

State Gazette of North Carolina.

EDENTON: PRINTED BY JAMES WILLS.

VOL. XIII.

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1798.

NUMBER 632.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 6.

IN committee of the whole, Mr. Dent is the chair on the subject of the contention between Mr. Griswold and Mr. Lyon.

Mr. Hofner's evidence. During the balloting the Speaker left his chair and took a seat by me. I heard a conversation carried on with considerable warmth between Messrs. Dana and Lyon. The Speaker checked them, and they separated. Soon after a conversation began between Mr. Lyon and the Speaker. It commenced, as well as I recollect, on the subject of the stamp act: all that was said I do not recollect; but Mr. Lyon said he had been through part of Connecticut and he found that the sentiments of the people of that state differed from those of their Representatives here.—Some general conversation then took place of little consequence and which has left but little impression on my mind. Mr. Lyon however addressing the Speaker, remarked, that the Connecticut members pursued their own private views here, and that they were not guided by the opinions of their constituents; that he believed nine tenths of the people of that state differed in sentiment from the representation on their floor, that the Representatives from Connecticut were influenced by a desire to obtain offices, and that it was immaterial how little lucrative those offices were as they would be influenced by a salary of 1000 dollars, as well as one of 9000; that the Representatives blinded the eyes of their constituents, and that it was only necessary for the people to be informed of it to induce them to oppose them; that if he were to remove into Connecticut and set up a press he had no doubt but that he would bring about a revolution in the sentiments of the people; that he was well acquainted with the people of Connecticut as he had spent the first part of his life in this country in that state; that several persons from Connecticut had been in the state of Vermont to visit their friends; that he had attacked them in that quarter and had convinced them, that their opinions were erroneous. At this time Mr. G. was sitting in the seat usually occupied by Mr. Harper, and addressing himself to Mr. L. asked whether he made use of his wooden sword on that occasion. Mr. Lyon appeared to pay no attention to this remark, and I thought at the time did not hear it. Immediately after this Mr. G. quitted his seat and went behind the bar; I left mine and did not see the insult which is said to have been offered.—I was present only at the beginning of the dispute. I attended particularly to the relation of the Speaker yesterday and found I could agree in his relation of the circumstances, only he has been able to relate them more particularly as the discourse was addressed to him.

Mr. Sitgreaves. During the conversation and before Mr. Lyon spoke on the subject of Connecticut; did you hear any thing said disrespectful to Mr. Lyon.

A. No, I did not.

Mr. Nicholas. Did the conversation respecting Connecticut come in connection from Mr. Lyon.

A. The conversation was disconnected and interspersed with queries and remarks by the Speaker; perhaps these remarks had a tendency to draw more from him than he originally intended.

Mr. Goodrich's testimony. The only testimony I have to give is as to a conversation of Mr. Lyon relative to his having been cashiered in the army. I came to this place in a stage taken by Mr. Champlin, a member from Massachusetts (Mr. Otis) and Mr. Lyon. We were the only persons in the stage for a considerable part of the way. I had some little personal acquaintance with Mr. Lyon before this time. Mr. Lyon on the way seemed to be disposed to give to us the history of his life. It was filled with many singular and ludicrous anecdotes. The ludicrous anecdotes he told of himself in a playful manner invited from those who were with him a kind of playfulness if not something more towards Mr. Lyon. I mention these circumstances to introduce properly the account he gave us as to his being cashiered. How it was introduced, whether voluntarily on his part or induced by the remarks made by some of the company, I do not perfectly recollect. I think, however, that something was said about Mr. Lyon's having been in the army. I can't be very minute in the account he gave. I recollect his saying that that allusion to his being cashiered had been in the public papers; that it was a matter of deep mortification to him; that he could not bear to hear of it; that it happened

when he was young. He said that he was a subaltern officer of a corps stationed on the frontier at a great distance from the main army and without support; that the officers and the men were uneasy and discontented with their situation; they considered themselves as being too exposed; that he, at a certain time was out with a party of the men, that when he returned he found a corps of men either had abandoned or were abandoning their post; that they went to some distance, when they made a halt; that he endeavoured to persuade them to return; they refused. The officers insisted, that he should go to the head-quarters and make a representation of their situation. He went. Upon being introduced to General Gates he damaged him for a coward, and ordered that he should go into the custody of a guard; that he, Mr. Lyon, insisted on his right as an officer not to be put under guard; that an aid of General Gates said something on the subject and Mr. Lyon was finally arrested; tried with the rest of the officers by a court martial, sentenced to be cashiered from the army. He said the charge was, that the officers, as they themselves could not abandon the post; had excited the men to run away. He further said, as it respected himself, the charge in question was unjust. I think Mr. Champlin, one of the gentlemen, perhaps Mr. Otis, asked him if he had worn a wooden sword. He said not. Mr. Champlin, if I am not mistaken, made this remark: that if he saw it in poetry that he had worn a wooden sword he should only consider it as being figurative for being cashiered for cowardice. Mr. Lyon told him he had wiped off this stain; that he had held an office in the army—of a pay master. I think he mentioned, that he did not continue long as pay master owing to some other having been appointed with whom he had a dispute about it; that in that dispute, while in the army, the circumstance of his being cashiered, had not been mentioned to his dishonour, that he had been appointed and for many years commanded as Colonel a regiment of militia in Vermont. I recollect nothing further of importance to the present circumstance.

Mr. Dana—He acknowledged his feelings much interested in the business; and wished to be excused from giving testimony if the committee would indulge him. Some remarks had been made upon his testimony before the committee, a repetition of which he wished to avoid.

Mr. Brooks hoped the member would be excused. He had heard his testimony before the committee and did not think it very material.

Mr. Harper hoped he would not be excused.

Mr. I. Parker was for excusing the member. He remarked there was an insinuation before the committee, from the member from Vermont, that the gentleman's testimony was rather partial or warped by his feelings. This was what the member alluded to.

Mr. Sitgreaves conceived the testimony of the member from Connecticut material as to the beginning of the transaction, he wished him not to be excused.

Mr. Nicholas also wished the member not to be excused. The question was put and the noes carried it.

Mr. Dana before he entered on his evidence remarked, that some persons belonging to the house had, out of doors, made some unwarranted remarks upon his testimony before the committee, and as it was not very material to the present case he had expressed his wish to be excused. But the house had denied him, he should therefore proceed. On Tuesday of last week, while the tellers were counting the ballots, I slept from my seat and stood at the fire behind me. While there Mr. Williams of New-York came up to me and mentioned that the member from Vermont had said that the Connecticut representation would be turned out if they voted against Mr. Nicholas's amendment. Some time after the member from Vermont came towards me, and I asked him, before Mr. Williams, whether he had said what Mr. Williams informed me he had. He said he did not say that, but that we all should be turned out if we carried the point we wished to carry. I asked what the point was. He said it was that the President should appoint to offices where no such offices were provided by law. I told him that was not the question upon Mr. Nicholas's amendment. He answered in two words, *it is*. I replied in three, *it is not*. There was then a variety of conversation. I believe I said something of the improbability of his knowing the people of Connecticut better than their representatives. I felt some irritation at his manner, and some indignation at his idea of being able to influence any of my consti-

tuents. I believe I shewed a degree of irritation, but on the intimation from the Speaker I recollected where I was and parted from the Vermont member. Reflection told me to have no more conversation with him, and to this day I have not had any.

I took no part in the after conversation. When I passed by the member from Vermont, afterwards he was leaning on the bar, and I heard him say that the Representatives from Connecticut cared nothing about their constituents, and then he spoke about the million he had designed for one of the members from Connecticut. I do not remember the reply. Before Mr. Griswold received the indignity I was walking outside the bar, the Speaker occupied my seat. I did not hear distinctly the conversation; but from the reply made, I supposed Mr. Lyon was saying he could accomplish some great object in Connecticut. The reply of Mr. Griswold was that he could not even if he was to go into Connecticut with his wooden sword, and—two other words were here used which related to another story.

Mr. Dana was pressed to mention the two words: They were *and candle*. With his wooden sword and candle.

These words I did not hear distinctly, and should have some doubts whether these two words had been added, if I had not been informed by my colleague since that he did use them. In justice to the member from Vermont, I should mention, that I have but an imperfect recollection of the conversation. I felt irritated at it, though afterwards I felt ashamed that I should be irritated by what he had said. Mr. Dana mentioned some conversation he had had with his colleague and Mr. Brooks on the subject of the previous conversation between them and Mr. Lyon.

Mr. Dana in reply to a question from Mr. Harper gave the following account of the manner in which the indignity was offered his colleague.

I witnessed it. I was looking in my colleague's face and marked him particularly, for I felt particularly interested. He turned his eye towards the member from Vermont: drew back his right arm; his countenance changed, and now expressed to my satisfaction, that he recollected where he was: his hand then came up with his handkerchief and wiped his face. I slept up to him, and laid my hand on his arm, saying, this must be considered of; the member from New-York threw in his cautionary hint. I proposed that we should leave the house, I believe he said yes, and we went out.

Mr. Coit's testimony.—I was not present when the net took place. Before it took place I was passing from my seat out of the bar where Mr. Lyon was standing. He was addressing a kind of ranting, braggart conversation respecting the state of Connecticut towards the Speaker. Whether I had noticed the conversation before I left my seat I do not recollect. My recollection is probably the more imperfect on this subject, from the circumstance, that I had heard a similar conversation from Mr. Lyon a little while before at one of the fire places, before the house formed. As I was passing, or before I left my seat, some observation was addressed particularly to me, with allusion to the subject of the conversation, either by the Speaker or Mr. Lyon. Mr. Lyon at the time was stating some comparative view of the number of votes given for members in Connecticut and the number given for himself in the state of Vermont. This led me to put some questions to Mr. Lyon, respecting his knowledge of the mode of voting in Connecticut. The answer not leading to any thing interesting I passed on to the south part of the House. I recollect as I passed, my colleague Mr. Griswold was sitting in the seat occupied by Mr. Harper or standing behind it. I recollect nothing further.

Mr. Lyon asked whether when he was making a comparative statement of the votes given for members of Congress in Connecticut and Vermont he did not justify it by observing: that about the same number of votes were given in the former state for seven members, as were given in his own district alone in Vermont.

A. I cannot recollect the particulars.

Mr. Harper asked what was the tenor of the conversation alluded to by the witness, as having heard before the house formed.

A. I mentioned these terms ranting and braggart, not with a view to say any thing uncomfortable to the member from Vermont; was I disposed to do this I should not do it here: But I used the terms only in my own justification—my justification in not remembering more of the conversation than