the waves. Relying on his intrepidity alone, Verdreau threw out a buoy, jumped in himself, and after buffeting the billows reached the wreck.

"On board were 17 individuals who had survived their companions, and who expected every moment either to be washed off the decks, or dashed to pieces on the rocks. Verdreau attached the buoy to the vessel, which enabled the mariners, one by one, to pass along the rope to the long boat and the hulk. He was the last man that remained on the wreck. An instant's delay would have deprived the Republic of the future services of this young man, for no sooner had he reached the boat than the hulk was dashed to pieces against the rocks.

"The ship we learnt was called the Industry, and had just returned from Savanna, laden with sugar. It belonged to the port of Cadiz, and the crew were chiefly English.

"All the attention which humanity and Republican magnanimity could devise, was exercised towards those unfortunate men, who had survived the alarms and fatigues of a long night almost under water."

### CONGRESS. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

APRIL 30.

The resolution reported yesterday by the casting vote of the chairman of the committee of the whole on the subject of the treaty was taken up.

Mr. Dearbourne proposed the following addition to it, after the word Resolved,— "That altho' in the opinion, of this house the treaty is highly objectionable and may prove injurious to the U. S. yet considering all the circumstances relating thereto particularly that the last 13 articles are to continue in force only during the present war and two years thereafter, and considering also the efficacy of measures which may be taken for bringing about a discontinuance or the violation committed on our neutral rights in regard to our vessels and seamen, therefore"

&c.

Mr. Godhue was opposed to the amendment.

Mr. Swanwick hoped the house would agree to it. He had expected that gentlemen who were in favor of carrying the treaty into effect would not object to an expression of the sentiments, which the amendment contained. Many of those members who advocated its being carried into effect had acknowledged the defects of the treaty few considered it free from objection. It might be said, that this amendment could be considered as a reflection on other departments of the government. He did not conceive it any implication that the President and Senate had acted improperly; they certainly had acted to the best of their judgment at the time; but this did not preclude the house from the free exercise of their opinions. The question bro't into view by the amendment is whether the house consider the treaty to be intrinsically good, this the yeas and nays on the amendment would determine.—He reminded the House, that yesterday the resolution was only carried by the casting vote of the Chairman, and that he had said he did not like it, but voted for it under this impression, that in the house it might be modified. No one could object, he conceived to expressing a reliance on the executive, that they would by further negotiation relieve us from the dangers to which our property on the seas and seamen are exposed. He mentioned some instances of well authenticated sufferings on those heads. He foretold that the operation of the treaty would rivet the opposition to the treaty, and feared, that unless something further was done to protect our neutral rights, that we should be more and more molested by the British.

Mr. Williams conceived there would be inconsistency in modifying a resolution in the house, that had received the sanction of a majority yesterday in committee of the whole.

Mr. Hillhouse was against the amendment. He conceived it was not candid to bring the bringing the business forward in that shape.—

It would place gentlemen who were in favor of the treaty in a disagreeable situation of being obliged to vote for a proposition at variance with their former declarations, or to vote against the treaty. It was impossible in a resolution to express the impressions under which each vote was given, different motives operated on different minds. He could not for his own part vote for the resolution, if in that vote he was to declare he believed the treaty not a good one.

The hour of 12 having arrived, agreeable to order a call of the house took place. Some members were absent.

Mr. Gregg declared his intention of voting for the resolution as it was reported, if reduced to that; but he should prefer voting for it with the qualification proposed.—He would do it under the impressions. He did not like the treaty; but feared the rejection of the treaty would be rather more injurious to the country than its acceptance.

Mr. Harper came in. He would have been excluded by the rules of the house, not being present at the call. But having stated, that by his watch the hour of 12 had not arrived, the excuse was accepted and he took his seat.

Mr. Moore conceived, that the house were now to decide between two evils. He wished the amendment adopted; its adoption would restore more unanimity by declaring their opinion of the intrinsic merits of the treaty and would throw the responsibility where it ought to rest.

Mr. Sturgeons wished the question so modified, that members should be able to vote on the intrinsic merits of the treaty, disconnected from the final vote on the propriety of carrying it into effect. For his part he would rather vote against it, than vote at the same time a disapprobation of its merits. He wished the amendment could be brought in as a distinct proposition, that a vote could be taken on it, and then on the resolution unconnected with it; then he conceived the sense of the majority would be truly had on each.

Mr. Dearbourne said, that in offering the amendment, he did not conceive he had departed from the strict line of candour. He wished the sense of the house fairly taken, that was his only intention. He had conceived from the course of the debate on the Treaty that there were few gentlemen who contended for the intrinsic merits of the instrument, he did not suppose therefore that there could be opposition to the amendment he proposed to introduce. He was willing to modify it if the house tho't it necessary.

Mr. Brent who had been absent when the call was made, came in, and having excused himself to the satisfaction of the house took his seat.

Mr. Harper expressed an opinion favorable to the intrinsic merits of the treaty, he wished, therefore some modification made, that would enable gentlemen to vote for the treaty without pronouncing at the same time its condemnation. He proposed, that the amendment should be introduced by way of preamble, and a vote taken on it, and then on the resolution.

Mr. Dearbourne agreed to modify it according to the wishes of the member last up and proposed to bring in his amendment by way of a preamble "Whereas, altho' &c."

Mr. Nicholas observed, that the majority of the house was he believed against the resolution as it stood. It had been decided by the casting vote of the chairman yesterday, who then declared that he voted for it hoping it would be modified in the house.—To attempt to say that a majority was for the resolution without the amendment, was attempting to decide by argument what the majority of the house was, or upon what motives they voted. A question on the amendment and resolution must decide these points.

The House had certainly a right to make the resolution as palatable as possible before its final adoption. He conceived, that the sense of the House could be as distinctly taken on

the amendment as first brought forward, as it could by introducing it by way of preamble.

Mr. J. SMITH tho't, that the order would be, to take a question on the preamble first, then on the resolution; and that no question would be necessary on the two connectedly.

Mr. GREGG wished to offer an amendment as a substitute to that before the committee. It was in substance as follows,— "Resolved, that under a consideration of existing circumstances, without reference to the merits or demerits of the Treaty; and in confidence that measures will be taken by the executive, to maintain our neutral rights"—it is expedient, &c.

This was declared out of order, until the other amendment was negatived.

Mr. VENABLE was of opinion that, as the amendment was first brought forward, the Members were placed in no dilemma to express their sense of it.

Mr. MURRAY dwelt on the gloomy prospect which must open, if the Treaty was to go into operation with the proposed vote of censure. It would embitter the enmity which exists between this country and Britain, and weaken the hands of our executive, (which rather required strengthening) by striking at the confidence which ought to subsist in that branch of the government. He gave an eulogium on the President for having obtained as much as he had by the Treaty, will the small means in his hands.

Mr. S. SMITH moved to strike out of the proposed preamble the words, "may prove injurious to the United States."

Mr. MUEHLBERG stated, that when he gave the casting vote yesterday, it was expressly with a view of obtaining a modification. He declared his willingness to vote for the resolution with the preamble proposed.

Mr. DEARBORNE consented to vary his amendment, agreeable to the desire expressed by Mr. S. SMITH.

It was then moved to strike out the word HIGHLY in the preamble, so as to make it read "Altho' the Treaty is objectionable, &c."

This was carried by the casting vote of the Speaker, 48 members rising on each side.

Mr. SIDGWICK said a few words against the preamble. He declared himself a friend to the Treaty upon its intrinsic merits. He feared the preamble if adopted would increase the divisions which exist on the subject of the Treaty. He conceived it reflected unwarrantably on the President and Senate. He wished the house not to undertake to pronounce on the merits of the Treaty; but that this should be left to the experience and judgment of an intelligent people.

Mr. KITCHELL was against the preamble, on the same ground.

Mr. AMES wished to know whether after a distinct question was taken on the preamble and resolution, whether one must be taken upon both conjointly. He was informed by the chair, not.

Mr. PARKER was against the Treaty in every stage and shape. No modification of the resolution could induce him to give his vote to it. He should on that ground vote against the preamble.

Mr. HEISTER said, he should vote for the preamble; that if the resolution should pass, a protest of the sense of the House might exist upon the journals.

The yeas and nays were then called on the preamble, and were as follow:

Y E A S.

Messieurs. Bailey, Baird, Baldwin, Benton, Blount, Brent, Burges, Cabel, Christie, Clopton, Coles, Dearborn, Earl, Franklin, Gallatin, Gillispie, Giles, Gregg, Greenup, Grove, Hampton, Harrison, Hathorn, Havens, Heister, Holland, Jackson, Livingston, Locke, W. Lyman, Maclay, Macon, Madison, Milledge, Moore, Muhlenberg, New, Nicholas, Orr, Page, Preston, Rutherford, Israel Smith, Swanwick, Tatom, Van Courtlandt, Varnum, Venable, Winn. 49

N A Y S.

Messieurs. Ames, Bourne, Brodbery, Bryan, Buck, Claiborne, Coit, Cooper, Crabb, Dent, A. Foster, D. Foster, Gil-