Theo. Dcni. presented

Thomas Bowen

June 1820

SKETCHES

OF THE

HISTORY

OF

AMERICA.

By *JAMES THOMSON CALLENDER.*

PHILADELPHIA:

FROM THE PRESS OF SNOWDEN & M'CORKLE, NO. 47,
NORTH FOURTH-STREET.

1798.

[Price ONE DOLLAR.]

PREFACE.

SINCE this volume was written, the diſpute of Mr. Adams with France hath reached a criſis. The directory diſmiſſed with diſdain our triple Braintree embaſſy. The robbery of American ſhipping has burſt into tenfold magnitude; and our preſident's boſom beats with rapture at the approaching conſummation of his wiſhes. Oppoſed as contending partiſans, the republic might addreſs this moſt infatuated of all ſtateſmen in the language of the poet,

> One look from Crononhotonthologos
> Shall ſtare thee into nothing!

The French may begin by blockading American ſeaports with ten or twelve frigates. Immediately, the merchants lay up their ſhipping. Their bills are proteſted by quires. The counting houſes are deſerted. The jails are crouded. Stocks tumble to forty per cent. below par. The banks bolt their doors. Hard money vaniſhes. Drays unyoked rot by dozens on every wharf. The treaſury ſuſpends payment, and cannot borrow a ſhilling; becauſe, after deducting import duties, its own expences, and the intereſt of public debt, become twelve times greater than the public income*. Of courſe the federal government expires.

* Vide American Annual Regiſter.

Mr. Sitgreaves ſpoke of dying in the laſt ditch. If Jourdan diſembarks at Newcaſtle, he may find an excellent opportunity for dying in the *firſt* ditch. We have nine hundred thouſand negroes ripe for inſurrection; and not a ſingle fort fit to be the pigeon-houſe of a Flanders baſtion. Even the Alps and Pyrenees have been ſcaled in their moſt inacceſſible faſtneſſes; while five years of French victory have eclipſed five centuries of Roman fame. Many people ſay that the United States are popular in France, and that the government dares not to declare war. This argument is only fit for a drowning ideot catching at a ſtraw. The directory need but to print a few columns from Mr. Fenno's gazette, and the charm is diſſolved. At the end of the conteſt in Europe, France will overflow with turbulent veterans, and a diſtant expedition may very likely be planned, merely for the ſake of ſending them out of the country.

All men of property are intereſted in perſuading Mr. Adams immediately to retire from office. An hundred thouſand, or even a million of dollars, would be wiſely beſtowed to purchaſe his reſignation. And if the ſenate of the fifth congreſs ſhall give that example, they will act as the *negative* ſaviours of their country.

Philadelphia, February 12, 1798.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. III.

CHAP. IV.

CHAP. V.

CHAP. VI.

CHAP. VII.

CHAP. X.

CHAP. XI.

SKETCHES, &c.

CHAPTER I.

America.—Its discovery.—European mistakes respecting it.—Dr. Robertson.—His theory as to the extreme cold of the new world.—Its atmosphere.—Alledged inferiority in animal productions.—Dr. Adam Smith.—His misinformation as to North-America.—Absurd descriptions of Philadelphia by Payne and Guthrie.—European title to settlements in the new world.—Their defence.—Present number of inhabitants in America.

AMERICA was discovered by Christopher Columbus on the 12th of October, 1492. The north-east extremity of Asia approaches within thirty-nine miles of the north-western coast of the new world*. The passage over this narrow strait is facilitated by two intermediate islands. Perhaps, in a remote æra, some wandering families of Tartars crossed over by this route; and, in the course of ages, their posterity dispersed a scanty population over this great division of the globe. The Esquimaux alone, upon the north-eastern coast of the continent, are of a different race, and appear to have been a colony from Greenland.

The habitable part of the globe is computed to

* American Edition of the British Encyclopedia; vol. I, p. 568.

contain upwards of thirty millions of geographical ſquare miles. Of theſe, at leaſt nine millions are comprehended in America*. This area is about ninety times larger than that of Britain and Ireland, which poſſeſs a population of fourteen millions. When the forge, and the plough ſhall have ſtretched their dominion to the ſources of the Miſſouri, when a regular body of civilized nations, extending from the St. Laurence to Patagonia, ſhall cheer and gladden the ſurface of the earth, America may, without difficulty, ſupport a thouſand millions of inhabitants; or moſt likely, a much greater number.

Though this continent hath been diſcovered for three centuries, it is yet but imperfectly known to the nations of Europe. Travellers, in deſcribing it, have aſſumed their wonted privileges of embelliſhment and diſtortion. The ſtrangeſt fables have been circulated and believed, with regard to its climate, its aſpect, its natural productions, and the manners of its people.

When an American opens one of thoſe numerous deſcriptions of this country, that are publiſhed in Europe, he is commonly ſtruck with the multiplicity of miſtakes that occur in almoſt every page. To give an accurate account of any country requires a conſiderable ſhare both of induſtry and acuteneſs. But peculiar difficulties attend this taſk, on the weſtern ſide of the Atlantic. The habits of the people are more various and fluctuating, than in regions which have been long and thickly ſettled. Alterations and improvements of all kinds advance with ſuch rapidity, at leaſt in the territory of the United States, that what was, five years before, a juſt picture, often differs widely from the preſent condition of the ſame territory.

* Carey's American Edition of Guthrie's Geographical Grammar, vol. I. p. 36.

The immenſe extent of the continent preſents ſuch a variety of temptations to the forming of new ſettlements, theſe are ſo widely diverſified from each other, in their ſituation, climate, and produce, and ſuch numbers of people are conſtantly retiring backwards from the eaſtern coaſt, into the receſſes of the wilderneſs, that many years muſt paſs over before it can be poſſible to ſketch a picture of America, which will remain for any conſiderable time, an exact reſemblance of the original*. This country may be compared with a child riſing, by the moſt rapid growth, into the dimenſions of a giant; but conſequently requiring a much longer period, before it aſſumes a completeneſs of form, than an object of far inferior bulk.

As a ſpecimen of the ſtrange miſrepreſentations, with regard to America, which are current in Europe, a few paſſages ſhall be here ſelected from ſome of the books popular in that part of the world. Dr. Robertſon informs us that, "Over all the continent of North-America, a north-weſterly wind "and *exceſſive cold* are ſynonimous terms. Even in "*the moſt ſultry weather*, the moment that the wind "veers to that quarter, its penetrating influence is "felt in a tranſition from heat to cold no leſs violent "than ſudden. To this powerful cauſe we may aſcribe the extraordinary dominion of cold, and its "violent inroads into the ſouthern provinces in that "part of the globe†."

Charlevoix is quoted as an authority for this tale. When he wrote it, he muſt have been thinking of

* A farmer of Kentucky, ſometime ago, mentioned in Philadelphia, that he had reſided in that ſtate, for about eighteen months. He ſettled on the ſkirts of the cleared land, next the woods, his own houſe being the fartheſt in that direction. Since his arrival, ſo many new ſettlers had come, that plantations, were extended fifteen miles beyond his into the deſart.

† Hiſtory of America, Book IV.

the north-weſt wind of Canada, through which he travelled. He did not viſit the Britiſh colonies; ſo that he could not ſay whether ſuch a phenomenon prevailed in them or not. From extravagant accounts of this kind, it is not ſurpriſing that the people of Europe form an alarming idea of the American climate. To the greater part of the territory of the United States, perhaps to the whole of it, this deſcription bears no reſemblance. Charlevoix wrote above ſeventy years ago; and even though his account had been accurate for that time, yet the climate has ſince undergone great alterations. Mr. Jefferſon relates*, that formerly the ſnows in Virginia covered the ground, for about three months in every winter, but that now, in the lower parts of the country, they very ſeldom lie aweek. He remarks, that, "In Virginia, both heats and "colds have become much more moderate within the "memory even of the middle-aged." Dr. Robertſon mentions a prodigious froſt, at Charleſton, in South-Carolina, in February, 1747. For many years paſt, ſnow and ice have been hardly ſeen in that city.

The ſame hiſtorian attempts to explain the primitive cauſe of the extreme degree of cold in America. His reaſonings appear to be ſomewhat inconſiſtent. As to the northern extremity of the continent he obſerves that, "though the utmoſt extent "of America towards the north be not yet diſcover-"ed, we know that it advances nearer to the pole "than *either Europe or Aſia*. The latter have large "ſeas to the north, which are open during part of "the year; and even when covered with ice, the "wind that blows over them is leſs intenſely cold *than* "*that which blows over land* in the the ſame high la-"titudes. But in America the land ſtretches from the

* Notes on Virginia. ART. CLIMATE.

"river St. Laurence towards the pole, and ſpreads "out immenſely to the weſt. A chain of enormous "mountains, covered with ſnow and ice, runs thro' "all this dreary region*." He goes on to aſcribe the peculiar ſeverity of the north-weſt American winds to their blowing over "ſuch an extent of high and "frozen *land*." The reſult of his inquiry is, that the climate of North-America is more cold than that of Europe becauſe the land is broader and approaches nearer to the north pole. The doctor has omitted to give us any reaſon, why a wind that blows over *frozen land* muſt be colder than another which blows over *a frozen ſea*; ſo that his theory of explanation reſts on a mere aſſumption. But let us admit the juſtice of his aſſertion, that the northern extremity of the continent is *colder* than that of Europe, becauſe it is *broader*, and advances *nearer to the pole*. We are certain then, that the ſouthern extremity of America, muſt be a great deal warmer than the ſame latitude in Europe; for the land approaches only within thirty four degrees of the ſouth pole, that is, to the latitude of Dunbar, a town in the ſouth-eaſtern part of Scotland. The continent, beſides, is very *narrow*; and its ſituation is indeed a perfect contraſt to the northern extremity. But here again, the author takes up a quite different doctrine. "The moſt obvious and probable cauſe "of this ſuperior degree of cold towards the ſouthern "extremity of America, ſeems to be the *form of the* "*continent there*. Its breadth gradually *decreaſes*, "and its dimenſions are *much contracted*." This hypotheſis he explains in a long note. Thus in one end of America, the *breadth*, and in another end the *narrowneſs* of the continent, is advanced as a philoſophical explanation of extreme cold.

* Hiſtory of America, Book IV.

"Another peculiarity in the climate of America "is its *exceſſive moiſture in general*. In ſome places, "indeed, on the weſtern coaſt, rain is not known; "but in all other parts, the moiſtneſs of the climate "is as remarkable as the cold. The foreſts where- "with it is every where covered, no doubt, partly, "occaſion the moiſture of its climate; but the moſt "prevalent and obvious cauſe is the vaſt, and Pacific "Oceans, with which America is *environed on all "ſides* *!". The Cape of Good-Hope is ſurrounded by immenſe oceans; yet the climate is remarkably *dry*. This cannot therefore be a ſatisfactory explanation for the exceſs of moiſture in the American atmoſphere. But if it were ſo, the writer, to make his theory conſiſtent, ought to have demonſtrated, for what reaſon rain is not known, in ſome places on *the weſtern coaſt*. Peru extends along the ſhore of the great Pacific Ocean, by far the broadeſt on the ſurface of the globe, and yet thirty years are ſaid to have ſometimes elapſed in that country without rain. It does not appear, on any ſound evidence, that the climate of this country is more wet than that of many others. Let us hear the account that is given of the weather of England by perſons who obſerve it. In the Gentleman's Magazine, for February 1793, there is an article, dated the 27th of that month, which may ſerve to aſſiſt us, in forming ideas on this point. "The climate of England," ſays the writer, "in the opinion of many, has, of late years, "undergone a conſiderable change. Formerly we "uſed to have ſmart froſts in winter; and hot and "ſometimes *dry ſummers*. For ſome years back, both "winters and ſummers have *generally been wet*, with "ſo little ice, that luxury, by its agents, has been "obliged to procure it from foreign parts. In the "courſe of laſt year, thoſe who kept a regiſter of

* Encyclopedia. vol. I. p. 539.

"the weather, tell us, there were but *one hundred* "*and three dry days!* For the little that is paſſed of "the preſent year, we have ſcarcely had ſix dry "days." It is not eaſy to conceive a more dreadful picture of the atmoſphere of any part of the temperate zones, than what is here ſet before us. As it comes from the Engliſh themſelves, and is atteſted in a reſpectable publication, it would be trifling to doubt of its general accuracy. Nor is ſuch a quantity of rain and moiſture a novelty, as the author ſeems to hint, in the Britiſh iſlands. "We have rain," ſays a proverb, "for nine "months in the year, and wet weather for all the "reſt of it." Even Americans ſeem to have adopted an erroneous opinion reſpecting the comparative moiſture of their climate. Dr. Morſe has obſerved, that, "the quantity of rain which falls in England "annually is computed to be twenty four inches; in "France eighteen inches, and in New-England from "forty-eight to fifty inches; and yet in New-England "they ſuffer more from drought than in either of the "fore-mentioned countries, although they have *more* "*than double* the quantity of rain."* In New-England "they ſuffer more from drought," becauſe there is not one-half, nor, perhaps, one-ſixth part of the rain annually that falls in England; where, as we have ſeen above, there is rain for five days in the week. If double the quantity of rain actually fell in New-England, it would follow, as a neceſſary conſequence, that every day in the year muſt be wet; but on the contrary, weeks together often paſs in New-England without a ſingle ſhower.

The American climate is colder than that of European countries under the ſame latitudes, where the woods have been cleared, and the ſoil cultivated for many centuries. But this implies not, as it

* American Univerſal Geography, vol. I. p. 310.

has been ignorantly pretended, any ſingular malignity in the climate of the new world. France, Italy, and Spain, were much colder, in ancient times, than at preſent, and for the very ſame reaſon. Charlevoix even ſays, that the French ſettlers in Canada conſidered the climate as improved by the very ſlight degree of cultivation which exiſted in that province, about ſeventy years ago. Our thick and boundleſs foreſts prevent the rays of the ſun from penetrating to the ſurface of the earth; hence the ſnow cannot diſſolve ſo quickly, as in an open country. The north-weſt wind ruſhing over ſo vaſt a tract of ice and ſnow, ſtill further cools the air. But this wind is only felt extremely cold, while ſnow covers the ground. Whatever may formerly have been the caſe, the ſtate of Pennſylvania, and the others to the ſouthward, feel at preſent very little inconvenience from it. "In the moſt ſultry "weather," it is extremely ſalutary and refreſhing, and not an object of terror, as Dr. Robertſon, and ſome other writers have repreſented it to be*.

In the courſe of two or three generations, at fartheſt, the climate will correſpond with that under

* In an Engliſh verſion of Chaſtellux's Travels, there is a note ſubjoined, by the tranſlator, which contains theſe words, "In the "middle of the hotteſt day in July, or Auguſt, where the heat was ſo "intolerable as almoſt to prevent reſpiration, I have frequently known "the wind ſhift ſuddenly round to the north-weſt, attended with a "blaſt, ſo cold and humid, as to make it immediately neceſſary to "ſhut all the doors and windows, and light large fires." Vol. II. p. 52. This is a very high degree of colouring. That heat ſhould be ſo exceſſive, in this country, as to endanger reſpiration, is ſomewhat next to incredible. The ſummer of 1793, was the hotteſt remembered in Philadelphia, for many years paſt; yet there was no difficulty in reſpiration. This writer acknowledges, in the ſame note, that the climate is improving ſo rapidly as to make the change ſtrikingly perceptible in a few years. In his ſecond volume, a note appears reſpecting the young men and women of Philadelphia, which is ſo very indecent, as well as untrue, that it cannot admit of an extract.

the ſame degree of latitude in Europe. Many tracts of land, that now lie buried in ſnow, for ſix months of the year, will then rival the fineſt regions of the world. Quebec ſtands a degree and fifty-five minutes to the ſouth of Paris, Halifax, in Nova-Scotia, four degrees and ten minutes to the ſouth of it, and only one degree and four minutes north of Montpelier in Languedoc. Montreal is but ten minutes north of Milan in Italy, and one degree and fifty-nine minutes north of Montpelier. Philadelphia is only two minutes north from the ſame latitude with Pekin in China; and in this city, for half of the year, we enjoy delightful weather. Even the coldeſt winters are conſidered as the moſt healthy. In autumn, for a month together, there is frequently not a ſingle cloud to be ſeen, while a regular and plentiful dew ſupercedes the fear of drought. At the ſame time of the year, the rains of Britain frequently continue during a conſiderable time, for ſix days in the week, and rot the harveſt, while Britiſh philoſophers are gravely employed in deſcribing and deprecating the malignant moiſture of America. In Pennſylvania, aſthmatic complaints are ſaid to be leſs frequent than in Britain, which is a neceſſary conſequence from the ſuperior mildneſs and purity of our ſky. The climate of London is ſuppoſed to be equal to that of moſt other parts of England, and is certainly much better than that of ſome counties, ſuch as Lancaſter and Cornwall. Yet from a writer there, we learn that of the firſt fifty-eight days in the year 1793, hardly ſix were dry. We are told, on the ſame authority, that in the year 1792, England had two hundred and ſixty-two days of rain, which is more than a proportion of five days in the week. The Britiſh climate alſo is thought to be growing worſe; while it is remarked all over this continent, that ours is conſtantly grow-

ing better. Marſhes are every where begun to be drained. Whole foreſts are daily cut down. The free circulation of air is thus promoted, while an exuberance of moiſture is checked. Ten times more land is now cleared in one year, than was cleared in the ſame ſpace of time before the war of 1756. We may infer that the improvement of the climate will bear ſomething like an equally augmented proportion. Hence it is weak in a modern hiſtorian, to refer implicitly, upon this head, to writers of fifty or an hundred years old. He ought to enquire with diligence how circumſtances actually exiſt. A literary man is apt to imagine that he knows much, when he has only read much. He finds twenty different travellers concur in aſſerting that the climate of a diſtant country is extremely intemperate. Like Dr. Robertſon, he reſts with confidence on ſuch complicated atteſtations, though, perhaps, three-fourths of theſe writers have only tranſcribed the opinions of each other.

The beſt evidence of the ſalubrity of an atmoſphere is derived from the ſuperior good health of its inhabitants: and, excepting the low lands, towards the ſea, in Delaware, and the ſouthern ſtates, the continent may, in this reſpect, bear a favourable compariſon with Europe. This fact will be beſt illuſtrated by examining the proportion of births to that of deaths, in the two continents.

Mr. Barton * has collected a variety of eſtimates of this kind for particular periods of time, from which are ſelected a few ſpecimens.

		Deaths.
At Salem, in 1782 and 1783, the proportion was to	100 births	49.00
At Hingham, in Maſſachuſetts, for fifty-four years, to	100 ditto	49.50

* American Philoſophical Tranſactions, vol. III. p. 25, et ſeq.

		Deaths.
At Philadelphia, for 1789 and 1790, the bills for the white inhabitants gave to	100 births—	49.94
England, in general, according to sir William Petty, to	100 ditto—	80.00
Liverpool, for five years,	100 ditto—	112.70
Chester, four years,	100 ditto—	107.42
Northampton,	100 ditto—	123.23
London, twenty-six years,	100 ditto—	124.92

There is a copious collection of estimates of this kind, which ascertain, that the number of births is in proportion to the number of deaths much greater in North-America than in Europe. Mr. Barton has likewise printed comparative tables of the longevity of the inhabitants of Britain and America; and it appears that the advantage is not on the side of the former country. In Connecticut, seventy-four persons, out of every thousand who are born, survive the age of eighty years; whereas, at Northampton in England, only forty survive that period; and at Norwich in the same country, but thirty-one. The citizens of the northern and middle states of this continent may rest perfectly satisfied by the conviction, that they have an equal chance for health and long life, with the natives of any other quarter of the globe. To complaints of heat and cold, these calculations give a satisfactory answer.

Dr. Robertson tells us, that "the vast number, "as well as *enormous* size of the trees in America, "indicate the extraordinary vigour of the soil in its "native state."* To believe many European writers as to the growth of American trees, one would imagine, that every tree whatever, in the forests of America, grows from four to seven or eight feet in diameter, and from sixty to an hundred and twenty feet in height. In fact, a very large proportion of American trees are of the common size

* History of America, Book IV.

of thoſe in the old world, and there are ſtill to be ſeen in England, the remains of ſeveral very ancient oaks, of a greater magnitude than any trees yet heard of in America. Some of theſe, indeed, riſe to a larger bulk than is uſual in Europe, but in general, the difference in this reſpect is only trifling. In America, vegetation is more vigorous than in the Britiſh iſlands, and a tree has acquired in this country a greater magnitude in twenty years than it can generally reach in England during forty years.

There is a common ſuppoſition, among the writers of the old world, concerning the woods of America, which has been countenanced by Dr. Robertſon: "As trees and plants derive a great "part of their nouriſhment from air and water, if "they were not deſtroyed by man and other ani-"mals, they would render to the earth more, per-"haps, than they take from it, and feed rather than "impoveriſh it. Thus the unoccupied ſoil of Ame-"rica might go on, *enriching* for many ages."*

This ſource of American fecundity is chimerical. It is true that here, as in the old world, the foreſts ſhed their leaves during autumn, and theſe cover the ground in prodigious quantities, but without forming or perceptibly deepening the ſoil. When theſe leaves are turned up to the depth of four, ſix, or perhaps twelve inches, the ſurface of the earth is frequently found heaped with naked ſtones, without almoſt a ſingle mark of vegetation; and this is, ſometimes, the caſe for whole miles together. What, then, has become of thoſe immenſe maſſes of vegetable putrefaction that have been heaped on the ground for at leaſt four thouſand years? Or where is that peculiar mould of earth, formed by thoſe leaves, of which the writers in Europe are

* Hiſtory of America, Book IV.

ſpeaking? The proper anſwer ſeems to be, that they do not exiſt. In Europe, a large extent of country is often covered with forests, and when the land has been cleared, the ſoil is frequently found barren. But if the rotting of the falling leaves in America forms a mould of peculiar fertility, the ſame cauſes muſt in Europe have produced the ſame conſequences. As in that continent, however, no ſuch conſequences are to be met with, a moderate degree of reflexion might have convinced the advocates of this idea, that the ſame caſe muſt happen in America. Many tracts of this country are entirely diveſted of trees, and yet are equally fertile with any other part of the continent. By this ſyſtem, however they ſhould have been comparitively barren. Beſides, a doctrine of this kind leads to extravagant concluſions. If the fall of leaves is to deepen the ſoil at all, we may at leaſt allow an additional depth of the twentieth part of an inch annually, or five inches in the courſe of a century. At the end of four thouſand years, the ſurface of the earth in North-America, ſhould, by this calculation, have been bedded with a mould to the depth of two hundred inches, or upwards of ſixteen feet and an half. But no perſon will affirm, that ſuch a depth of ſoil is, perhaps, any where to be found. It is in vain to fabricate plauſible theories in oppoſition to the teſtimony of the human ſenſes; nor is it of the ſmalleſt weight, that ſuch a doctrine may have been adorned by the combined eloquence of Raynal, Robertſon, and Buffon.

As an evidence of the malignity of the American atmoſphere, it has been remarked, by Dr. Robertſon, that the animals in this country, when diſcovered by Columbus, were leſs various in their ſpecies than thoſe of the old world. "Nature was not "only leſs *prolific* in the new world, but ſhe ap-

" pears likewiſe to have been leſs vigorous in " her productions. The animals, *originally* be- " longing to this quarter of the globe, appear " to be of an inferior race, neither ſo robuſt, " nor ſo fierce, as thoſe of the other continent. " America *gives birth* to no other creature of " ſuch bulk as to be compared with the Elephant " or rhinoceros, or that equals the lion and tyger " in ſtrength and ferocity. The *tapyr* of Braſil, the " quadruped of the *firſt magnitude* in the new world, " is not larger than a calf of ſix months old. The " *puma* and *jaguar*, its fierceſt beaſts of prey, which " the Europeans have inaccurately denominated " lions and tygers, poſſeſs neither the undaunted " courage of the former, nor the ravenous cruelty " of the latter. They are inactive and timid, hardly " formidable to man, and often turn their backs " upon the leaſt appearance of reſiſtance. (So much the better.) The ſame qualities in the climate of " America which ſtinted the growth, and enfeebled " the ſpirit of its *native* animals, have proved per- " nicious to ſuch as have *migrated into it volun- " tarily* from the other continent, or have been " tranſported thither by the Europeans. The bears, " the wolves, the deer of America, are not equal " in ſize to thoſe of the old world. Moſt of the " domeſtic animals, with which the Europeans " ſtored the provinces wherein they ſettled, have " degenerated with reſpect to their bulk or quality, " in a country, whoſe temperature and ſoil ſeem to " be *leſs favourable* to the *ſtrength* and *perfection* of " the animal creation."*

This paſſage is inſerted here at full length, becauſe it contains a ſummary of the ſpeculations of Buffon and others on this branch of natural hiſ-

* Hiſtory of America, Book IV.

ſtory, Mr. Jefferſon, in his Notes on Virginia, has fully vindicated the climate of America from theſe unjuſt imputations, and the reader will turn, with peculiar ſatisfaction, to a work, which unites the ſweetneſs of Xenophon with the force of Polybius, information without parade, and eloquence without effort. Mr. Williams, alſo, in his hiſtory of Vermont, proves, by a multitude of examples, that many animals in America exceed the bulk of the ſame ſpecies in the old world. Some places in this citation, deſerve particular notice.

From the inſpired writings we learn, that, all quadrupeds, now on the face of the globe, emigrated from Aſia, after the deluge. It is hard then to ſay, what the writer means by *animals originally belonging* to this continent, and *native* animals; which he holds up in oppoſition to thoſe which have *migrated into it voluntarily*. If he ſuppoſes that the tapyr, the puma, and jaguar have been the produce of ſeparate creation, or that, as he expreſſes it, America has *given birth* to them, it is as likely that the bears, wolves, and deer, of America, have alſo been *created* in the new world. We are fortunate in wanting the ſtrength and perfection of the rhinoceros, the lion, and the tyger, for we certainly never ſhould have been the better for them, But the mammoth alone was much larger than the elephant, the rhinoceros, and all the carnivorous quadrupeds put together. This is ſurely a ſufficient evidence of the vigour of nature. Mr. Jefferſon mentions an American biſon that weighed eighteen hundred pounds, a bear, four hundred and ten pounds, and a red deer, two hundred and eighty-eight pounds. He quotes Buffon, as admitting that the beaver, the otter, and ſhrew-mouſe, are *larger in America than in Europe*. The black mooſe, is ſaid by Kalm, to be as high as a tall horſe, and by Cateſbey, to be

about the bigneſs of a middle-ſized ox. Mr. Jefferſon adds, that the white bear is as large in America as in Europe. If the domeſtic animals of North-America are inferior to thoſe of Europe, it is only from want of care in thoſe who breed them. "It may be affirmed with truth, that in thoſe "countries, and with thoſe individuals of America, "where neceſſity or curioſity has produced equal "attention, as in Europe, to the nouriſhment of "animals, the horſes, cattle, ſheep, and hogs of "the one continent are as large as thoſe of the "other."* Buffon reckons two hundred and twenty-ſix different ſpecies of quadrupeds. Of theſe, it appears from tables printed by Mr. Jefferſon, that an hundred are peculiar to America, and that before its diſcovery, it contained twenty-ſix others common to Europe. Dr. Robertſon was miſtaken in ſaying, upon the authority of Buffon, that "of two hundred different kinds of animals, "ſpread over the face of the earth, only about "*one-third* exiſted in America, at the time of its "diſcovery."†

If Dr. Robertſon had reſided for ſix months in Kentucky, he might have avoided ſome errors in his account of the character and condition of the ſavages. He would have underſtood more from ſtudying *their manners, living as they riſe*, than any other perſon will learn on that ſubject, from peruſing his elaborate diſſertation of an hundred and thirty-eight quarto pages. It is told and believed, on the other ſide of the Atlantic, that very few people of either ſex, in this country are unmarried at the age of twenty, and that nothing is more common than to ſee a couple, whoſe ages together do not exceed *thirty*. Boſton, New-York, and Philadelphia, con-

* Notes on the State of Virginia. ART. PRODUCTIONS.
† Ibid.

tain in whole, about an hundred and twenty thouſand inhabitants leſs or more; and in theſe three cities, it is barely probable, that three ſuch couples are to be found. Speaking of North-America, Dr. Smith ſays, "Labour is there ſo well rewarded, "that a numerous family of children, inſtead of "being a burthen, is a ſource of opulence and "proſperity to the parents. The labour of each "child, *before it can leave the houſe*, is computed to "be worth one hundred pounds *clear gain* to them. "A young widow, with four or five young children, "who, among the middling or inferior ranks of peo-"ple in Europe, would have little chance for a "ſecond huſband, is there frequently conſidered "as a ſort of fortune. The *value* of children is the "greateſt of all inducements to marriage. We "cannot, therefore, wonder that the people in "North America ſhould generally marry *very* "*young*. Notwithſtanding the great increaſe occa-"ſioned by ſuch early marriages, there is a con-"tinual complaint of the ſcarcity of hands in North-"America."* The author had been miſinformed in every particular. A family of children is not ſuch a burthen here as in Europe, unleſs in the ſea-port towns, becauſe the plenty of land, and the lightneſs of our taxes, have introduced a general eaſe of circumſtances. But examples are rare, where children have been a ſource of opulence and proſperity to their parents. The reverſe is frequently the caſe; though juſt as in England it may ſometimes happen. As to the hundred pounds of *clear gain*, by the *labour* of each child before it can leave the houſe, an hundred cents would have been a more probable calculation. *The young widow*, will have juſt as little chance for a huſband, in one

* Inquiry into the Nature and Cauſes of the Wealth of Nations, Book I. chap. viii.

of the ſea-port towns of the United States, where ſubſiſtence has univerſally become very expenſive, as in any part of England. Yet, ſuch marriages occaſionally take place in both countries. In the country, where food may be had for a trifle, an American farmer might not be much afraid of ſuch an incumbrance with a wife, yet he would conſider four or five children to be one. The value of children, regarded merely as working machines, would be an idle motive to matrimony, ſince it would be more expedient to hire ſervants. The preſent generation is ſufficiently diſpoſed to leave another behind it; but not for the money that is to be acquired by rearing of children. As to the great increaſe by ſuch early marriages, in a conſiderable portion, at leaſt, of this continent, marriages are not perceptibly more early than in Europe, or, if a difference can be found, it is but ſmall. Mr. Barton, in the article before quoted, has made a large collection of the various amount of births in proportion to marriages, in France, England, Pruſſia, Switzerland, and other parts of Europe. For theſe four countries, the births are about four to every marriage, or ſomewhat leſs. He quotes the regiſter of marriages and births for a town in Maſſachuſetts, during the courſe of fifty-four years. The former amounted to five hundred and twenty-one, the latter to two thouſand two hundred and forty-ſeven. This gives four births to every marriage, with an overplus of one hundred and ſixty-three, or leſs than one-third. But no ſingle inſtance can be a ſatisfactory evidence of the ſuperior number of births to a marriage, for the whole of ſo vaſt a continent.

One would imagine that, at leaſt, of the great ſea-port towns in America, the writers of Europe ſhould have a competent knowledge. This does not

always appear to be the case. Mr. Payne, in describing Philadelphia, has favoured his readers with the following information, "It (the city) is seated "between two navigable rivers, the Delaware on the "*west*, and the *Schuylkill* on the *east*. Every owner of "a thousand acres has his house in one of the two "fronts facing *the river*, or in the high street, run-"ning from the middle of one front to the middle "of the other.—Several canals are let into the town "from *each river*, which add to the beauty and "convenience of the place.—Its *quay* is two hun-"dred feet square.—The city contains about twenty "thousand inhabitants."* This description is chiefly borrowed from Guthrie, with a few variations, at the fancy of the transcriber. Guthrie, who, in his turn, borrows from Burke, has placed the Delaware on the *north*, and the Schuylkill on the *south* of the city, to which he assigns *thirty thousand* inhabitants†. To an American reader, such descriptions require no criticism. The city and liberties extend about two miles and an half in length from north to south, but with a small inclination to the east, close upon the western bank of the Delaware. The city spreads for about half a mile from the bank of that river towards the Schuylkill, which runs in a parallel line to the Delaware, west of it, about two miles. As to "the two fronts facing the river, "and the canals let into the town from each river," there is nothing like them. By a report, dated the 19th of August, 1791, the city contained forty-two thousand five hundred and twenty inhabitants. The fever, in summer, 1793, swept off about five thousand people, yet the number is at present perhaps more than fifty thousand.

* Universal Geography, Book IV, p. 305. This book was printed at Dublin, in 1793, in two large quarto volumes.

† Geographical Grammar, London Quarto Edition, 1792, p. 929.

Hundreds of miſtakes of all ſorts may be collected from Payne and Guthrie. The former tells us, for example, that Maryland contains "*an hundred and* "*thirty thouſand* inhabitants." By the cenſus of 1791, Maryland had three hundred and ninety-ſeven thouſand ſeven hundred and twenty-eight inhabitants. It is needleſs to ſpend further time upon Payne and Guthrie, "upon faults too evident for "detection, and too groſs for aggravation*.

One charge yet remains to be noticed, which has been repeated in a thouſand different forms. It is here inſerted, in the words of Dr. Johnſon, in his "Obſervations on the State of Affairs, in "1756." After obſerving of the conteſt between France and England, about their boundaries, in North-America, "that no honeſt man can heartily "wiſh ſucceſs to either party," he proceeds thus, as to the general title of the European ſettlers to their lands on this continent:

"It cannot be ſaid, that the Indians originally "invited us to their coaſts; we went uncalled, and "unexpected, to nations who had no imagination "that the earth contained any inhabitants ſo diſ-"tant and ſo different from themſelves. We aſ-"toniſhed them with our ſhips, with our arms, "and with our general ſuperiority. They yielded "to us as to beings of another and *higher* race, "ſent among them from ſome unknown regions, "with power, which naked Indians could not re-"ſiſt; and which they were, therefore, by every "act of humility, to propitiate, that they, who "could ſo eaſily deſtroy, might be induced to "ſpare.

* Dr. Johnſon on Cymbeline. A new edition of Guthrie's Geographical Grammar, has been printed in Philadelphia. That part of the work which related to the United States, was written entirely over again. The original was too imperfect for emendation.

" To this influence, and to this only, are to be " attributed all the ceſſions and ſubmiſſions of the " Indian princes, if, indeed, any *ſuch ceſſions were* " *ever made*, of which we have had no witneſs but " thoſe who claim from them, and there is no great " malignity in ſuſpecting that thoſe who have *robbed* " have alſo *lied**.

The queſtion has been warmly debated, what right Europeans ever had to territories in America? When the Spaniards laid waſte populous and civilized empires, the nature of their conduct needs no illuſtration. We ſhall here ſpeak only of the ſettlement of thoſe colonies, that are now comprehended in the federal union. With regard to them, hiſtory will not ſupport or juſtify the harſh language that has been ſometimes employed.

New-England contains nearly one-fifth, part of the people in the United States. It was originally colonized by perſons who conducted themſelves on the principles of ſtrict juſtice. In March, 1621, Maſaſſoit, one of the principal Indian chiefs, viſited the Plymouth ſettlers. He entered into a treaty with them. It was inviolably obſerved by himſelf and his ſucceſſors for fifty years; and, at this day, the name of Maſaſſoit is remembered in New-England with reſpect and gratitude. New-York was firſt planted by the Dutch; and this event does not ſeem to be marked by any ſtrong ſymptoms of hoſtility, or of fraud. The lands of Pennſylvania were honeſtly purchaſed from the Indians. They adhered peaceably to their bargain, and no third party is entitled to object againſt it. As to Virginia, Mr. Jefferſon, in his Notes, obſerves, " that the lands " of this country were taken from them (the na- " tives) by conqueſt, is not ſo general a truth as is

* Murphy's Edition of Johnſon's Works, Vol. II. p. 282.

" ſuppoſed. I find, in our hiſtorians and records, " repeated proofs of purchaſe, which cover a con- " ſiderable part of the lower country; and many " more would, doubtleſs, be found on further " ſearch. The upper country we know has been " acquired altogether by purchaſe, made *in the moſt* " *unexceptionable form.*" As for the other ſtates, we ſhall find, that, in general, the lands have been acquired at a price which was conſidered as adequate, by both parties. Subſequent breaches of treaty have been committed on each ſide. In conſequence, quarrels enſued, juſt as they do in Europe. They could not always be avoided here, any more than in the old world, unleſs the new ſettlers had deſerted their lands and left North-America to remain a wilderneſs.

In ſome parts of Virginia, Mr. Jefferſon computes, that the Indians were as one to every ſquare mile. Other regions of the continent were ſtill more deſolate. Of this Dr. Robertſon gives the following inſtances. A miſſionary travelled from the Illinois to Machillimackinac. In twelve days, the party did not meet with a ſingle human creature. Dr. Brickell, in an excurſion from North-Carolina towards the mountains, did not, in the courſe of fifteen days, meet any perſon whatever. The continent, with a few exceptions, contained, perhaps, not more than a thouſandth part of the people whom it was capable of ſubſiſting. Such vaſt tracts of excellent land ought not to lie waſte; and they never would have been peopled by the Indians. The Europeans purchaſed extenſive territories on the coaſt, and colonized them. If the natives found themſelves incommoded for want of room, they had it in their option to retire backwards into the deſart; where a hunter might range for a fortnight without meeting a rival. They had, therefore, no great rea-

ſon to be diſcontented. It might be ſaid, that they could ſubſiſt by hunting only, and that to deprive them of their hunting ground was to ſtarve them. We muſt admit, with many exceptions, the idea that their chief ſubſiſtence was derived from the chace. The tribes on the north and ſouth-weſtern frontier of the union, have large plantations of Indian corn, and raiſe cattle; ſo that they now, at leaſt, are in very little danger of ſtarving, though they ſhould never hunt at all. When general Sullivan marched into the country of the Six Nations, he found extenſive orchards and cornfields. General Wayne, in Auguſt, 1794, declared, that the Miamis had the largeſt corn fields which he ever ſaw in America; and it has been ſaid, that they extended to five thouſand acres. Some writers indeed ſeem to think that it was culpable to take Indian lands, upon any terms, and expatiate on the trifling prices paid for them. But theſe lands are in reality worth very little to a tribe of hunters compared with their value to a nation of farmers and manufacturers. There is no harm in *buying* ground from an Indian community any more than from a private perſon in Europe. Why ſhould a tribe of two or three hundred hunters engroſs an extent of land equal to the ſupport of five hundred thouſand or a million of people? The Indians on our frontier are not, at preſent, famed for ſimplicity; as will appear in a future part of this volume.

Mr. Guthrie, in his Geographical Grammar, eſtimates the whole inhabitants of America at one hundred and fifty millions. This is a very wild miſtake. The amount may be aſcertained with tolerable accuracy. The ſubject is curious and deſerves our attention.

By the cenſus of 1791, the United States contained, three millions, nine hundred and twenty-nine

thouſand, three hundred and twenty-ſix perſons; ſome diſtricts were not included. The whole, according to Morſe, vol I. p. 297, may have been three millions, nine hundred and fifty thouſand. In 1784, Canada, by a cenſus, was found to have one hundred and thirteen thouſand and twelve inhabitants, beſides ten thouſand loyaliſts, in the upper parts of the province. The total population of the Britiſh dominions of North-America can ſcarcely exceed two hundred thouſand. The native Indians may be gueſſed at an equal number; and the ſettlers in the Spaniſh part of North America, at an hundred thouſand. Theſe make together half a million. About ſeven years have elapſed, ſince the cenſus of the United States. The people may be now augmented by one million. Thus, if we allow five millions to the federal government, and five hundred thouſand to the Spainards, the Britiſh, and Indians, we have, in whole, five millions, and an half. The empire of Mexico is divided into nine dioceſes; and in 1741, a cenſus was made of the people in four of theſe, and in ſome part of a fifth. The Indian families were two hundred and ninety-four thouſand, three hundred and ninety-one, which, at five to a family, make one million, four hundred and ſeventy-one thouſand nine hundred and fifty-five. Dr. Robertſon, who gives this ſtatement, ſubjoins, that in two of the dioceſes omitted, "the Indian race is more numerous than *in any* (other) "*part of New Spain.*" In Nova Galicia, which he terms a vaſt province, the people, of only "a ſmall "part of it," were numbered. We may, therefore, conclude, that the four diſtricts, where the Indians were not numbered at all, and that part of Nova Galicia which was left unſurveyed, contains, at leaſt, as many Indians, as the other part of the empire. The hiſtorian, therefore, was certainly inaccurate

in ſaying, that "the number of Indians in the Mexican empire exceeds *two* millions." By his own account, they muſt have been not leſs than three millions, in 1741, when this imperfect cenſus was made in four dioceſes only, and part of a fifth one, out of the whole nine. About fifty-three years have ſince elapſed. They are, upon the whole, increaſing, of which Dr. Smith has brought ſome evidence*, ſo that by this time, they are, moſt likely, four millions. The other inhabitants of Mexico are, by the higheſt computation of Dr. Robertſon, three millions. Thus we have ſeven millions for Mexico, and Peru is not beleived to be more populous. Admitting theſe two empires to contain fourteen millions of inhabitants, and the other Spaniſh dominions on the continent of South-America two millions, we have thus ſixteen millions. Four millions will be ſufficient for Braſil and Paraguay. The reſt of that continent, a few ſpots excepted, is a deſart. Hence the total number of inhabitants in South-America does not amount to more than twenty millions, nor thoſe in North-America to more than five millions and an half; at leaſt the over-plus cannot be conſiderable.

The inhabitants of the United States have, by various calculations, been found to double upon a medium, in twenty-five years. Hence, in 1847, their preſent population of five millions will have extended to twenty, and in 1897, to eighty millions. By the ſame progreſs, the cloſe of the nineteenth century would comprehend an augmentation to twelve hundred and eighty millions; and as, before that time, the northern continent muſt be over-ſtocked with people, the over-plus will naturally find vent in the ſouthern continent. Under

* Inquiry into the Wealth of Nations, Book V. Chap. vii. Part II.

many difficulties, the people of New-England, in particular, have continued for an hundred and fifty years to multiply in the preceding proportion; and there is no reaſon to think, that the ratio will hereafter decreaſe.

Peru was conquered about two hundred and fifty years ago, and Mexico at a more early period. Since that time, theſe countries have remained in tranquillity; and yet it is very doubtful whether, including every colour, they contain at preſent five times the number of people which were to be found in them immediately after the Spaniſh conqueſt.

Since the firſt torrent of emigration, in the reign of Charles I. very few individuals have ever gone to ſettle in New-England; but there has been a conſtant ſtream of emigration from it into the other colonies. The original ſettlers amounted, by Hutchinſon's account, to about twenty thouſand, and, including Vermont, that part of the union has now a million of people. Thus, in a century and an half, the firſt colony has augmented to fifty times its primitive number; while the increaſe in the Spaniſh provinces bears not any thing that approaches to a correſpondent proportion. Such is the eternal difference between freedom and ſlavery. Under a government like ours, the Spaniſh colonies might, by this time, have made the banks of the Amazon and the La Plata, as populous as thoſe of the Delaware and the Hudſon.

CHAPTER II.

European Supremacy.—Britain.—Summary of her Colonial Syſtem.—At no expence in founding her colonies.—Wars of 1689, 1702, *and* 1739.—*War of* 1756.—*The real cauſe of that war.—Its enormous expence, and abſurd conduct on the part of Britain.—Inſignificance of Canada to that country.—Approaching ſubverſion of European ſupremacy in every part of America.—Mr. Harper's propoſal.*

AS the native Americans were, in a great meaſure, defenceleſs, the ſovereigns of Europe immediately marked out this continent for their prey; and a conſiderable portion of it continues to languiſh in their fetters. By flagrant uſurpation, they aſſumed the right of granting patents and charters, for diſcovery and colonization, on the weſtern ſhore of the Atlantic. If Columbus had accompliſhed a voyage to the moon, or if Cabot had aſcended to the planet Herſchel, a king of Spain or England, might, with equal plauſibility, have claimed a title of parcelling out theſe regions to Cortez, or to Penn. This was a violation of natural juſtice, which had no precedent among the ancients. When the Grecian republics diſperſed colonies on the coaſt of Aſia, they never attempted to aſſume that ſort of dominion, which hath ſince been claimed by the monarchs of Europe. The Americans, during the late revolution, might have ſpared much of their labour in proving what rights they had acquired,

by their charters, from the Britiſh crown. All government, which is not founded on the legitimate conſent of the people, and conducted by their repreſentatives, is, in itſelf, uſurpation Hence, when a Britiſh monarch gave a title to countries which were not his own, it was to be ſuppoſed that his ſucceſſors, in the ſame ſpirit of robbery, would embrace the firſt temptation to break their part of the engagement. But this breach, on their ſide, was of little conſequence; becauſe, ſuch patents and charters formed an inſult upon common ſenſe, and the primitive rights of mankind.

If the Britiſh government had been at any charge in founding colonies in North America, there might have been ſome reaſon for aſſuming a privilege to give them laws, to ſmother their manufactures, and reſtrict their navigation. But, in place of money or aſſiſtance, ſhe gave them nothing, or next to nothing, but charters, for poſſeſſing territories that were not her's to beſtow, and of which ſhe did not always know under what degree of latitude they were placed. The numerous miſtakes in extending royal grants have produced confuſion and litigation in the colonies. The ſettlers of America were able, without foreign aſſiſtance, to have made laws, and marked out boundaries for themſelves. England interpoſed in this way for one ſingle purpoſe only, that, as ſoon as the colonies became a fit object for taxation, or monopoly, ſhe might ſecure to herſelf the whole benefits that could be drawn from them. People, to this day, and even on this ſide of the Atlantic, perſiſt in terming Britain the *mother* country. If her relation to her colonies deſerved a domeſtic name, it was that of a jealous and bloody ſtep-mother.

In the exportation of their own ſurplus produce, the Britiſh colonies, both of North-America, and

the Weſt-Indies, were greatly reſtricted by acts of parliament. Part of their productions could be exported only to Britain. By confining tobacco and cotton, for inſtance, to the home market, the Britiſh merchants expected that they would be able to buy them cheaper in the plantations, and to ſell them with a better profit in Britain. They likewiſe propoſed, by this regulation, to eſtabliſh, in their own favour, between the colonies and foreign countries, an advantageous *carrying trade*, of which Britain was to be the centre, as the only country in Europe into which theſe commodities were firſt to be imported. Britain encouraged America in the manufacture of pig and bar iron, by exempting them from duties to which the like commodities were ſubjected, when imported from any other country. Yet an abſolute prohibition was impoſed upon the erection of ſteel furnaces, and ſlitting mills in any of the colonies. England would not ſuffer her coloniſts to work in thoſe more refined manufactures, even for their own conſumption. They were to purchaſe, from her merchants and manufacturers, all goods of this kind, for which they had occaſion.

She prohibited the exportation from one province to another by water, and even the carriage by land upon horſeback, or in a cart, of hats, of wools and woollen goods of the produce of America. This regulation prevented the eſtabliſhment of any manufactures of ſuch commodities for diſtant ſale; and confined the induſtry of the Americans in this way, to ſuch coarſe and houſhold manufactures, as a private family commonly makes for its own uſe, or for that of ſome of its neighbours in the ſame province. After reciting theſe reſtrictions, Dr. Smith adds, that "to prohibit a "great people from making all that they can of "every part of their own produce, or from employ-

" ing their ſtock and induſtry in the way that they " judge moſt advantageous to themſelves, is a *ma-* " *niſeſt violation of the moſt ſacred rights of man-* " *kind**." The Engliſh nation had originally aſſumed a right of enacting laws to which they had no lawful or honeſt claim; and a multitude of the ſtatutes which they made were in " manifeſt vio- " lation of the moſt ſacred rights of mankind." Nor is this an haſty or unguarded expreſſion. For the author adds, that theſe prohibitions were " only " *impertinent badges of ſlavery* impoſed upon them " (the colonies) without any ſufficient reaſon, by " the groundleſs jealouſy of the merchants and ma- " nufacturers of the *mother* country."

This account ought to calm the raptures of American gratitude towards the ſupremacy of Britain, even in its beſt days, and its mildeſt form. Her commercial regulations have always been adapted, or, at leaſt, deſigned, to ſerve her own intereſt at the expence of the reſt of the world, her colonies not excepted. How far ſhe was ſucceſsful in this effort, may be gathered from the intereſting ſtatement exhibited by the ſame author†. We ſhall now inveſtigate ſome of the principal features of her adminiſtration, where the concerns of the mercantile intereſt did not give an impreſſion.

In the firſt place, it does not appear that the crown of England bore almoſt any part of the charges of founding the colonies, that now compoſe the ſixteen United States. Before the year 1589, Sir Walter Raleigh had expended forty thouſand pounds ſterling, in attempting to ſettle adventurers in Virginia. This ſum was equal in value to one hundred and fifty or two hundred thouſand pounds ſterling at

* Inquiry into the Nature and Cauſes of the Wealth of Nations, Book IV. Chap. vii. Part II.

† Ibid. Part III.

this day. Raleigh was "obſtructed occaſionally by the "crown, *without a ſhilling of aid from it**". His ſubſequent expences muſt likewiſe have been very great. Raleigh was, in 1603, impriſoned, and, in 1609, James the firſt, granted a charter for ſettling Virginia to a company.

"The king and company quarrelled, and, by a "mixture of law and force, the latter were ouſted "of all their rights, *without retribution*, after hav- "ing expended a hundred thouſand pounds ſter- "ling in eſtabliſhing the colony, *without the ſmalleſt* "*aid from government*. King James ſuſpended their "powers by proclamation of July 15th, 1624, and "Charles the firſt took the government into his "own hands†". Mr. Jefferſon mentions a variety of ſubſequent uſurpations. The grant of Maryland to lord Baltimore is one of the number. This was obtained in 1632, from Charles the firſt. It was not till after many years of ſolicitation, that Charles the ſecond permitted William Penn to found the colony of Pennſylvania. Yet Charles himſelf had no title to the country, except that general one derived from the voyage of John Cabot‡; and the grant itſelf was to coſt him nothing. This was the inſolence, perverſeneſs, and rapacity of a court. Charles the ſecond, had owed conſiderable ſums to admiral Penn, father to William, ſo that the grant was the diſcharge of a debt. New-York and New-Jerſey were torn from the Dutch by Charles the ſe-

* Jefferſon's Notes on Virginia, ART. CONSTITUTION.

† Ibid.

‡ In 1496, this mariner ſailed from England, in queſt of *China*. He fell in with the north ſide of Terra Labrador. On this notable atchievement were founded the territorial titles of the crown of England to her North-American dominions. The French, in one of their voyages to China, found themſelves, in May, 1544, in the Gulph of St. Lawrence; a circumſtance, from whence *they* deduced their right to Canada: Carey's American Edition of Guthrie, Vol. II. p. 244.

cond, in one of his piratical wars againſt their republic. He afterwards made a gift of New-Jerſey to his brother, James the ſecond, who ſold it to private adventurers. The two Carolinas and Georgia were ſettled in the ſame way; and, if the founders received pecuniary aid from the Britiſh government, it was too trifling to deſerve detailed notice.

Maſſachuſetts was firſt ſettled in 1620. A number of Engliſh partizans, perſecuted at home, purchaſed a tract of territory, ſituated within the juriſdiction of the Plymouth company. Theſe emigrants were driven from their native country with every mark of hoſtility and contempt. Archbiſhop Laud, under the auſpices of Charles the firſt, perſecuted all kinds of non-conformiſts with unrelenting fury. The puritans, on the other hand, were ready to ſubmit to all the rigour of perſecution, rather than to give up their religious opinions, and conform to the church of England. America opened an extenſive field; and Laud, even from principles of political expediency, ſhould have been glad to free England from ſuch diſſatisfied and dangerous inhabitants. The vengeance of this clergyman was not appeaſed by the exile of thoſe who differed from his tenets. Many thouſands of diſſenters, indeed, eſcaped from their inſular confinement; but had not Laud interpoſed his prohibition, the population of New-England might, at this day, have doubled its preſent amount.

Beſides the difficulty of obtaining leave to ſettle in America, the coloniſts had another formidable obſtacle to encounter and ſurmount. The crown of England had parcelled out the country to ſome of its hungry dependents. To theſe men a new colony was of no value, but for what could be ſqueezed out of it. They were careful to exert their authority in a ſtyle worthy of the ſource from which

it was derived. The arbitrary proceedings of the king and parliament, in aſſuming a power to make laws for the colonies without their concurrence, filled up the meaſure of American wrongs. Britain, evidently thruſt herſelf into the government of this country for the ſake of what ſhe could get; and, accordingly, when the colonies had made ſome progreſs in agriculture, ſhe was careful to cramp their commerce and induſtry, by vexatious and oppreſſive edicts. In this account there appear no traces of maternal affection. The royal, or parliamentary authority, along with that of the patentees, was, in all caſes, and without exception, a groſs deſpotiſm, founded on the helpleſsneſs of the original ſettlers. Between the patentees, however, a diſtinction muſt be made. Of Gorges and Maſon, the colony of Maſſachuſetts knew little, but by the law-ſuits raiſed in ſupport of their claims. As far as they or Penn had expended money in ſettling or improving the colonies, they were entitled to compenſation; and certainly no farther.

This kind of reaſoning cuts ſhort all claims of gratitude on the part of America towards England. As England never had any right of making laws for America, it is not worth while to deſcend to particular inſtances, where theſe laws were oppreſſive, becauſe the wiſeſt and beſt of them were, in equity, as truly void, as the gift of an eſtate by a perſon who is not the lawful owner. The conſtant tranſportation of all ſorts of criminals from Britain to the colonies, was an inſult, of that kind, which might have excuſed the Americans, for overlooking even the greateſt obligations. Lewis the fourteenth, if aſked, would very chearfully have ceded Canada, Cape Breton, and Nova Scotia to England. Theſe opportunities were neglected. Judge Hutchinſon thinks it likely, that, if the French had been

driven out of Canada, an hundred years ſooner, New-England, at the time of his writing, in 1767, might have contained two hundred thouſand additional people. Under the notion of England being a *parent* ſtate, this neglect was highly culpable. In reality, it does not appear that the Engliſh government, in any ſingle inſtance, paid ſerious attention to the intereſt of the colonies. This is not the language of party or prejudice, but the plain inference from a ſeries of legiſlative edicts, and hiſtorical events. With reſpect to the wars of 1739, and 1756, Britain has as little to boaſt of generoſity, as in any former part of her conduct towards America. Dr. Smith has ſpoke of theſe wars in terms, which cannot be juſtified by a ſober detail of facts. He ſays, that "the laſt war (that of 1756) which was undertaken altogether *on account of the colonies*, "coſt Great Britain, it has already been obſerved, "more than ninety millions. The Spaniſh war, of "1739, was *principally undertaken on their account*; "in which, and in the French war, that was the "conſequence of it, Great Britain ſpent upwards "of forty millions, a great part of which *ought* "*juſtly to be charged to the colonies**". From this, the writer ſeems to infer, that the colonies ought to pay a ſhare of the public debts of England. To enumerate the various cauſes of the war in 1739, would require much room; but every perſon who conſults hiſtory, will ſee that the Britiſh nation had a multiplicity of pretences; for ſhe had no *reaſons*, to commence that war, entirely diſtinct from any attachment *to her North American provinces*. Her merchants had, for many years, ſmuggled immenſe quantities of goods into the Spaniſh colonies. The court of Madrid determined to check this practice,

* Inquiry, Book III. Chap. V.

and hoſtilities enſued*. On this Spaniſh quarrel, George the ſecond engrafted another on the continent of Europe. America had no natural concerns in ſuch meaſures. If any of her traders embarked in a contraband commerce to the Spaniſh dominions, it was the intereſt of the reſt of the people to leave them alone, to fight their own battles. At this time, and with leſs impropriety, the United States might now declare war againſt France, Spain, and Britain, for interrupting their navigation. In this war, France attacked us, not as American republics, but as Britiſh colonies. At the ſiege of Louiſbourg, in 1745, the provinces of New-Hampſhire and Maſſachuſetts loſt between two and three thouſand men; a loſs, that, as Mr. Hutchinſon obſerves, was very ſeverely felt, and it may be ſafely aſcribed to the turbulent ambition of Britain. America, notwithſtanding the affirmation of Dr. Smith, had no reaſon to thank the court of London, for this war, and conſequently ſhe was under no moral obligation to pay any part of its charges.

As to the war of 1756, Dr. Franklin had propoſed to defend Pennſylvania, by embodying an American militia. The colonies, if united, could with eaſe have defended themſelves againſt any force which the French ever brought into Canada. That they did not actually do ſo, muſt be attributed to Engliſh jealouſy. "The defence of her colonies "was a great expence to Great Britain. The moſt "effectual mode of leſſening this, was to put arms "into the hands of the inhabitants, to teach them "their uſe. But England wiſhed not that the Ame-"ricans ſhould become acquainted with their own "ſtrength. She was apprehenſive, that, as ſoon as "this period arrived, they would no longer ſubmit

* Conſult on this ſubject Robertſon's Hiſtory of America, Book VIII.

" to that monopoly of their trade, which to them " was highly injurious, but extremely advantage- " ous to the mother country. In comparison with the " profits of this, the expence of maintaining armies " and fleets to defend them was *trifling*. She sought " to keep them dependent upon her for protection, " the best plan which could be devised for retaining " them in peaceable subjection. The least appear- " ance of a military spirit was therefore to be guard- " ed against; and, although a war then raged, the " act, organizing a militia, was disapproved of by " the ministry. The regiments which had been " formed under it, were disbanded, and the defence " of the province entrusted to *regular* troops*." The generosity of Britain, in that war, was one of the principal arguments, employed by the advocates, for reducing the Americans to unconditional submission. The limits of Canada, for which it commenced are likely to produce, at some future time, a second quarrel on this continent. It may, therefore, be worth while to examine more fully the real causes of the war of 1756, and the real importance of Canada to the rest of the British empire.

The animosity of the English nation towards France, has plunged them into many unprovoked wars against that people. One of the principal causes of that in question, was their jealousy of the share which the French had in trade with the Indians. Some of the latter passed by Albany to Montreal, two hundred and fifty miles farther, to buy goods, which they could have had cheaper at Albany. Guthrie, in his Geographical Grammar, states this circumstance, and adds, with a tone of regret, " so " much did the French exceed *us* in the arts of " winning the affections of these savages!" If the

* London Edition of Franklin's Works, vol. I. p. 256.

Indians preferred the French to the Engliſh market, it muſt have been becauſe they were better treated at Montreal than at Albany; ſo that the remark, though deſigned by the writer as an oblique ſarcaſm on French cunning, is a tacit acknowledgement of the ſuperior prudence and integrity of the French nation. But this diminutive advantage on the ſide of France, deſerved not to have been, as it really was, an object of envy to the people of England. Theſe two rival nations traverſed an ocean above a thouſand leagues wide, that they might open dram ſhops, for the debauchery and extirpation of a race of naked barbarians. This traffic was not an object of rational ambition to either party. Their common eagerneſs to purſue it, may readily be traced to their ſtrong deſire of purchaſing furs from the Indians, at a very cheap rate, in order to ſell them at an exorbitant price in Europe. The ſpiritous liquors, which formed a ſtaple commodity in this commerce, have utterly deſtroyed whole tribes of the primitive Americans: of thoſe who ſtill exiſt, the havoc has been very great. The Six Nations, for example, are ſaid to have ſhrunk from a very ſuperior number, to hardly fifteen hundred fighting men*. In a moral ſenſe, therefore, this trade was extremely deteſtable. But, even as a ſource of wealth, its expediency might have been very doubtful. We are told that the Indians would ſometimes give away their whole property for a dram. But the traders were frequently robbed and murdered, by the ſavages, whom they had intoxicated for the purpoſe of cheating them. This is the natural pro-

* "There are in the Six Nations, according to an accurate eſtimate, lately made by the reverend Mr. Kirkland, miſſionary among them, ſix thouſand, three hundred, and thirty ſouls. He adds, that among theſe there *is*, comparatively, but very few children." Morſe, vol. I. p. 44.

greſs and termination of knavery. After all, the furs were to be tranſported across the Atlantic, before they could be ſold again. Hence, if we take into conſideration, the numerous hazards of all kinds that were to be ſurmounted, before the ſkin of a beaver was finally brought to market, it ſeems very likely, that, upon the whole, theſe wandering pedlars from Europe, would have been employed more honourably and more profitably, both for their countrymen and themſelves, at home, in the ordinary occupations of domeſtic life. But the futility of this plan of commerce is placed beyond all doubt by another conſideration. Canada was the principal cauſe of the bloody war of 1756. This war coſt England one hundred and eleven millions, two hundred and ſeventy one thouſand, nine hundred and ninety-ſix pounds ſterling of public money*. The expences of France were certainly as great. Thus it is evident that a ſingle campaign coſt either nation more than all the furs in the world were worth. Since Britain became poſſeſſed of Canada, her trade with that country has been computed to employ about ſixty ſhips, and a thouſand ſeamen. The exports from the province, at an average of three years, in ſkins, furs, ginſeng, ſnake-root, capillaire, and wheat, amounted to one hundred and five thouſand, five hundred pounds ſterling per annum. The imports from Britain were eſtimated about the ſame ſum†. It may be ſuppoſed, that the number of ſhips and ſeamen engaged in this trade, is at preſent much greater, than has been above ſtated; for the trade itſelf has, of late years, been conſiderably augmented. In 1786, the exports from the province of Canada amounted to three hundred

* Hiſtory of the Public Revenue of the Britiſh Empire, by ſir John Sinclair, vol. II. p. 99.

† Guthrie, p. 887.

and forty-three thouſand, two hundred and ſixty-three pounds ſterling. The imports of the ſame year, were three hundred and twenty-five thouſand, one hundred and ſixteen pounds ſterling*. Thus the extent of the commerce between Britain and Canada ſeems to have trebled ſince the peace of 1763. We ſhall lay aſide the extravagant expence of the conqueſt, as well as that of preceeding wars for Canada, and of its defence in the revolution of 1775. Let us then eſtimate the preſent advantages derived by Britain from this addition to her dominions. The amount of Britiſh goods exported to Canada, ſince the conqueſt in 1763, cannot, upon an average up to this time, (January, 1798) be higher than two hundred thouſand pounds ſterling per annum. This calculation may be ſafely reſted on the particular ſtatements above mentioned. It is always reckoned a good trade, where a clear profit is to be gained of ten per cent. At this rate, England obtains, by the poſſeſſion of Canada, twenty thouſand pounds annually. It is uſual, in eſtimating the benefits ariſing to a nation in Europe, from one of its American colonies, to ſpeak of the whole profits of the commerce, as if they were ſome peculiar ſpecies of emolument, that could have been acquired only by the poſſeſſion of that individual ſpot. This ſort of political ſophiſtry has produced ſome very bloody and fruitleſs wars. In the caſe before us, for inſtance, the ſame capital could have been employed by Britiſh merchants in other branches of trade; and therefore the acquiſition of the country did not deſerve a ſtruggle. We are, indeed, informed, of the immenſe advantages that are obtained by the procuring from Canada of raw materials for manufactures†. This is another part

* Morſe, vol. I. p. 109. † See Guthrie, p. 887.

of the mercantile catechiſm, that has impelled mankind to innumerable crimes. *The raw materials* of manufactures may always be had, by thoſe, who, like the Britiſh nation, are able to pay for them. But we ſhall admit that they could only be found in Canada, and that upon theſe raw materials, there is a ſecond clear profit of ten per cent. amounting altogether, to a benefit of forty thouſand pounds per annum, to Britain. Still that nation is a great loſer by the retention of Canada. The expences of her civil and military eſtabliſhment cannot be exactly aſcertained, yet they will hardly come to leſs than an hundred thouſand pounds a year; for the ſingle fortreſs of Gibraltar, even in time of peace, coſts England annually twice that ſum*. In time of war, the expences both of Gibraltar and of Canada, become infinitely greater. If the military eſtabliſhment in Canada be two thouſand men, theſe are ſo many hands ſubtracted from the domeſtic manufactures of Britain, to an extent of loſs, perhaps, not leſs than fifty thouſand pounds a year. Thus, in one way or other, this province draws from Britain an hundred and fifty thouſand pounds ſterling per annum, even in time of peace, while its profits are forty thouſand. Ireland, in the reign of Elizabeth, required for its peace eſtabliſhment, more than four times the product of the whole revenue that tyranny could rend from its vitals†. Canada is, in this reſpect, what Ireland was to Britain at the cloſe of the ſixteenth century. How ſtriking is the folly of nations, of ſtateſmen, and of kings! In the war of 1756 only, the ſtruggle for Canada, coſt France and England, between them, two hundred millions ſterling, and the lives of five hundred thouſand men; and, after all, the dominion of the province, if it

* Hiſtory of the Public Revenue, vol. II. p. 172.
† Carey's American Edition of Guthrie, vol. I. p. 387.

could have been had for nothing, was abſolutely not worth acceptance! In 1784, the expence of collecting the cuſtoms in Quebec, Halifax, St. John's, and Newfoundland, exceeded their whole amount by a clear loſs of ſeven hundred and twenty-five pounds ſterling*.

The preceeding ſtatement of facts, proves the right of this country to political independence, and furniſhes a ſatisfactory anſwer to the accuſation of *ingratitude*, ſo loudly thundered in our ears, by the orators of Britain.

For the ſake both of Europe and America, it is to be deſired, that the colonial ſupremacy, held by the former, over ſome regions of the latter, may ſoon expire. This uſurped authority has uniformly produced bad conſequences to all parties. Spain, for inſtance, with the moſt wealthy and tempting portion of the new world, hath been reduced to ruin. Her colonies, at the ſame time, groan under odious oppreſſion. Peru and Chili excepted, the culture of the vine and olive are forbidden to the Spaniſh coloniſts. They muſt buy the wine and oil for which they have occaſion from old Spain. The difficulty of tranſporting ſuch bulky articles acroſs the iſthmus of Panama, is the only reaſon for exempting Peru and Chili from this edict of deſolation. No veſſel belonging to the Spaniſh colonies was ever permitted to carry the commodities of America to Europe. No veſſel of any foreign nation is openly received into the harbours of the Spaniſh dominions on the continent of America. The pains of death, and the confiſcation of moveables, are denounced againſt every inhabitant who trades with them. Yet, in ſpite of all theſe regulations, the king of Spain is defrauded of half his revenues. An author, quot-

* See Political Progreſs of Britain, Third Edition, Chap. vii.

ed by Dr. Robertſon, gives a ſtriking picture of the ſtate of government in the Spaniſh colonies. "We "have," ſays he, "viceroys, preſidents, gover- "nors, oydors, corrigidors, alcaldes, and thouſands "of alguazils abound every where; but, notwith- "ſtanding all theſe, public abuſes continue to mul- "tiply*." With ſuch a ſcene before them, the citizens of the United States cannot be ſufficiently thankful, that they have eſcaped from the talons of the *mother* country. Had the king of Britain ſucceeded in his plan of conqueſt, the ſubjects of Spain would have found no cauſe to envy the condition of Britiſh colonies.

It is pleaſing to obſerve how the rapacity of deſpotiſm overſhoots its aim. The Spaniards, both in Europe and America, have their invention continually on the ſtretch to elude the royal edicts. This ſpirit deſcends from the higheſt departments in government to the loweſt. The very officers appointed to check contraband trade, are often employed as inſtruments in carrying it on; and the boards inſtituted to reſtrain and puniſh it, are the channels through which it flows. In Mexico and Peru, the annual eſtabliſhment for defraying the charge of adminiſtration, exceeds one-half of the revenue collected. The annual amount, in ſterling money, exacted by Spain from America and the Phillipine iſlands, is computed by Dr. Robertſon at only two millions and ſeven hundred thouſand pounds ſterling, of which one-half is expended in ſupport of the adminiſtration. If theſe dominions contain ſixteen millions of people, the king of Spain gains by them about one ſhilling and eight pence per head. A poor reward for the ſlavery of a human being! But for their oppreſſed ſituation, the Spaniſh colonies might, perhaps, have

* Hiſtory of America, Book VIII.

been thrice as populous, and certainly much more improved than they are at preſent. Spain has had a ſtill worſe bargain of her colonies than Britain. Even in point of economy, it would have been for her advantage, to declare them independent an hundred years ago. The bloody war of 1739, excluſive of many other quarrels, muſt have coſt her altogether, at leaſt twenty-five or thirty millions ſterling. The very intereſt of this ſum would have been more than the whole net revenue that ſhe draws from her colonies. By caſting open their trade, ſhe would ſtill enjoy as great a ſhare of it, as ſhe could manage. England, by the ſeparation of her colonies, and the breaking up of her monopoly trade, has not loſt a ſingle farthing; ſince her commerce with the United States is much more extenſive than that with her North American colonies ever was before the revolution. This might be a leſſon to the crown of Spain.

The following is a remark made in an Engliſh magazine for the year 1791.—"Such is the fanati-"ciſm and ignorance of the Spaniards, that it is "moſt probable their ſettlements will be in "the hands of *the United States*, before their "eyes are opened to the light of knowledge and "liberty." The United States will certainly underſtand their own intereſt better than to attempt ſuch an acquiſition, or even to accept of it, if proffered for nothing. The ſupremacy of Spain will not, however, be long lived. "Her violent and ar-"bitrary government has, upon many occaſions, "been obliged to recall or ſoften the orders which "had been given for the government of her colo-"nies, for fear of a general inſurrection*."

* Inquiry into the Wealth of Nations, Book IV. Chap. VII. Part II. No hint of this important circumſtance occurs in Dr. Robertſon's Hiſtory of America.

It may have been ſo; but that is, at preſent, no concern of ours. In ſummer laſt, Mr. Robert Harper held out to Congreſs, the conqueſt of the two Mexicos, as a temptation for America to league with England againſt France. The above detail ſhews how inſignificant theſe poſſeſſions are even to Spain herſelf; and thus, on the ſide of avarice, the ſcheme is blaſted, even if the regions deſtined to federal plunder could be ſeized without reſiſtance. Mr. Harper, at the ſame time, railed at the French for conquering the dominions of monarchs, who had endeavoured to conquer them. Spain hath not warred againſt the United States, ſo that his own plan was evidently by far more atrocious than any which he had aſcribed to the republic. A proſal for robbery more unprovoked, more ſhameleſs, more criminal, was never ſuggeſted in the cabin of Blackbeard, or the camp of Brandt. Had his end been to liberate an injured people, the humanity of the viſion might have atoned for its madneſs. The view in which the member held out his ſcheme was not the diſpenſation of freedom to ſlaves, but the acquiſition of booty to conquerors. The moſt ſerious conſideration is, that the incendiary of Ninety Six, ſpoke, to be ſure, only as the *avaunt courier* of his party, who act with the regularity of a Roman legion*.

* On December 23d, 1797, Mr. Harper, in a private converſation in the ſtatehouſe, ſaid, that he wiſhed to ſee *the Bourbons reſtored to the throne of France*, and the nobility to their *ancient privileges*. Some of the company appeared to feel ſurpriſe; upon which, Mr. Harper ſubjoined, that he was willing to grant a legiſlature of ſome ſort. He ſaid, that the beſt friends to France, would wiſh for *a reſtoration of royalty*. It was replied, that, in this caſe, it would likewiſe be better for the United States to reſtore the Britiſh monarchy. He rejoined, that the American government would end in royalty, and it would ſuit the country beſt, but the minds of the people were *not yet ripe for it*.

This converſation is related on the authority of members of congreſs, who were preſent.

CHAPTER III.

Federal plan for the conqueſt of Mexico.—Britiſh captures at Port-au-Prince.—Caſe of the pilot Butler.—Preſidential Canting.—The cauſes of Mr. Jefferſon's reſignation.—Letter to Mazzei.—Defence of it.—Review of the political character of Virginia.—Extravagant ſchemes of the truly federal party.—Important anecdote.—Mr. Gerry.—Servility of the firſt congreſs.

"THE way to empire cannot be too "ſhort," ſaid Tullia, when ſhe drove her chariot over her father's dead body. "The way to Spaniſh "gold cannot be too ſhort," exclaims the federal orator to congreſs. The wiſdom of Mr. Harper's ſcheme is equal to its honeſty. For the trifling expence of ten millions of dollars, the United States might aſſemble twenty thouſand men at the mouth of the Ohio. They have then only to deſcend with the ſtream, till they gain ſome proper place for diſembarking. They next daſh through a foreſt three hundred leagues wide, which leads them to the capital of New Mexico. Some ſlight objections occur. Three-fourths of the army will die of hunger on the march, from the difficulty of taking ſufficient proviſions along with them. Three-fourths of the remainder will periſh of fatigue and the flux; and the Indians may, probably, knock the reſt on the head. But theſe are the petty cavils of cowardice. Cortez did not calculate, and why ſhould we?

If this plan had only been ſpouted in a fit of paſſion, it had not been worthy of attentive remark.

But Mr. Harper, in a printed letter to his conſtituents, dated May 25th, 1797, dwells upon the idea. Recommending an alliance with England, he ſays, that the colonies of Holland and Spain "muſt ſink "under the arms of the two countries:" viz. of Britain and the United States. A long extract, containing this aſſertion, has been circulated in one, at leaſt, if not others, of the federal newſpapers. If the friends of order, in congreſs, had never propagated any ſcheme equally profligate and audacious with this, charity would be led to ſuppoſe, that Mr. Harper acted only by the impulſe of his own folly. But their ſtruggle for rejecting the Indian, Algerine, and Spaniſh treaties, unleſs linked with that of Jay, was a branch from the ſame root. The war with France, into which they make ſuch vigorous efforts for driving America, is altogether as frantic as Mr. Harper's plan; and hence it is not injuring them to believe that they approved of his propoſal for the Mexican expedition.

On the 2d of June, 1797, a number of American captains at Port-au-Prince, in St. Domingo, preſented a petition to governor Simcoe. They repreſented that eleven American veſſels, with cargoes, amounting to three hundred thouſand dollars, had been captured by Britiſh privateers, and were then lying at that port, in expectation of a trial. They had applied for it, and had been told in anſwer, that they were to be ſent for adjudication to Mole St. Nicholas. They ſtate, that ſome of the veſſels cannot proceed to that place without conſiderable repairs: others, had been abandoned by their crews. Some, with their cargoes, were likewiſe in a ſtate of ſuffering. Many of the petitioners, being entire ſtrangers, were reduced to inconvenience from want of money. Some crews and ſupercargoes, from ſickneſs, diſappointments, and mortifications, were

reduced to the moſt diſtreſſing circumſtances. They affirm, that they had carried on a legal trade, agreeably to the Britiſh treaty. They ſupplicate that a court of admiralty may be appointed at Port-au-Prince for trying their cauſes, and conclude with ſome compliments to the perſonal character of Simcoe himſelf.

His anſwer was haughty and reproachful. He promiſed to recommend to the judge of the admiralty, Mr. Combauld, to decide their caſes at an early period; but he gave them no reaſon to think that there would be a court erected for that end at Port-au-Prince. He hoped that they would be acquitted of that contraband traffic which many citizens of the United States carried on with the French government in St. Domingo. He cloſed with telling them that this illicit trade might, at no remote diſtance, "ſeriouſly diſturb the national repoſe, and affect the *ſecurity* of the American continent." This menace appears ſomewhat inexplicable. He cannot ſurely mean that England is to affect our ſecurity by land, as a conſequence of her having robbed our ſhips at ſea. The latter was, of itſelf, enough in all conſcience. Thus American veſſels are liable to be taken into an Engliſh port, and to be kept there till their crews deſert, their cargoes ſpoil, and themſelves rot for want of an Engliſh trial. When no longer capable of ſailing, they are ordered to make a voyage in queſt of adjudication. Mr. Harper and his friends think that they have gained every thing, becauſe they have at laſt exaſperated the French into the ſame ſyſtem of privateering, which the Britiſh have carried on for four years and an half, and in which they ſtill ardently perſiſt.

It would require conſiderable room to enumerate all the Britiſh confiſcations of American pro-

perty in the Weſt-Indies, within the laſt ſix months. Captain Dunlevy remained in Hiſpaniola from the 9th of June, to the 20th of October, 1797. The following is a ſummary of his account, as to Mr. Combauld's operations. Eighteen veſſels, with their cargoes, were condemned. Two of the captains of theſe ſhips were detained three months before they could get their papers, which could have been had with eaſe in three days, or a much leſs time. Another of theſe captains died of grief. A nineteenth veſſel, with her cargo, was ſold to pay the coſts of court. A twentieth was cleared, but the cargo condemned. Seven were diſcharged on paying coſts. This is manifeſt injuſtice; for, if the Engliſh were not warranted in ſeizing them, it was highly oppreſſive to make them pay any expence whatever. They ſhould rather have them reimburſed for their detention. But what could be expected, when the ſame nation were both parties and judges? Some others in the above liſt were under trial, when captain Dunlevy came away. The whole amount to thirty one, and ſeveral veſſels were likewiſe detained, of which the trials had not come on. Many ſuch details of the preſent year might be given, as to Engliſh piracy. Yet the Adamites always ſpeak as if piracy were confined to the French only.

The relative ſpirit of the American miniſtry towards the two nations is fully exhibited in the following narrative. Citizen Adet had complained to Mr. Pickering reſpecting the French corvette L'Eſperance. She was taken by the Britiſh ſhip Argonaut, who went with her prize into Lynnhaven bay, in Virginia. According to Adet, the corvette was there fitted out by admiral Murray, as a Britiſh cruiſer, and this Adet urged as a violation of the treaty of Paris. Pickering, in his letter to

Charles Pinckney, undertakes to anſwer this complaint. He firſt remarks, that the captain of the corvette, and the French conſul at Norfolk, had both been applied to, and ſhewed no diſpoſition to complain of any improper conduct on the part of the captors. Thus far all is well; but Mr. Pickering proceeds thus: "the governor (of Virginia) "having heard that a reſpectable pilot by the name "of *Butler*, was acquainted with the circumſtan- "ces of this affair, he directed his depoſition to be "taken; it was taken, and imported, that admiral "Murray himſelf, purchaſed the prize and manned "and fitted her in Lynnhaven bay for a cruize; "but Butler's *depoſition* was afterwards taken on "the part of the Britiſh, in which *he contradicted* "*all the material facts recited in the former depoſi-* "*tion*, which he accounted for by ſaying, that he "could neither write nor read, and that there had "been inſerted in his firſt depoſition what he had "never ſaid *." Mr. Pickering then mentions to Pinckney his anxiety for further information. This had been ſupplied by the Britiſh miniſter, Mr. Hammond, in a letter from admiral Murray, who declared that he ſent the corvette back to ſea, as ſoon as wind and weather would permit.

From the face of this ſtory, it ſeems that our ſecretary of ſtate acted right. The French conſul and captain, at leaſt as he pretends, would have nothing to do with complaining. Butler, the only evidence againſt Murray, retracted upon oath; and ſince the admiral himſelf denied his having fitted out the L'Eſperance, as a privateer, Mr. Pickering had no choice but to give him credit.

Now comes the oppoſite ſide of the queſtion. On the 24th of March, 1795, Butler emitted his *firſt*

* Meſſage from the Preſident, of January 19th 1797, p. 46.

depoſition, purporting, as above, that the corvette was fitted out by admiral Murray, for a privateer. But it is NOT TRUE, as Mr. Pickering affirms, that Butler ever contradicted this teſtimony in a ſecond depoſition. That of the 24th of March, 1795, was immediately ſent forward to Mr. Pickering, and by the latter communicated to Mr. Hammond, who ſent a copy of it to captain Cochrane of the Thetis, which was then under repair at Norfolk. When Cochrane was ready to ſet ſail, he ſelected Butler, as his pilot; and after the ſhip had got into Hampton roads, he began to charge the man with having acted as a ſpy on board of Engliſh ſhips. He read, in evidence, a copy of Butler's depoſition of the 24th of March, and threatened to carry him off, and treat him as a ſpy. Under theſe circumſtances, Cochrane preſented a paper, which he called of the nature of a counter declaration, and required Butler to ſubſcribe it. The pilot was glad to ſign any thing, rather than run the immediate hazard of being carried away from his buſineſs, his family, and his country; beſides the proſpect of being ſtarved, flogged, and probably murdered by a gang of barbarians. He was not indulged with a copy of the paper, nor made acquainted with its contents. Captain Cochrane did not offer to adminiſter an oath.

When Butler got on ſhore, he made a depoſition before three magiſtrates of the county of Norfolk, and in preſence of a number of reſpectable citizens. He therein related the circumſtances of ſurpriſe, compulſion, and alarm, under which Cochrane compelled him to ſign a paper contradictory to his depoſition of the 24th of March. This ſecond depoſition was taken on the 4th of May, 1795, and forwarded to Mr. Pickering. Yet our ſecretary, takes not the leaſt notice of it, and modeſtly gives

the title of a *depoſition* to the paper obtained by captain Cochrane. Theſe particulars are abridged from a copious detail furniſhed by colonel Joſiah Parker, who has been five times elected as a repreſentative to congreſs, and who, for claſſical propriety of expreſſion, is excelled by no ſpeaker in that houſe. This gentlemen has documents for proving what is above related. After this explanation, it will be difficult to defend the veracity of colonel Pickering. Mr. Waſhington, along with a copy of this letter to Pinckney, ſent to congreſs, as uſual, an introductory meſſage. It concludes in theſe words: "A government which "required only a knowledge of the *truth* to juſtify "its meaſures, could not but be anxious to have "this fully and frankly diſplayed." Canting is always ſuſpicious. Mr. Waſhington, in the unavoidable exerciſe of his mind, *muſt* have known that this inflammatory letter contained other bungling attempts at impoſture, as well as that about the Norfolk pilot. Such cobwebs may laſt for a day, but the bruſh of hiſtory quickly ſweeps them down, and conſigns them to their native dunghill.

This is the cabinet that makes ſo much noiſe about its *morality*. From contemplating the preſent ſecretary of ſtate, we naturally turn to one of his predeceſſors. For a long time before Thomas Jefferſon reſigned his place, the federal prints were diligent in reproaching him, as unworthy to be entruſted with ſo high an office. Since he gave it up, they have cenſured him for a reſignation, of which they were extremely glad. The Minerva contains a letter, copied into a Jerſey Gazette, of October 11th, 1797, which has theſe words: "The "good and the wiſe ſaw him ſuddenly retreat from "a poſt of honour, and eſſential ſervice, at a mo"ment, when his country was in a ſituation ſo cri-

" tical as to require all the efforts of wiſdom, and " the poſture of firmneſs and dignity."

If Mr. Jefferſon is ſo dangerous a man as the ſix per cent. writers have conſtantly repreſented him to be, it was unſuitable to regret his retreat. America was well rid of him. But theſe ſcribblers had terms to keep with the great body of citizens, upon whom his abilities and his ſervices had made a laſting impreſſion. His retirement was heard of with univerſal concern, unleſs among the immediate leaders and agents of the ſtock-holding and Britiſh faction; and with them it was neceſſary to conceal their triumph. Enlightened men looked around them, and ſaw no other character capable to fill the gap. Motives of prudence compel Mr. Jefferſon's adverſaries, Phocion excepted, to ſpeak with deference of his talents.

The cauſe of reſignation may be told in a few words. The late preſident has a reſerved ſullen temper, which of itſelf muſt be extremely tireſome. He had likewiſe a ſtrong bias to the Hamiltonian and Antigallican ſyſtem, ſo that Mr. Jefferſon found himſelf in very frequent minorities. When the three ſecretaries, and Mr. Randolph, attorney general, were convened with the preſident, report ſays, that Randolph uſed to argue on the ſide of Jefferſon, and when the vote came, to agree with Knox and Hamilton. To a man of independent fortune, and of a literary turn, this ſituation could have no charms; and as few aroſe from the emoluments of office. Theſe reaſons form a good apology for his retiring; as the events that ſucceeded his retreat, compoſe the beſt encomium on his abilities. Within three ſhort months thereafter, the preſident ſtumbled into that pit of deſtruction, the plan for a Britiſh treaty. The next four months produced what Mr. Hamilton choſe to call a *rebellion*. All the

reſt of our hiſtory has been as calamitous as it well could be, when ſhort of actual war. At laſt, matters grew ſo very bad, that general Waſhington himſelf durſt no longer hold the helm. If reſignation, at a critical moment, be culpable, the charge falls a thouſand times more heavily on the preſident than on his ſecretary.

And here, inſtead of what has been done, let fancy ſuppoſe what might have been done, ſince the fatal 16th of April, 1794, if Mr. Jefferſon, with a ſound majority of congreſs to ſupport him, had conducted the adminiſtration of America. Inſtead of aukward inſtructions, which the executive bluſhed to produce, the meſſage would have been open, conciſe, and deciſive; and the repreſentatives would have been conſulted about it. "Send back," it would ſay, "our impreſſed fellow citizens, with double "wages for the time of their detention. Send back "our veſſels, taken in contempt of juſtice. The "ſubject is complicated, and will require time. "But as a pledge of your ſincerity, depoſit in our "treaſury before hand, a million of dollars, for "the relief of the families of impreſſed ſeamnen*, "and of thoſe merchants who have gone to jail "in conſequence of your piracies. Unleſs you "do ſo, we forbid the exportation of provi-"ſions to the Britiſh Weſt-Indies, and ſhall anni-"hilate your armies without firing a piſtol. We "want no treaty of commerce with you, till the "end of the war ſhall decide your future ſituation."

By this firm but reaſonable tone, England might have learned to reſpect the United States. France,

* Notice, on this head, the whining of Mr. Pickering. When aſſigning the motives for Jay's miſſion, he ſays,—"Did not the im-"preſſment of our ſeamen, like the ſpoliations on our commerce, ex-"cite an univerſal complaint?" Letter to Pinckney, p. 15. The public have already ſeen the two curious cards reſpecting impreſſment, between Jay and Grenville.

courting their amity, would have reſtrained her cruiſers, as ſhe actually did, till July, 1796, when ſhe heard of the final ratification of the Britiſh treaty, which is the confeſſed cauſe of her preſent depredations.

As for the weſtern inſurrection, Mr. Jefferſon has never expreſſed impatience for the burning of Pittſburgh; of courſe, he would have quelled the riots in their infancy, at an expence of five hundred dollars. Inſtead of refuſing to pay the militia who burnt Nickajack, inſtead of inveighing againſt democratic ſocieties, and boaſting of Creek friendſhip, he would have authoriſed generals Clarke and Pickens to enter the country of theſe cut throats, at the head of five thouſand men, to teach them ſome reſpect for treaties, and ſome dread for offended juſtice.

The writer in the Minerva proceeds to declaim upon a letter ſaid to be written from Mr. Jefferſon to one Mazzei at Florence. Much clutter has been made about this piece, which, unfortunately for the enemies of Mr. Jefferſon, contains only ſtrict truth. The following is the moſt intereſting part of it.

"Our political ſituation is prodigiouſly changed "ſince you left us. Inſtead of that noble love of "liberty, and that republican government, which "carried us triumphantly through the dangers of "the war, an Anglo-monarchico-ariſtocratic par-"ty has ariſen.—Their avowed object is to impoſe "on us the ſubſtance, as they have already given "us the form, of the Britiſh government. Never-"theleſs, the principal body of our citizens remains "faithful to republican principles. All our pro-"prietors of lands are friendly to thoſe principles, "as alſo the maſs of men of talents. We have "againſt us (republicans) the executive power, "the judiciary power, (two of the three branches

" of our government,) all the officers of govern-
" ment, all who are ſeeking offices, all timid men,
" who prefer the calm of deſpotiſm to the tempeſtu-
" ous ſea of liberty, the Britiſh merchants and the
" Americans who trade on Britiſh capitals, the
" ſpeculators, perſons intereſted in the bank and
" the public funds; eſtabliſhments invented with
" views of corruption, and to aſſimilate us to the
" Britiſh model in its corrupt parts."

This letter was originally tranſlated from a French newſpaper by Webſter, who ſpoke of it as if it had been *treaſon*. That an Engliſh faction has ariſen, and obtained an undue influence in government, can hardly be denied, when, beſides a million of other traits, we ſee one preſident after another haranguing againſt French piracy, and paſſing over in guarded ſilence, the ſea-robberies of Britain. The conſtitution, of which the letter ſpeaks, is, upon the whole, a good inſtrument, but liable to numerous and important objections. One of theſe is the immenſe patronage beſtowed on the preſident, and a ſecond, the univerſal negative of the ſenate. It has been ſhewn*, that a preſident, with eleven ſenators to help him, can abſolutely ſtop the whole buſineſs of the legiſlature. This may be called repreſentative government, but it is evidently the dregs of monarchy and ariſtocracy.

The ſame piece in the Minerva, that has been above cited, ſpeaks of Virginia as uncommonly prone to inſurrection. The American Annual Regiſter, and the Hiſtory of 1796, comprehend a variety of remarks in anſwer to the calumnies heaped upon that ſtate by the federal party. The ſubject has not, however, been exhauſted, and it is of infinite concern to undeceive the people who may have been

* Hiſtory of 1796, Chap. VIII.

miſled by their artifices. The fact then is, that if true republicaniſm, if a genuine ſenſe of order and of freedom, ſhall be driven from every other ſtate in the union, their laſt ſtand will be made in Virginia. Previous to the actual commencement of hoſtilities in 1775, little or nothing was heard of mobs in that province; for its inhabitants were ſenſible that the burning of effigies, the bedaubing of a defenceleſs individual with tar and feathers, was not the way to reflect honour on a ſtruggle for independence*. While the Britiſh newſpapers were filled with the noiſy and tumultuous proceedings of other colonies, Virginia remained in comparative order and tranquility. Her loyalty was a conſtant ſubject of miniſterial exultation; for it ſeemed plain enough, that if ſhe ſtood by the old country, all the projects of New-England were to end in diſappointment. When matters, however, came to an extremity, it was found, that Virginia was as zealous in the common cauſe as any other ſtate, and much more ſo than moſt of them. Connecticut tories ſupported a bloody ſhare in the partizan war of the frontiers. Mr. Williams, one of the repreſentatives of New-York, ſaid, laſt winter, in congreſs, that at the commencement of the revolution, one half of the people of that ſtate were tories. In Pennſylvania, the revolutionary party never could have ſtood upon their legs, but by the concurrence of Iriſh emigrants. In the two Carolinas and Georgia, the people fought deſperately among themſelves. But it is believed that, during the whole war, no body of Virginian citizens ever raiſed the Britiſh ſtandard. They did not even ſubmit, when Britiſh armies entered the ſtate. Ramſay ſays, that, in general,

* It is not here affirmed that *nothing* of that kind may have taken place; but that, upon the whole, the behaviour of the colony was exemplary.

they chose to retire out of the way, when Cornwallis was burning all before him. In battle they were inferior to no troops in the union. The savages, whom they subdued, used to say, that Virginia was *the great knife*.

This state, so frequently stigmatized as *antifederal*, was the very first that suggested a federal union. In 1785, this proposal was made in the Virginian house of delegates. In consequence, an imperfect continental convention was, in 1786, held at Annapolis, and this proved the seedbed of that convention which formed the present constitution. "Virginia," says Morse, "has taken "a leading, active, and influential part in bringing "about the late grand revolution in our federal "government*." Ever since that time, the state has remained in tranquility, and in perfect submission to the laws. To Virginia, America is, in a a great measure, indebted both for her independence, and her present constitution. To upbraid her then, as antifederal, is the very pinnacle of ingratitude, of audacity, and fiction.

The stock-jobbing party accuse this state as desirous of a war with England. No Virginian above ideotism, should ever desire a foreign war. Intersected almost throughout by navigable streams, Virginia lies more open to the ravages of a maritime enemy than any other state in the union. This truth was severely felt during the war of 1775; and consequently, this will be one of the last states that would ever wish for actual hostility. The clamour excited against her, as anxious for a war with England, is, only a branch of the *truly federal* system of imposture.

Virginia has been reproached for permitting the continuance of slavery. But we have the authority

* American Geography, London Edition of 1792, p. 409.

of Mr. Jefferſon * for ſaying, that, long before the revolution, the ſtate wanted to prohibit the importation of ſlaves; a meaſure prevented by England. In 1786, the aſſembly, by an act, put an end to this vile commerce; and a general abolition is gradually going forward. In a petition, lately preſented to congreſs, by ſome negroes, it tranſpired, that Virginia affords an aſylum to fugitive ſlaves from the more ſouthern ſtates. She does not, with the ſavageneſs of North-Carolina, prohibit their emancipation. While Maſſachuſetts connives at eccleſiaſtical oppreſſion, Virginia has eſtabliſhed an univerſal right of conſcience, and no man is obliged to pay for religion, unleſs he pleaſes. The clergymen of New-England, or a part of them, cannot avoid being much hurt at a precedent, ſo dangerous to the commercial intereſt of the church; and they have, undoubtedly, ſwelled the torrent of calumny with which Virginia has been overwhelmed in the eaſtern ſtates.

The vindication of Virginia has been taken up in this place, becauſe the federal party appear very much diſpoſed to extrude her from the union. Many of their projects and menaces are ſo cloſely interwoven with downright madneſs, that it ſeems difficult to believe the ſincerity of the party. And yet, after their attempt for a conditional rejection of three foreign treaties, unleſs they could obtain a fourth; after their propoſed ſtanding army of twenty-five thouſand men†; their doctrine of partitioning the United States‡; their French war; their Mexican excurſion, with other frenzies equally wild and diſtracted, wonder ceaſes at the propoſed extruſion of Virginia; or, as Webſter and other federal writers term it, a ſeparation from the whole fou-

* Notes on Virginia. † American Annual Regiſter. ‡ Ibid.

thern ſtates. By ſuch a disjunction, the continent, as to all its external relations, would ſink into the loweſt inſignificance and wretchedneſs. Yet a Connecticut newſprinter has publiſhed a ſeries of letters in defence of this propoſed ſeparation; which, among other effects, implies an immediate annihilation of public and private credit, and conſequently of the national debt. The federal party revile Virginia, becauſe its members in congreſs have conſtantly oppoſed their funding ſyſtem, the overgrowth of preſidential influence, and other matters connected with theſe. Yet if left to themſelves, Mr. Sedgwick and Co. would long ſince have extinguiſhed the preſent government, the funds, and all together. If they can juſt now entangle the union in a French war, this cataſtrophe may ſtill be expected. The following anecdote diſplays the genuine ſpirit of the ſtockholding party.

"When the bill for eſtabliſhing a national bank "was under conſideration, he (Mr. Madiſon) had "oppoſed it, as *not warranted in the conſtitution*, "and incidently remarked, that in the convention "a motion was made and negatived, for giving "congreſs a power to grant charters of corporation*." Mr. Madiſon ſubjoins, that, for this ſlight reference to the convention, he was attacked by ſeveral ſpeakers, and among others by Mr. Gerry of Maſſachuſetts, who had been a member of the convention.

On the ſubject of this bank, Mr. Alexander Hamilton gave in to congreſs a report, dated 13th of December, 1790, and which fills twenty-one folio pages. He ſays not a ſingle word as to its being authoriſed by the conſtitution, which undoubt-

* Bache's Debates on the Britiſh Treaty, vol. I. p. 378.

edly gives no ſuch power. But here we learn that it was directly negatived by the framers of that inſtrument; and expreſsly contradicted the ſpirit and deſign of it. Indeed, a power of creating corporations, would have veſted in congreſs an oppreſſive degree of influence, repugnant to the genius of a free government.

Mr. Madiſon was cenſured for referring to what paſſed in the convention. When an obſcure paſſage occurs in a living author, the beſt mode of explanation is by an appeal to himſelf. When a bond or indenture appears ambiguous, the ſureſt way to get its meaning is, by enquiry at the parties who drew and ſubſcribed it. The reference to the convention was, therefore, ſtrictly proper; and Gerry, and others who objected to it, betrayed impenetrable effrontery. The bare omiſſion of ſuch power in the conſtitution, was enough to warrant the rejection of the plan; but when the point had been abſolutely debated and negatived in the convention, this added, if poſſible, to the ſtrength of the caſe. Congreſs had ſworn to ſupport the conſtitution. By paſſing the law for incorporating the bank of the United States, they, at the ſame inſtant, broke their own oaths of office, and violated the conſtitution. So far from pocketing the reproof for reference, Mr. Madiſon and his friends ought to have advertiſed, in the newſpapers, the true picture of this enormous ſtride of venality. Yet this junto affect peculiar reverence for the conſtitution; and hold themſelves out as its excluſive guardians. All who queſtion their purity are its enemies. What aſtoniſhing hardineſs!

Gerry, and great part of his majority, were deſtined to be partners of the future bank, thus founded on a breach of the conſtitution. Theſe are the immaculate legiſlators whom Virginia deteſts, and

Connecticut admires. If the firſt federal congreſs wanted the comprehenſive information, the dignity of ſentiment, and enthuſiaſm of eloquence, that ſometimes mark a Britiſh parliament, they did not fall ſhort of the ſervility, meanneſs, and corruption of its blackeſt era.

A writer in the New-Jerſey *Centinel of Freedom*, of January, 1797, has well drawn the portrait of ſuch partiſans as Webſter. "The writer of this "paragraph," ſays he, "by good government only "means the Hamiltonian adminiſtration; by "good order, ſubmiſſion to this adminiſtration; by "federal ticket, a ticket favourable to this admi-"niſtration; and by peace, peace with England "and war with France. It is curious to obſerve "with what effrontery ſome people talk of good "government, good order, peace, and federaliſm. "Every one knows that the Hamiltonian par-"ty have diſcovered a much greater diſpoſition "towards antifederaliſm than their political oppo-"nents; for they have on all occaſions endeavour-"ed to *quarrel with the ſouthern ſtates*, and diſ-"affect them to the union. Their love of order "has only been diſcovered by their ſubmiſſion to "an adminiſtration under their own controul; but "as ſoon as the majority of the houſe of repre-"ſentatives checked their progreſs to dominion, "they immediately became refractory, abuſive, "and attempted to menace the immediate repre-"ſentatives of the people into an unconditional "compliance with their will: their love of peace "has only been ſhewn by an humiliating ſubmiſſion "to Britiſh inſolence and depredation, and in a "proſtituted commendation of a treaty that has tar-"niſhed the luſtre of America."

The fulſome compliments which have conſtantly paſſed between the preſident and congreſs,

betray that ſpirit of monarchy, of which the letter to Mazzei complains. This ſervility is carried farther by congreſs than in the Britiſh houſe of commons, where a royal ſpeech is always criticized with freedom and minuteneſs. Among other encomiums bandied between Mr. Waſhington and the firſt congreſs, one turned on his accepting of no ſalary but for his perſonal expences. "I muſt "decline," ſays he, "as inapplicable to myſelf, "any ſhare in the perſonal emoluments.—And pray "that the pecuniary eſtimates for the ſtation in "which I am placed, may, during my continuance "in it, be limited to ſuch actual expenditures as the "public good may be *thought to require*."

The anſwer of the repreſentatives, dated May 5th, 1789, tells him that this reſtriction, "cannot "fail to demonſtrate the *purity*, whilſt it increaſes "the *luſtre* of a character, which has ſo many ti-"tles to *admiration!*" Thus they began, and thus they have ever ſince gone on. Of all the vulgar artifices for popularity ever heard of, this as to accepting of no ſalary is perhaps the moſt pitiful; and yet ſuch has been public infatuation, that, while drawing for every cent of his allowance, general Waſhington has been celebrated for refuſing to take more than his net houſhold charges. The granting of ſo large a ſum had bad effects, by adding the wet of avarice to that of ambition.

CHAPTER IV.

The caſe of Edward Hulen.—More Britiſh amity.—True motives for the acceptance of Jay's treaty.—Capture of the Mount Vernon.—Remarks on the convention of 1787.—Authentic copy of the plan of government propoſed by Mr. Hamilton.—Commentary on that paper.

AS our preſidents and friends of order, are ſo wonderfully delicate on the ſubject of Engliſh piracies and impreſſments, this chapter ſhall begin with ſome recent anecdotes of that kind. Every federal artifice has been employed, from the two ſpeeches of Mr. Adams to congreſs, down to the ſcurrilous paragraphs in Mr. Fenno's gazette, with the view of exciting the tempeſt of public indignation againſt France. A ſummary, like that which follows, will help to preſerve in equipoiſe the balance of reſentment.

On the 27th of July, 1797, Nathaniel Silſbee, captain of the ſhip Betſey, addreſſed a letter to the printer of a Salem newſpaper. He had arrived at Salem three days before, from Madras. He left in that port nine Engliſh ſhips of war. One of theſe was the Sybille frigate, captain Cook, who preſſed from captain Silſbee Edward Hulen, a native of Salem. He alſo threatened that if complaint ſhould be made by Silſbee to the governor, on ſhore, he would not only take every ſeamen, but alſo every officer from the Betſey. He did not commit this violence from ſcarcity of hands; for he told captain Silſbee that he had thirty-five men *over and*

above his ſhip's complement. He added, that he believed fifteen of them to be real American born citizens. He ſaid that he had preſſed them from on board of American ſhips at Liſbon, in ſpite of the remonſtrances of the American conſul at that place. Cooke farther declared, that he would keep theſe men in perfect ſecurity, till the end of the war.

After the impreſſment of Hulen, the Betſey was daily viſited by a lieutenant from the Sybille. During his ſtay on board, this officer took full command of the ſhip, muſtered the crew regularly on the quarter deck, and would not ſuffer any ſhip's duty to be carried on at theſe times. He farther threatened to correct the American officers for not manning the ſhip's ſide, and paying him ſuch reſpect as he ſaid that the preſence of any Britiſh officer ought to command. Hulen has left an aged and diſconſolate mother, who depended entirely for ſupport upon her ſon. Captain Silſbee adds that ſeveral other American ſeamen were, about the ſame time, preſſed from other American ſhips at Madras. The caſe of Edward Hulen, muſt afflict every friend to the United States. But it will give joy to that Britiſh junto, in this city, who, by a recent meaſure, have done their utmoſt for promoting aſſaſſination. The late and preſent behaviour of American tories afford an able vindication for the prudent ſeverity of the French republic.

A letter from a Philadelphian captain, dated Cape Nicholas Mole, 13th July, 1797, gives the following account. Off Tortuga, his veſſel, which was bound for Gonaives, a French port, was taken by an Engliſh frigate. That ſame evening, while the ſhips were lying within twenty yards of each other, the frigate fired a twelve pound ſhot "in hopes to ſink

" me," ſays the captain. On arriving at Cape Nicholas, his papers were examined, and returned; but government would neither buy his proviſions, nor permit him to proceed on his voyage; " they " pay no attention to the treaty here." The reaſon for detaining him ſeems to have been leſt he ſhould ſail for a French port; as he ſubjoins that he was to ſail for Kingſton by the firſt convoy. The captain further ſays that the Engliſh bring in for adjudication all American veſſels going to or coming from French ports. Thoſe *going to* are libelled for having in their invoices nails and knives, French letters, French ſupercargoes; or in ſhort any trifle ſerves as a pretence, and they are generally condemned. Thoſe *coming from* French iſlands are libelled for having coffee on board, ſhipped by the French adminiſtration, and are generally condemned as *French Americans*.

Thus the Engliſh conſider Jay's tranſaction as a mere jeſt. The twenty fifth article of that paper ſays that " nothing in this treaty contained ſhall, " however, be conſtrued or operate contrary to " former and exiſting public treaties with other ſo- " vereigns or ſtates." Now, before this war began, England did not pretend that ſhe had any title to ſtop American veſſels bound to a French port; nor did ſhe ever attempt to ſtop them. The violation would not have been endured in a ſingle inſtance, and was in itſelf too extravagant ever to have been projected.

By the twenty-third article of the treaty of commerce, ſigned at Paris, in 1778, it is declared, that " free ſhips ſhall alſo give a freedom to goods;" thus, that Engliſh property in an American ſhip ſhall be ſecure from a French privateer. The twenty-fifth clauſe of Jay, as juſt now quoted, comprehends a protection of the treaty of Paris; and

yet, in practice, the Engliſh have broken it many hundreds of times, to the entire ruin of a multitude both of French and American citizens. They were not contented with this. They ſeized, alſo, American veſſels bound to or from French iſlands, which tended directly to deſtroy the trade of the latter. Thus the French were put upon the moſt unequal and diſtreſſing footing. They were not to interrupt American trade with the Engliſh Weſt-Indies, while England was deſtroying American trade with the French Weſt-Indies. Inſtead of interfering, our paſſied executive, through the medium of the ſenate, were encouraging Mr. Fenno to publiſh daily columns of invective againſt the French revolution.

It was not to be ſuppoſed, that any people, and much leſs that a people intoxicated with victory*, were long to endure ſuch partial treatment as that above deſcribed, without feeling reſentment and meditating vengeance. The frigid neglect of Mr. Waſhington has been ſucceeded by the boyiſh petulence, or factious malignity of Mr. Adams; and both have gone directly to the extirpation of the American mercantile intereſt. Had Mr. Jefferſon been elected preſident, France would have placed ſome

* The French government lately publiſhed a ſtatement on this head, from the 8th of September, 1793, to the 19th of February, 1797. The republic has, by this account, gained thirty-one pitched battles, and two hundred and thirty leſſer actions. Her troops have killed an hundred and fifty-two thouſand, ſix hundred men; and taken, an hundred and ninety-ſeven thouſand, ſeven hundred and eighty-four priſoners; ſeven thouſand, nine hundred, and ſixty-three pieces of cannon; an hundred and eighty-ſix thouſand, ſeven hundred and ſixty-two firelocks; four millions, three hundred and eighty-eight thouſand pounds weight of powder, and five hundred and fifty-ſeven important cities, or camps, forts, redoubts, and other places of ſtrength.

This is ſuch a catalogue of ſucceſs, as, perhaps, no other nation ever could exhibit. The number of the ſlain is certainly not magnified. Thoſe who periſhed in hoſpitals were, moſt likely, four times as numerous.

confidence in the known purity of his republican principles. This national choice, would have held out a kind of pledge for the general good will of the citizens of the United States; and the deluge of commercial desolation must, in that case, have had a fair chance for being, in some degree, suspended. But when the French found, that Mr. Adams, the friend of England, was raised to the chair, they foresaw that extremities were to be the sole resource.

And here it is grateful to observe, how completely deceit has overshot its mark. With many honourable exceptions, the great body of the mercantile interest, in this city, is devoted to England, as existing, in some measure, by credit obtained in that country. The printed ticket, the ballot-box, and post-office manœuvres, as well as the *legal opinion*, so timeously tendered, during the late election for president, were the work of the federal party, of whom our British merchants compose such a powerful division. Having, by the most scandalous artifices, obtained the election of Mr. Adams, as president, they now reap the fruits of it in the ruin of their trade, and the probability of a French war, into which their hero is straining every nerve to plunge them. Had they permitted the election to proceed in an honest way, Mr. Jefferson must have been president, and our affairs with France might have been in a train of accommodation.

The letter from the West-Indies, last quoted, has neither the name of the ship nor captain, and this might afford room for doubting its authenticity. But the substance of its contents has been verified from a thousand other channels. The printer of the Philadelphia Gazette has no disposition to tell faults of England, but on the best evidence. The suppression of the vessel's name arises, most likely,

from the prudence of its owner. His bills, indorſed by ſome federal friend, are, probably, lying proteſted at the banks; and the guilt of having ſent ſuch a piece to the preſs, would be an adequate reaſon for ſending *him* to priſon. He muſt know little of the paper-money party, who fancies them incapable of ſuch a proceſs. It will be wonderful indeed, if, before this time, the Scotch tories at Norfolk, have not commenced the ruin of the pilot Butler.

It is not true, by the way, that even yet the French univerſally capture American ſhips. Here follows an inſtance to the contrary. On July 28th, 1797, the ſchooner William, captain Linnel, arrived at Norfolk, from Grenada. On the 4th current, while in company with a ſchooner, of and for New-London, two French privateers brought them too. After examining their papers, the French told them that they had particular orders not to ſtop or diſturb any American veſſel, and were very ſorry for having put them out of their courſe. The mate of the William had ſix hundred dollars under his care, and they told him that he had no occaſion to hide them, as they ſhould take nothing but what appeared to be Engliſh property. A French ſailor was ſeverely threatened by his captain for attempting to ſteal a pig. On the 23d of May, 1797, James Hammond, an American ſeaman, was preſſed from the ſhip Hope of New-York, captain Pierce, at Madeira. This was done by captain James, of the Britiſh brig of war, El Corſo. Some days after, the ſame brig impreſſed five others of his men, two of whom were, with difficulty, recovered. Hammond and other three were kept. On the 28th of June, the brig Abigail, capt. Lake, while lying in the port of Gibraltar, was boarded by the Hamadryade, a Britiſh frigate. Four of his crew were forcibly taken away.

Two of them had been recently redeemed from ſlavery at Algiers. Captain Lake, who gave this account, arrived at Philadelphia on the 31ſt of Auguſt, 1797. Other inſtances of Britiſh impreſſment might be collected, but theſe are ſufficient for a ſample of the admirable effects of our Britiſh alliance*.

The Hiſtory of 1796, exhibits oceans of demonſtration that the dread of a Britiſh war, in the event of congreſs rejecting Jay's bargain, was the joint of offspring of ignorance, and knavery. Dr. Smith, Mr. Sedgwick, and the other ſix per cent. leaders, panted for nothing ſo much as alliance with a monarchy, which furniſhed ample precedents for every ſpecies of financial corruption, and which held their political opponents in mortal abhorrence. The merchants kept in view compenſation for previous piracies, a perpetuity and extenſion of their Britiſh credit, and the domeſtic danger of perſecution from the banks, if they rejected this concluſive ſtep of the Hamiltonian ſyſtem. The people, at large, who could have no intereſt but that of their country, believed aſſertions, which the timid republican repreſentatives hardly ventured to contradict. Thus was the wel-

* A Boſton newſpaper, of December 8th, 1797, has the following ſingular ſpecimen of Britiſh friendſhip. Captain Coffin, in the Joanna of Nantucket, had ſailed on a voyage to the South ſea whale fiſhery. After great hardſhips in attempting to double Cape Horn, he returned to Fiſhby to repair. He would then have made a plentiful cargo, but was prevented by a Britiſh letter of marque, the captain whereof had orders not to let any American veſſel catch fiſh, till the Britiſh ſhips were ſupplied. Thus captain Coffin lay idle during half the ſeaſon, till the letter of marque ſailed away. The Britiſh fiſhers then ſuffered him to proceed in his buſineſs; but they ſhewed him a proclamation, excluding all American veſſels from killing whales, till the Britiſh had left the ſtation.

As the United States have, for ſome years paſt, become a mere receptacle for external indignities, no trifle of this kind can be ſuppoſed to make an impreſſion.

fare of the United States ſacrificed to the ſhort-ſighted proſpects of intereſt and fear. General infatuation overlooked the moral certainty that France, having already broke down one half of Europe, would demand and extort from America a tenfold atonement for the ungrateful and injurious preference given to the moſt deteſted of her enemies.

The ſeaſon of repentance and degredation has at length arrived. Like Ceſar's ides of March, it has come, but it has not gone. On this head, the Maryland Journal of June 18th, 1796, contains a few remarks that, like the prophecies of Caſſandra, will find belief when it is too late. They were occaſioned by the capture of the Mount Vernon, a few days before, and are as follows.

"Phœdrus, tells a ſtory of a man with whom "two females were in love. His hair was half "black and half grey. One of his admirers pul-"led out all the grey hairs to make him look young; "and the other all the black hairs to make him "look old. He very ſoon became bald

"The preſent condition of American commerce "may be quoted as a corrollary to this fable. On "one hand, the Britiſh, under the moſt frivolous "or ſcandalous pretences, ſeize, plunder, and "confiſcate American veſſels, beat or preſs the "crew, and in the caſe of Mr. Boſſon, murder the "captain. On the other hand, the French captain "of the Flying Fiſh deliberately leaves his dwelling "houſe at No. 399, North Front-ſtreet, Philadel-"phia, goes aboard of his veſſel, ſails down the ri-"ver, captures one of our merchantmen, and ſhews "the maſter a liſt of others which he is reſolved "to take. He then ſtands in for the coaſt, turns "the crew into a pilot boat, gives them his name "and addreſs, and tells them that he has orders to

" ſeize every veſſel which he knew or even *ſuſpec-*
" *ted* of being bound to or from Britain.

" Thus the head of the axe is at once buried in
" the root of our commerce. Citizen Paris plain-
" ly conſiders himſelf as acting by legal authority.
" He does not hide his candle under a buſhel. He
" has reſided in Philadelphia, where his family and
" houſhold furniture are ſtill very likely to be
" found, and where he is himſelf well known.
" When boarding the Mount Vernon, he behaves
" like a man conſcious of rectitude, and diſdainful
" of oppoſition, frankly tells his name, his place
" of reſidence, his inſtructions, and his intentions.
" It requires very little judgement to ſee that the
" captain of the Flying Fiſh is not a pirate. He
" muſt therefore be ſomething elſe; and it is not
" preſumptuous to think him only *part of a ſtupen-*
" *dous whole;* in a word, that five hundred other
" privateers, belonging to the republic, have, or
" very ſoon will have, commiſſions of the ſame te-
" nor with his.

" The circumſtances announce profound con-
" tempt for this country. If France did not like
" our treaty with her Britiſh enemy, ſhe might have
" attempted to defeat it by negociation. But this
" ſhe ſcorned to do; for, though the Boſton Centi-
" nel and the Minerva, have repeatedly ſaid that
" about fifty members of congreſs are traitors to
" their country and French tools, no body is weak
" enough to believe ſo impudent an aſſertion.
" France finds that ſhe can, by this time, do with-
" out us, and ſcorns to enquire what are our de-
" ſigns. Proviſions are now as cheap and plentiful
" in France as here, and the want of them was
" the chief reaſon why ſhe courted our good will
" with ſo much aſſiduity.

"Indeed many features in our behaviour to "France seem designed to disgust her. Newspa- "pers and pamphlets have teemed with abuse of "the most inflammatory and indecent nature against "the republic. They have been circulated with "industry, and read with approbation, by a very "numerous party among us. The word *jacobin* "has been transplanted into the vocabulary of Ame- "rican billingsgate; and, in fine, grinning where "they could not bite, one half of our political au- "thors, orators, and printers, have represented the "French, by the lump, as the vilest monsters that "ever disgraced the human form. It was impos- "sible that the French should not be offended at "such childish insolence, such toothless malignity. "We are now reaping the harvest that we have "sown.

"The naval power of Britain is a just object of "terror to this country; but that of France, "though inferior to the former, is yet, by a mil- "lion of times, superior to that of a nation whose "navy consists of three or four frigates, that have "been for two years on the stocks, and are like- "ly to remain there. By a quarrel with Britain "we might have had the miserable revenge of plun- "dering part of her commerce, but, from France, "we can gain nothing better than bloody noses and "wooden legs. She has few trading ships at sea; "and, as for taking her privateers, the Flying Fish "would hardly sell at vendue for as much powder "and ball as, in the common rate of fighting, would "be wanted to sink her.

"Pretences for sea-robbery are always to be had. "The republic may declare Britain to be in a state "of siege; and with as much reason as the British "have declared Guadaloupe to be so. She is then, "by the law of nations, warranted to capture all

" that goes out or comes in; and, between the two " rivals, America is exactly in the same plight with " the man in Phœdrus between his two mistresses.

" If France had sent a dozen men of war to at- " tack our sea coast, it would have shown that she " at least thought us capable of resistance; but " when a canoe of six nine pounders is made the " instrument of alarm and vengeance, we may " guess that her resentment is exceeded by her " contempt.

" Much has been said of the benefits resulting to " America from the privilege of trading in neutral " bottoms during the present war. But the war " has caused a rise in the price of provisions ruin- " ous to many individuals. For one example, out " of an hundred thousand, there is a person now " in a printing-office in Baltimore, whose wages " were, three years ago, a dollar per week higher " than they are now; while, at the same time, a " dollar will not go half as far now as it did then. " Individuals who are in this situation, plainly pay " a personal tax, extending to half their income, " on account of the war. To them it is evidently and " highly oppressive.

" The English have often envied the rapid pro- " gress of America in the carrying trade. They " have laboured in vain to thrust her out of it. By " a policy more acute than honourable, Eng- " land is now within sight of affecting her purpose. " France, has, for many years, been fighting the bat- " tles of America, but citizen Paris has now begun to " fight those of Britain. If he acts without autho- " rity, the mistake may cost him his life, in a coun- " try like France, where the head of a man is " sometimes cut off with as little ceremony as the " quarters of a bull frog."

It is generally underſtood, that, in the convention of 1787, a form of government, in ſubſtance monarchical, was propoſed and rejected. Mr. Hamilton conducted this party. At the period of accepting the conſtitution, the republicans were diſpleaſed by the length of time for which the ſenate hold their ſeats; and, it has been affirmed, that their friends in the convention, only acceded to it as a matter of compromiſe. If the ariſtocratical party had carried the point of a preſident and ſenate elected for twelve, or even eight years, this would have anſwered, very completely, all the purpoſes of monarchy. They could, as at preſent, throw out every bill from the repreſentatives, which did not ſuit their views. In the mean time, their chief, the preſident, had the abſolute diſpoſal of the loaves and fiſhes; and ſo long a period of uſeleſs reſiſtance, could not fail to wear out the obſtinacy of almoſt any republican in the lower houſe. Here then, behold royalty in all its deformity of ſtrength and corruption! The federal ſenate of twelve years were likely to have been more flexible, more abject, than even a Britiſh houſe of peers. The latter, in general, enjoy an independent property twenty or forty times greater than that of moſt American ſenators. Hence the former are leſs acceſſible than the latter, either to foreign or domeſtic corruption. Had Mr. Hamilton, therefore, and his party, obtained this object of a longer period for the election of a ſenate and preſident, the whole fruits of the revolution muſt have been forfeited. Of the two ſyſtems, Britiſh ſupremacy would have been the leſſer evil. There is no peculiar ſublimity in American legiſlators, that would render them impenetrable to an argument from the mint. Franking, for inſtance, was not more odly perverted by an Engliſh member to pay the wages of his footman, than by Roger Sherman

tranſmitting his dirty linen from Philadelphia to a Connecticut waſhing tub.

The actual plan of a federal conſtitution, as laid before the convention by Mr. Hamilton, was never expoſed to the public view. A copy of it has been obtained for inſertion in this volume. It was communicated by a gentleman who has long held an important ſituation in the government of the country. By ſingular good fortune, his character has eſcaped the ſhafts even of federal calumny; and his name is at the ſervice either of Mr. Hamilton, or of any gentleman who ſhall, at his deſire, enquire for it. In two or three ſentences he may have varied a word, from inaccuracy of tranſcription, but he is poſitive as to having preſerved the ideas, in every article, with ſtrict fidelity. The paper has alſo been read, in preſence of two members of congreſs, to a gentleman who ſat in the convention; and he declared his belief that it was a faithful copy of the plan ſuggeſted by Mr. Hamilton. After this previous explanation, as to the authenticity of the paper, nothing remains but to give a copy of it, annexing to ſome of the articles a few obſervations.

PROPOSITION OF COLONEL HAMILTON OF NEW-YORK, IN THE CONVENTION FOR ESTABLISHING A CONSTITUTION OF GOVERNMENT FOR THE UNITED STATES.

I. "The ſupreme legiſlative power of the United States of America to be veſted in two different bodies of men; the *one* to be called the aſſembly; the *other* the ſenate, who together ſhall form the legiſlature of the United States, with power to paſs all laws whatſoever, ſubject to the *negative* hereafter mentioned.

II. "The aſſembly to conſiſt of perſons elected by "the people, to ſerve for three years."

[One year is long enough. The Senate are remarkably liſtleſs about the trifling buſineſs which they have to do; and this may be juſtly aſcribed to the length of time for which they are elected. The nation cannot hold its legiſlators by too ſhort a bridle.]

III. "The ſenate to conſiſt of perſons elected "to ſerve during good behaviour; their election "to be made by electors choſen for that purpoſe "by the people; in order to this the ſtates to be "divided into election diſtricts. On the death, re- "moval, or reſignation of any ſenator, his place to "be filled out of the diſtrict from which he came."

[This clauſe is exceptionable. To ſerve during good behaviour means to hold the office for life; ſince if a ſenator votes with the majority, it is about impoſſible to get him diſmiſſed. This has been proved by two well known caſes in the preſent ſenate. As for this mode of electing by electors, it gave room for that juggling by which Mr. Adams obtained the preſidency. The paper muſt imply, though it has not been ſo expreſſed, that the ſenate were to have a negative on the acts paſſed by the repreſentatives. Thus legiſlation would iſſue in an ariſtocracy holding their ſeats for life. It would be far preferable to ſend back for an Engliſh governor.]

IV. "The ſupreme executive authority of the "United States to be veſted in a *governor* to be "elected during good behaviour; the election to "be made by electors choſen by the people in the "election diſtricts aforeſaid: the authorities and "functions to be as follows; to have a *negative* "upon all laws about to be paſſed, and the execu- "tion of all laws paſſed; to have the direction of

" war, when authoriſed or begun; to have, with " the advice and conſent of the ſenate, the power " of making all treaties; to have the ſole appoint- " ment of the heads or chief officers of finance and " foreign affairs; to have the nomination of all " other officers, ambaſſadors to foreign nations in- " cluded, ſubject to the approbation, or rejection of " the ſenate; to have power of pardoning all of- " fences, except treaſon, which he ſhall not pardon " without the approbation of the ſenate.

[America has been taught, by experience, that the ſenatorial check on the preſident is a mere ſhadow. The number of ſenators is ſo ſmall, and the offices which he has to beſtow are ſo many, that a preſident always has commanded, and always may command, the acquieſcence of a majority in any meaſure that he thinks fit. The contrary can only happen by a very unuſual combination of circumſtances. But when this governor and ſenate hold their ſeats for life, nothing but jobbing and corruption can be expected to enſue. The executive negative on the laws entruſting the welfare of a whole people to the judgment or folly of a ſingle man, is one of the very worſt features in monarchy. The power of making treaties, as explained by congreſs in the caſe of Jay, implies any thing and every thing. Inſtead of holding his office for life, a preſident ſhould not hold it for more than two years at a time, leaving the people to elect him a ſecond time if they ſaw proper. This would diminiſh the probability of his becoming a penſioner to ſome foreign power; as the ſhortneſs of his ſtay in office would make it leſs worth while to purchaſe him. Such a ſale is far within the chapter of poſſibilities. Suppoſe that ſome future chief magiſtrate of America ſhall write an encomium, in three volumes, on the

conſtitution of Ruſſia; that the latter country ſhall be at war with England; and that he ſhall, in defiance of the intereſt of his conſtituents, and to the apparent ruin of the government itſelf, attempt to plunge America into the quarrel, as an ally of Ruſſia. Reaſon muſt conclude, that the court of Peterſburgh has paid him handſomely for his efforts. The probability of a ſecret penſion will be increaſed, if it ſhall tranſpire, that this preſident, before his elevation, correſponded, in a very diſhonourable mode, with ſome ſpy or informer at Peterſburg.

With the powers conferred by Mr. Hamilton's propoſal, an American *governor* would want nothing of royalty but the name.]

V. "On the death, reſignation, or removal of "the governor, his authorities to be exerciſed by "the preſident of the ſenate, till a ſucceſſor be ap-"pointed.

VI. "The ſenate to have the ſole power of de-"claring war, the power of adviſing and approv-"ing all treaties, the power of approving and re-"jecting all appointments of officers, except the "heads or chiefs of the departments of finance, "war, and foreign affairs."

[The ſole power of declaring war is, in itſelf, ſuch a ſweeping privilege, as could not be ſafely entruſted but to the immediate repreſentatives of the people. This would be a complete ariſtocracy.]

VII. "The ſupreme judicial authority of the "United States, to be veſted in judges, to hold their "office during good behaviour, with adequate and "permanent ſalaries; the court to have original "juriſdiction in all cauſes of capture, and an appel-"late juriſdiction in all cauſes on which the reve-"nues of the general government, or the citizens "of foreign nations, are concerned.

VIII. "The legiſlature of the United States to "have power to inſtitute courts in each ſtate, for "the determination of all matters of general con- "cern.

IX. "The governors, ſenators, and all officers "of the United States to be liable to impeachment "for mal and corrupt conduct; and, upon convic- "tion, to be removed from office, and diſqualified "for holding any place of truſt and profit. And all "impeachments to be tried by a court to conſiſt of "the chief *, or judge of the ſuperior "court of law of each ſtate, provided ſuch judge "hold his place during good behaviour and have a "permanent ſalary."

[A governor, in the previous appointment of judges, could readily ſelect men from whoſe verdict he ſhould have nothing to fear.]

X. "All laws of the particular ſtates, contrary "to the conſtitution or laws of the United States, "to be utterly void; and the better to prevent ſuch "laws being paſſed, the governor or preſident of "each ſtate ſhall be appointed by the general go- "vernment, and ſhall have a negative upon the "laws about to be paſſed in the ſtate of which he is "governor or preſident."

[This *appointment* and *negative* would reduce the ſtate aſſemblies to perfect inſignificance.]

XI. "No ſtate to have any force, land or naval, "and the militia to be under the ſole and excluſive "direction of the United States, the officers of "which to be appointed and commiſſioned by "them."

The laſt word, undoubtedly, applies to the ſenate and governor, whom the fourth and ſixth articles had already veſted with the power of all appoint-

* Here is a blank in the manuſcript.

ments. So immenſe an accumulation of patronage, would have made them as abſolute as the late kings of France. Such a ſyſtem as that here ſketched out was a direct extirpation of the liberties of America. General Waſhington, as a member of the convention, knew this plan; and that it met with his approbation is plain; for when raiſed to the preſidency, he appointed Mr. Hamilton to be ſecretary of the treaſury. This office, in the way by which Mr. Hamilton conducted it, immediately comprehended twenty times the real influence enjoyed by Mr. Jefferſon, as ſecretary of ſtate. The preſident thereafter continued to foſter Mr. Hamilton with augmenting confidence, and never failed to ratify all the ſtatutes of his majority. Theſe circumſtances ſpeak very diſtinctly; nor will the preſident's tuneful periods in praiſe of republican government obliterate the ſtain. Mr. Waſhington ought to have held in deteſtation every man capable of inventing or defending ſo vile a ſcheme. Inſtead of that, the apoſtle of a federal throne was preſſed to his boſom.

When ſuch plans were in agitation, it is not ſurpriſing that a party in the convention became ſolicitous to ſhut their doors. But time has, at length, rent the veil of ſecrecy; and the primitive principles and projects of Mr. Hamilton and his friends are now fairly committed to the world.

When, in the convention of 1787, the vote was carried for ſhutting the doors, the republican party ſhould have walked out of the houſe. Their want of firmneſs hath been the ſole cauſe of their depreſſion. It was of infinite conſequence that the opinions and arguments of every member in the convention ſhould be exactly known. The republicans could not have committed a greater error than by flinching from the publicity of debates.

As the convention met in order to frame a repreſentative government, their numbers ought to have borne ſome proportion to the importance of the ſtates from whence they came. For though the meeting voted ſeperately by ſtates, and not in an individual maſs, yet ſtill that ſtate which ſent the greateſt number of repreſentatives had the beſt chance of obtaining its own wiſhes. Five lawyers in a cauſe have the advantage over two of equal abilities. To this convention Pennſylvania ſent eight repreſentatives, Delaware five, Maſſachuſetts two, Virginia three, and New-York one. The conſtitution was indeed to be thereafter ſubmitted to the ſtates ſeperately; but, when once framed, it was difficult to get an alteration without rejecting the whole plan.

CHAPTER V.

Remarks on Mr. Alexander Hamilton's explanation of his correſpondence with James Reynolds.

ON Auguſt 25th, 1797, a pamphlet was publiſhed at Philadelphia, under the following title: "Obſervations on Certain Documents, contained "in No. V. and VI. of *the Hiſtory of the United* "*States*, *for the year* 1796, in which the Charge "of Speculation, againſt Alexander Hamilton, "late Secretary of the Treaſury, is fully refuted. "Written by Himſelf."

This piece extends to thirty-five pages, beſides an appendix of fifty-eight. The firſt part compriſes the author's reply to the accuſation againſt him. The latter contains fifty-ſix letters and other papers.

Mr. Hamilton opens his pamphlet with a deſcription of the jacobins of America. In his dialect, the word jacobin comprehends one-half of the citizens of the United States; for, at the late election of preſident, the two parties, under the reſpective names of Adams and Jefferſon, were exactly balanced. By accident, or fraud, a part of the citizens of Pennſylvania were prevented from tranſmitting their votes to this city, within the time required by law. Hence Mr. Jefferſon had only thirteen ſuffrages from this ſtate, when the voice of the people had given him fifteen. The transference of theſe two votes to the oppoſite ſcale, decided againſt Mr. Jefferſon. He loſt the preſidency by a minority of ſixty-eight ſuffrages againſt ſeventy-one. Had the remainder of the Pennſylvania votes been accepted, he would have been preſident by ſeventy againſt ſixty-nine.

When two parties are thus minutely poiſed, they ſhould, if poſſible, ſpeak about each other with temper and decency. Such conduct ought eſpecially to be expected from Mr. Hamilton; who filled, for about ſeven years, one of the firſt offices under the federal government. An idea of gravity and dignity is annexed to ſuch a ſtation.

Of American jacobins our ex-ſecretary ſpeaks thus. "The moſt direct falſhoods are invented and "propagated, with undaunted effrontery, and unrelenting perſeverance. Lies, often detected and "refuted, are ſtill revived and repeated, in the "hope that the refutation may have been forgotten, "or that the frequency and boldneſs of accuſation "may ſupply the place of truth and proof.—If truly "this be, as every appearance indicates, a conſpiracy "of vice againſt virtue, ought I not rather to be

" flattered, that I have been ſo long and ſo peculi-
" arly an object of perſecution* ?"

This martyr of virtue, this exulting object of perſecution, this antagoniſt of falſhood, has publiſhed ninety-three pages to prove, that he was guilty of conjugal infidelity, that is of *breaking an oath*; for the latter is one of the crimes comprehended within the former. This is the man, who, at the ſame moment, has the hardineſs to announce " a " conſpiracy of vice againſt virtue." Mr. Hamilton ſhould ſpeak with reſerve as to the faults of others. The portrait which he draws of American jacobins, correſponds, preciſely, with the publications and meaſures common, though not univerſal, among the writers and leaders of the federal party. No man has plunged farther than Mr. Hamilton himſelf into the ocean of calumny. He ſhould, therefore, be one of the laſt men to complain about it.

The entire form and eſſence of this vindication is ſo vile, ſo diſguſting, ſo groſsly indecent, that one hardly knows either how to tranſcribe or abridge it. Some of the principal facts are as follows.

In ſummer, 1791, Maria, the wife of James Reynolds, waited upon Mr. Hamilton at his houſe in Philadelphia. She told him that her huſband had treated her with cruelty, and deſerted her; that her relations reſided in the ſtate of New-York, and ſhe ſolicited money to pay the expence of returning to them. Mr. Hamilton, for the purpoſe of beſtowing charity, paid a viſit to Mrs. Reynolds at her lodgings. " She met me, " ſays he, " and con-
" ducted me into a *bed* room."

" After this," adds our author, " I had frequent
" meetings with her, moſt of them at my own

* Obſervations, &c. p. 4.

"houſe; *Mrs. Hamilton, with her children, being* "*abſent on a viſit to her father.*" OBSERVATIONS, p. 18. The ex-ſecretary might have ſpared the additional offence of this palliation. If he had really felt that remorſe and ſhame to which he pretends, Mr. Hamilton never could have printed this luggage of circumſtances. They were not requiſite even to "wipe away *a more ſerious ſtain.*" OBSERVATIONS, p. 10. Their omiſſion could not have impaired the force, but they add to the ignominy of his exculpation. Mr. Hamilton might have copied the delicacy of the painter, who caſt a veil over the face of Agammenon, to conceal what it was impoſſible to expreſs.

An indignant huſband ſoon makes his appearance; and Mrs. Reynolds, in a letter to the colonel, ſays that he had been ſwearing he would write to Mrs. Hamilton. This was in December 1791. No. II. of the appendix is a letter from the huſband demanding *ſatisfaction*, which he affirms that he *will* have, "before one day paſſes me more." In No. IV. he ſays "I have this propoſal to make to you. "Give me the ſum of one thouſand dollars." There next follow two receipts for this money, the one for ſix and the other for four hundred dollars. The lady was unwilling to quit ſo good a friend. She addreſſes him in love ſick epiſtles, real or forged, and declares that till he ſhall viſit her, "my breaſt "will be the ſeate of pain and woe."

Reynolds himſelf, alſo, writes a letter to the colonel, dated March 24th, 1792. He expatiates on his own good nature in permitting the ex-ſecretary's viſits, gives hints of his power to be troubleſome, and of his diſpoſition to oblige. Some other letters ſucceed, demanding money. They had been complied with, for it appears by No. XV. dated April 17th, 1792, that the colonel continued

his visits. On the 2d of May, he received a formal prohibition from ever seeing the lady again. "I "was in hopes," says Reynolds, "that it would "ware off, but I find their is no hopes." Solicitations for money follow. The two hundred dollars mentioned by Clingman* were obtained to fit up a boarding house. The last letter is dated August 30th, 1792. In the OBSERVATIONS p. 9, Mr. Hamilton calls this an *amorous* connection. If this account be true, it merited a coarser name.

The object in publishing this correspondence is to prove that the connection between Reynolds and the ex-secretary did not refer to the purchase of certificates, but to the charms of Mrs. Reynolds.

Yet Mr. Hamilton and his friends have always enlarged on his poverty. The scale of expence in this affair disagrees with that supposition. In eighteen months Maria, must have cost him at least about eighteen hundred dollars. The expence is extravagant in proportion to its end. It revolts against his well known character for economy. He says that he was afraid of having the matter known to Mrs. Hamilton. Yet in her absence, he had frequent interviews with Mrs. Reynolds at *his own house*. This betrays but small regard for the secret. "Ser-"vants, have ears, as well as other people," says Slipslop. It appears, likewise, that he received numerous messages and letters from the parties, and that Reynolds paid him several visits at his house. All this discovers little attention to the dread of disclosure; and indeed the story was well enough known.

Mr. Hamilton rests much upon the profligate character of the parties, and the improbability of his having entrusted such a being as Reynolds with

* Documents, No. 4.

his ſecrets of ſpeculation. But, by his own account, he did commit his confidence to this man, and protracted the connection with his wife during a whole year after he had been menaced with a diſcovery.

His pamphlet, full as it is of defiance and defamation, puts a cloſe to his claims for ſuperior veracity. He who acknowledged the reality of ſuch epiſtles, could feel no ſcruple to forge them. The latter ſuppoſition is as favourable as the former to his good name. He ſpeaks much about his attachment to Mrs. Hamilton, while he ſquandered what was due to his family, and rambled, as he pretends, for eighteen months in the embraces of pollution.

The evidence or preſumption againſt the authenticity of the letters printed by Mr. Hamilton ſtands thus. Reynolds affirms, that Mr. Hamilton had employed him as an agent of ſpeculation. This the ex-ſecretary denies; but, their probity being upon a par, we know not which of them to believe. Mrs. Reynolds adds her teſtimony, as to the belief of ſpeculation, and ſays, that the correſpondence and receipts for money, ſince publiſhed by Mr. Hamilton, were fabricated by him and her huſband*. But if they actually were ſo, it remains to be gueſſed *why*, *when*, and *where* they were compoſed.

On this hypotheſis we are to believe that Mr. Hamilton, on the motive of threats from Reynolds, and of his being viſited in priſon by Meſſrs. Muhlenberg, Monroe, and Venable, haſted his enlargement. This happened, on the evening of Wedneſday, the 12th of December, 1797. The interview between Mr. Hamilton and the members was on the evening of Saturday following. The correſ-

* Documents, No. V. See Hiſtory of 1796, Chap. VI. The colonel has reprinted the other papers, but leaves out No. V.

pondence muſt have been framed in the interval; and a day or a few hours were ſufficient for that effect.

In No. IV. Clingman, ſays, that Reynolds, on the night of his liberation, ſent a meſſage to Mr. Hamilton, and by deſire waited on him on Thurſday morning. In No. V. he relates ſome particulars, which, according to his account from Reynolds, paſt at this interview. Clingman, in a poſt-ſcript to No. V. ſays, that, as Mrs. Reynolds aſſured him, the letters were *fabricated by her huſband and Mr. Hamilton*. The latter, in this publication, takes no notice of the allegation by Clingman, that *he*, (Mr. Hamilton) *ſaw Reynolds after his enlargement*. He ought, in conſiſtency to have denied it. But he had already owned the fact to the three members. Mr. Hamilton, a rake, and Mr. Reynolds, a ſwindler, alternately give each other the lie. The probability of untruth and fraud upon each ſide is ſo great, that it is impracticable to determine between them*.

In the appendix, No. XXXIII. we meet with a letter to Mr. Hamilton, from Meſſrs. Muhlenberg and Monroe, dated 17th of July, 1797, wherein they write thus: "the explanation of the nature "of your connection with Reynolds, which you "then gave, removed the ſuſpicions we had before "entertained of your being connected with him in "ſpeculation." There is another from Mr. Venable to the ſame effect. The ex-ſecretary reſts much upon this admiſſion. But every other perſon is now equally well qualified with theſe gentlemen to judge of the evidence; ſo that this is nothing more than the opinion of three individuals.

* In the Hiſtory of 1796, it is ſaid, by miſtake, that Mr. Hamilton received a copy of the whole documents therein publiſhed. From the Obſervations it comes out, that he never ſaw No. V. till in print.

Yet even their opinion is unfortunately mutilated. Mr. Hamilton has printed thirteen letters that paſſed between himſelf and Mr. Monroe. From theſe it appears that Mr. Monroe ſtill entertained conſiderable doubts. They were grounded on the information given by Clingman, which cloſes No. V, and bears date the 2d of January, 1793. In one letter Mr. Monroe ſays, "whether the imputations againſt you as to ſpeculation, are well or ill founded, depends upon the facts and circumſtances, which appear againſt you upon your defence. If you ſhew that they are ill founded, I ſhall be contented." Mr. Hamilton, in a ſucceeding letter, writes thus: "the reſult in my mind is, that you have been and are actuated by motives towards me *malignant* and *diſhonourable*." The parties wrote on till they were at the point of fighting a duel. The ſecond claſs of doubts excited in Mr. Monroe, by Clingman, as to the innocence of the ex-ſecretary, did not take place till ſome weeks after the three members had received the explanation from Mr. Hamilton. The one circumſtance happened on the 15th of December, 1792, and, the other on the 2d of January thereafter. Now, the exculpatory letters from the three members refer to nothing ſubſequent to the former date; and as the ſuſpicions of Mr. Monroe were revived by Clingman, it is natural to imagine that thoſe of Meſſrs. Muhlenberg and Venable were likewiſe excited. Whether this was the caſe, or not, appears of little conſequence, unleſs, becauſe it ſhews the very ſlippery nature of the vindication derived from them. If this was the beſt defence which they would give to Mr. Hamilton, he has but ſcanty room for triumph.

The colonel dwells, with much complacency, on his own tranſcendant dignity of character. "It is

" morally impoſſible," ſays he, " I ſhould have " been fooliſh as well as depraved *enough* to em- " ploy ſo vile an inſtrument as Reynolds for ſuch " inſignificant ends, as are indicated by different " parts of the ſtory itſelf. " OBSERVATIONS. p. 10. The ends alledged were, ſpeculation to the extent of thirty thouſand dollars. Mr. Hamilton pretends that he employed Reynolds as a convenient huſband. This end was *infinitely* more inſignificant than the other; ſo that the inference in the above paſſage evidently contradicts the fact.

On p. 13, he ſpeaks of " the general improbabili- " ty, that I ſhould put myſelf upon paper with ſo " deſpicable a perſon, on a ſubject which might ex- " poſe me to infamy. " The improbability has actually been fulfilled.

" As to the diſappearance of the parties after the " liberation, how am I anſwerable for it? Is it not " preſumable, that the inſtance diſcovered at the " treaſury was not *the only offence of the kind of* " *which they were guilty?* After one detection, is " it not very probable that Reynolds fled to avoid " detection in other caſes?—Reynolds was conſide- " rably in debt. What more natural for him than " to fly from his creditors?" OBSERVATIONS, p. 35. " Could it be expected that I ſhould ſo debaſe " myſelf as to think it neceſſary to my vindication " to be confronted with a perſon ſuch as Reynolds? " Could I have borne to ſuffer my veracity to be " expoſed to the humiliating competition?" Ibid p. 36. This tone does not become Mr. Hamilton. People of regular morals, think that the profligate, who debauches another man's wife, cannot be *degraded* by confronting her huſband.

As to the diſappearance of Reynolds, after his enlargement, Mr. Hamilton has not even offered to deny the having ſeen him privately on the ſuc-

ceeding day at his own houſe. In No. V. of the documents, he owned to the three members of congreſs, "that he had received a note from Reynolds "in *the night*, at the time ſtated in Clingman's pa- "per, and that he had likewiſe ſeen him in *the* "*morning following*." This looks ſomewhat myſterious. The diſmiſſion of Reynolds from priſon, without trial, remains to find a decent apology; but, if it was preſumable that he had been guilty of other and ſimilar offences, this highly aggravated the impropriety of diſcharging him. As to his running away for debt, there does not appear any particular reaſon for thinking that he fled on this account. Reynolds, in his torn letter to Clingman, gave a more natural and ſimple account of his intended diſappearance. "He has offered to furniſh me and "Mrs. Reynolds with money to *carry us off*. If I "will go, he will ſee that ſhe has money to *follow* "*me*." The word *he* can refer only to Mr. Hamilton, which is clear from the reſt of the letter. He was writing in full confidence to Clingman, and could have no imaginable reaſon to frame a fiction.

The confronting of Reynolds with Hamilton, before the three members of congreſs, would have been more ſatisfactory to them than the production of any papers. Beſides, although our ex-ſecretary profeſſes ſuch diſdain of being placed in a ſtate of compariſon with him, yet the inſtinctive indignation of innocence, would have prompted moſt people, to drag forward ſo perfidious an accuſer; and, in preſence of the gentlemen, to have extorted a confeſſion of his fraud. The ſame ſhyneſs of appealing to the original parties, appears in this pamphlet. Clingman and the lady have been married. They reſide now at Alexandria. Reynolds himſelf lives, it is ſaid, in New-York. If the letters publiſhed by Mr. Hamilton in the name of Maria are

genuine, it would be very eaſy to obtain her atteſtation of the fact. A juſtice of peace, at Alexandria, could diſpatch the buſineſs in half an hour. She could be directed to give a ſample of her hand; and, by comparing this with the letters, it would be aſcertained whether or not they really came from her pen. But Camillus dares not to meet this teſt.

Inſtead of ſuch an obvious and deciſive elucidation, Mr. Hamilton * brings forward Mary Williams, keeper of a boarding houſe in Philadelphia. This woman ſwears, that ſhe is well acquainted with the hand writing of Mrs. Reynolds, and that ſhe is *well ſatisfied* of the letters being genuine. She gives no particulars of her acquaintance with Mrs. Reynolds, except the declining to admit of her as a lodger. This is as lame a kind of evidence as can well be conceived. Why not appeal to the lady herſelf, in place of ſuch a circuitous method?

Theſe letters from Mrs. Reynolds are badly ſpelt and pointed. Capitals, alſo, occur even in the midſt of words. But waving ſuch excreſcences, the ſtile is pathetic and even elegant. It does not bear the marks of an illiterate writer. The conſtruction of the periods diſagrees with this apparent incapacity of ſpelling. The officer who can marſhall a regiment, muſt know how to level a muſquet. A few groſs blunders are interſperſed, and theſe could readily be deviſed; but, when ſtript of ſuch a veil, the body of the compoſition is pure and correct. In the literary world, fabrications of this nature have been frequent. Our ex-ſecretary admits that he has been in the habit of writing to this family in a feigned character. The tranſition was eaſy to the writing in a feigned ſtile. Mrs. Reynolds herſelf may have wrote theſe epiſtles from

* Appendix, No. XLI.

the dictating of the colonel; for "the variety of "shapes which this woman could assume was end-"less*." It is natural, then, to suspect, that she really may have acted that part. But if the colonel is not afraid of her springing a leak in the bottom of his tale, why does he avoid her testimony, and try to divert our attention by the prattle of Mary Williams?

But even admitting that the love letters and others were genuine, this does not take away the probability of a swindling connection between Reynolds and Hamilton. The way in which the colonel and Maria became acquainted rests on the single evidence of himself. Reynolds does not appear to have dropped to Clingman even a hint of incontinency. Mrs. Reynolds† told the three members of congress that she had burned a considerable number of letters from Mr. Hamilton to her husband. The dread that her deposition may stumble upon this fact, appears the only reason why the colonel chuses to keep her out of the way.

Hence, if the letters from Mrs. Reynolds are in her hand writing, this does not prove that they were the real effusions of a libidinous correspondence. If that correspondence had a being, it does not destroy the possibility of another, of a quite different sort, between the colonel and the husband. Speculation in June may well consist with adultery in December. The whole proof in this pamphlet rests upon an allusion. "I am a rake, and "for that reason I cannot be a swindler. I con-"fess that I stole a horse; but, if you say that I "stole a cow, I scorn to be confronted with my "accusers." This is an edifying and convenient species of logic. Both Reynolds and his lady af-

* Observations, p. 31. † Documents, No. III.

firm that there was a ſpeculation, and until they undergo a thorough examination, before ſome proper authority, the doubt never can be reſolved. Under ſuch circumſtances, it was proper that Mr. Monroe ſhould ſuſpend his judgment.

Mr. Hamilton ſays*, that, during his diſcuſſion with the three members, he diſcovered no ſymptom, different from that of *a proud conſciouſneſs of innocence*. What pride, what conſcious innocence, any man could feel, in the midſt of ſuch an acknowledgment, the reader is left to judge.

Thus much for the main points in Mr. Hamilton's piece. A few epiſodes remain to be handled. It now comes out that the improper communications from the treaſury office to Reynolds and Clingman were made by *Fraunces*, a clerk therein. This man afterwards preſented a memorial to congreſs arraigning Mr. Hamilton. His charge was rejected as groundleſs. In a note, the ex-ſecretary adds, "would it be believed, after all "this, that Mr. Jefferſon, vice-preſident of the "United States, would write to this Fraunces "friendly letters? Yet ſuch is the fact." In the appendix, we find theſe alarming epiſtles. Obſerve now, to what a deſtitution of materials the enemies of Thomas Jefferſon are reduced! The firſt letter, dated June 27th, 1797, muſt have been in anſwer to ſome requeſt for money. "I ſhall not "have one dollar to ſpare," ſays the vice-preſident. Another, dated next day, refuſes a *certificate of character*. This is the wonderful friendſhip ſo ſhocking to the nerves of our fiſcal Atlas! The letters are, in themſelves, entirely unimportant. They have no reference to any part of the ex-ſecretary's budget. In what way he got them, or for what reaſon he

* Obſervations, p. 8.

printed them, is yet to be told. They cannot leſſen, by the value of one cent, the reputation of our vice-preſident. If this correſpondence is one of the greateſt faults in Mr. Jefferſon which hatred can diſcover, and fury reveal, he enjoys the pureſt character which has adorned hiſtory. But ſince Hamilton ſpeaks of diſreputable correſpondence, we may remind him of that which he ſupported, for a twelve month, with Mr. Reynolds, and of his crouching under the menaces of this precious agent*. If any thing, within one million of degrees of ſuch diſgrace, can be fixed on Mr. Jefferſon, pray let us hear it; for, in that lexicon of lies and calumnies, printed by our Portugueſe ambaſſador, Dr. Smith, hardly one article, granting it to be true, has the veſtige of common ſenſe.

Inſtead of inveighing againſt the republican party, as propagators of ſlander, Mr. Hamilton ought to thank them for a degree of forbearance and delicacy of which his friends have very ſeldom ſet an example. During the time of this connection, it was known to many members of congreſs. If any republican character had been the hero of the ſtory, it would infallibly have been echoed from one end of the continent to the other. Yet that party, with much good nature, obſerved profound ſilence. Mr. Jefferſon had received a copy of theſe documents. He never ſhewed them, nor ever ſpoke of them, to any perſon. In ſummer, 1797, when the vice-preſident heard of the intended publication, he adviſed that the papers ſhould be ſuppreſſed. Benevolence could not go farther, but his interpoſition came too

* "Mrs. Reynolds, more than once, communicated to me, that "Reynolds would occaſionally relapſe into diſcontent at his *ſituation*; "would treat her very ill, hint at the aſſaſſination of me, and more "openly threaten, by way of revenge, to inform Mrs. Hamilton." Obſervations, p. 15.

late. Mr. Hamilton well knew that Mr. Jefferſon was maſter of his ſecret, and had kept it; and yet he took the opportunity of this pamphlet to attack his benefactor's reputation. If the papers had been printed four years ſooner, the beſt effects might have enſued to America, for the preſident would undoubtedly have diſmiſſed Camillus.

Quitttng theſe two letters from Jefferſon to Fraunces, we come to the offence for which Reynolds was impriſoned, and the cauſes for which he was diſcharged. Mr. Wolcott* ſays, that Reynolds and Clingman were proſecuted for having *ſuborned a perſon to commit perjury*. After the proſecution commenced, Clingman confeſſed that he and Reynolds had liſts of the names and ſums due to certain creditors of the United States, and which had been obtained from a clerk in the treaſury, with a view to the forgery of warrants on it, in the name of ſuch creditors. As to the name of this clerk, Hamilton, in No. V, intimated to the members that it was Duer. But Wolcott† affirms, that Duer had no concern with it. Thus, the two gentlemen contradict each other, and on a point which muſt have been equally well known to both. Mr. Wolcott explains the reaſon for withdrawing the proſecution, which was, that the offenders gave up the liſts of creditors obtained from the treaſury, and told the name of the unfaithful clerk. This he calls "an important diſcovery." As for delivering the liſts, theſe were only copies, and not original papers. It was quite eaſy for the parties to keep other copies, and proceed to fabricate warrants; indeed they might withhold and conceal part of the very liſts which they had got from the treaſury.

* Appendix No. XXIV. † Ibid.

Mr. Hamilton, ſpeaking of this diſmiſſion, ſays, "it was certainly of more conſequence to the public to detect and expel from the boſom of the "treaſury department, an unfaithful clerk, to prevent future and extenſive miſchief, than to diſgrace and puniſh two worthleſs individuals."—OBSERVATIONS, p. 34. But the ex-ſecretary ſhould have proved that the diſmiſſion of the one was neceſſary towards the diſcovery of the other; and this he has not done. "The culprits were compelled to give *a real and ſubſtantial equivalent* for the "relief which they obtained from a department "*over which I preſided.*" Ibid. The ſubſtantiality is very doubtful. As for *preſiding*, the comptroller is independent. Either Mrs. Reynolds was the real and ultimate cauſe of this diſcharge, or it reſulted from ſome inviſible machinery, which the movers do not chuſe to bring forward. It revolts againſt propriety, and the official judgment of Mr. Wolcott, to ſay, that he would diſmiſs two criminals for ſo trifling a reaſon. Clingman, of himſelf, confeſſed to Wolcott, the affair of the ſtolen liſts of names from the treaſury. From the certificate of the latter*, it is to be underſtood, that he made the confeſſion, unſolicited, and even unſuſpected. But adds the comptroller, "both Clingman and Reynolds "obſtinately refuſed, for ſometime, to deliver up "the liſts, or to diſcloſe the name of the perſon "through whoſe infidelity they had been obtained." All this muſt clearly be a ſham. The culprits were under proſecution for another crime, the ſubornation of perjury. Their deſpair is evident, from the voluntary confeſſion of Clingman. The delivery of the liſts, and the diſcloſure of the name of their aſſociate, were matters of courſe.

* Appendix, No. XXIV.

The comptroller had only to proceed with his ſuit, and could, at any period, have enſured the promulgation of every ſecret which they had. When a public officer, like Mr. Wolcott, conjures up an abſurd excuſe for having deſerted his duty, thoſe who pay his ſalary have a right to criticiſe him. Mr. Wolcott diſmiſſed, with impunity, two offenders that, as he ſays, he might reach Fraunces, a clerk in the treaſury. Had the comptroller been a boy or a fool, reaſon might have ſmiled at his frivolity of triumph. But ſince he is a man of long experience in buſineſs, and free from the ſallies of a florid imagination, it is juſt to infer that ſomething deeper than vanity lies at the bottom of the pool.

Other paſſages in this pamphlet might admit of remark, but the above appears to be a ſufficient ſpecimen. The arguments and the teſtimony produced by our ex-ſecretary are alike unſatisfactory. He lays much weight upon the purity and elevation of his perſonal character. His own performance explodes it. He triumphs in an exculpation from the three members of congreſs. Yet, as to Meſſrs. Monroe and Muhlenberg, his auxiliary writers conſtantly repreſent them as traitors to their country. According to Mr. Hamilton's own deſcription of jacobins, they muſt be the vileſt of mankind; and their atteſtation can deſerve no credit whatever; but yet it fills him with pride. An impartial byſtander might addreſs him thus.

" If Muhlenberg, and his two friends, are the fire-
" brands of faction, which you repreſent them to
" be, then it was unworthy of your innocence to
" aſk a vindication from them. The oak does not
" lean upon the bramble; nor ſtrength court the
" protection of weakneſs. But ſince you have ap-
" pealed to theſe gentlemen, in defence of your

" character, you betray an evident conſciouſneſs
" that they have a character to loſe. This earneſt
" recourſe to their honour diſcovers that you diſ-
" believe your own general portrait of jacobins;
" and the peculiar reproaches that your ſcribblers
" have poured on Meſſrs. Muhlenberg and Monroe.
" A veſtal does not prop her purity by the evidence
" of a bawd; nor a Sully waſh his hands while
" Cartouche holds the baſon. You arraign theſe
" men as calumniators; and, on the ſame page,
" you refer to their veracity in defence of yours.
" This is a contradiction. You placed yourſelf in
" a delicate ſituation. If they had refuſed, as they
" well might have done, to take notice of your ap-
" plication, your fame was, by your own arrange-
" ment, in a dangerous way. The confidence that
" you repoſed in them, and the alacrity which, in
" ſpite of all provocations, they have manifeſted to
" ſerve you, refute your clamours againſt them.
" The firſt ſtep in ſupport of your fame, fixes you
" in detected calumny.

" You give an inſufficient reaſon, for the releaſe
" of Reynolds from jail. You received a viſit from
" him before ſunriſe on the enſuing morning. He
" then diſappeared; and when the three gentlemen
" waited on you reſpecting his accuſations, you tell
" a long hiſtory of an intrigue, and produce a bun-
" dle of letters concerning it. That they are the
" real hand writing of the parties we have no proof
" but your word, and a depoſition from the miſtreſs
" of a boarding-houſe. On the contrary, Reynolds
" never ſpoke to Clingman of any thing but ſpecu-
" lation. His wife adds her ſuſpicion; and affirms,
" that the love epiſtles, and receipts for money,
" are a fabrication by her huſband and you. The
" whole collection would not have required above
" an evening to write them. At the diſtance of four

" years and an half, and when warned and chal-
" lenged to produce the parties themſelves, you ſtill
" avoid a perſonal reference. You ſpeak as if it was
" impoſſible to invent a few letters. Yet, upon this
" very buſineſs, you wrote in a feigned hand. And
" what is your molehill appendix, altogether, to the
" gigantic fabrications of Pſalmanazar and of Chat-
" terton? Send for the lady, or pay her a viſit. Take
" her before a magiſtrate, and let us hear what ſhe
" has to ſay. Your avoiding a public meeting with
" her, holds out a ſtrong preſumption of her inno-
" cence. Try, alſo, to find out Reynolds. Never
" pretend that you ſcorn to confront accuſers. The
" world will believe that you dare not."

To this addreſs the ex-ſecretary would be puzzled to make a ſound anſwer. Some of his friends are leſs ſore than he is on the ſubject of ſpeculation. In ſpring, 1794, commodore Gillon, replying, in congreſs, to Dr. William Smith, ſaid, " what makes " the gentleman angry? Did I ſpeak a word of *pilot* " *boats?*" The doctor pocketed this hint, which was equally well underſtood by every man in the houſe. Dr. Smith has always been among the fore-moſt in the battles of the ex-ſecretary; and no fact is beter believed, than that many others of the federal members did ſpeculate in certificates to the amount of millions. Of this party, Mr. Hamilton was the centre and the ſoul. He not merely planned, but dictated their meaſures; a circumſtance eſtabliſhed by the uniform correſpondence between his reports and the ſtatute book of the firſt and ſecond congreſs. Now, if he really did not touch a cent of their earnings, ſtill he muſt own that he kept ſorry company. If Mr. Hamilton ſhook from about his ears the golden ſhower, and trampled under foot the wages of ſpeculation, he can be nothing leſs than a ſecond Abdiel.

"Of all the vile attempts which have been made "to injure my character," ſays Mr. Hamilton, "that which has been lately revived in No V. and "VI. of the Hiſtory of the United States, for 1796, "is *the moſt vile*.—A juſt pride, with reluctance "ſtoops to a formal vindication againſt ſo deſpica- "ble a contrivance, and is inclined rather to op- "poſe to it *the uniform evidence of an upright cha- "racter*.

"This would be my conduct on the preſent oc- "caſion, did not the tale derive ſome ſanction from "the names of three men of ſome weight and con- "ſequence." OBSERVATIONS, p. 9.

As for the vileneſs of *the attempt*, &c. it is as fair as any thing can be. In committing the documents to preſs, the publiſher exerciſed a right and a duty. It did not appear, from any thing on the face of theſe papers, that the three gentlemen were ſatisfied with Mr. Hamilton's explanation. And he knew that they were not unanimous in the acquittal. The enquiry was a public concern, and the public were entitled to judge for themſelves.

With regard to *uniform uprightneſs of character*, there is no man in America, whoſe good name has encountered ſuch violent oppoſition as that of Mr. Hamilton. If he is to anſwer every charge againſt him, that has been made on reſpectable authority, this piece does not complete the taſk. Mr. Findley, in his Hiſtory of the Weſtern Inſurrection, has urged many accuſations, as bad as that of jobbing in certificates. The following are two inſtances. Mr. Hamilton has not attempted to deny any part of them.

The commander of the army lodged for ſome time in the houſe of major Powers, about thirty miles from the town of Waſhington. This man had been active in promoting a ſettlement. "His ſer- "vices were acknowledged, while head-quarters

" were at his houſe, and he was paid a larger ſum " than he demanded, for his trouble and ex- " pences*."

Sometime after this payment, Mr. Hamilton ſent for major Powers to Waſhington. He then examined him concerning the conduct of Albert Gallatin, and of ſome other perſons with whom the major was not even acquainted. The anſwers were unſatisfactory, and an officer was ordered to conduct him into another apartment, where he might, for an hour, refreſh his memory. He was thruſt into a room, among a croud of priſoners, under the point of the bayonet. When called out again, he told Mr. Hamilton that he had nothing further to recollect. The ſecretary reproved him in ſevere terms for concealing truth. He was immediately committed a cloſe priſoner. The beſt bail was offered for his appearance and refuſed. The military conducted him to Pittſburg and kept him in cuſtody till the eighth day. Mr. Hamilton being then gone, " the judge" ſent for major Powers, and politely aſſured him that he had no charge whatever againſt him.

Thus a meritorious citizen, whoſe ſervices had been gratefully rewarded, was, without warrant, accuſer, or even a pretence of guilt, impriſoned for eight days. The motive to this outrage was yet baſer than the act itſelf. Mr. Hamilton wanted Powers to turn evidence againſt people of whom he knew no harm. The crime of Reynolds and Clingman was ſaid to be ſubornation of perjury. The proceedings of the ſecretary came very near it. He had, by the way, no legal authority to commit any body. He held no regular truſt of that nature. As for the judge, who endured ſuch tranſactions before his eyes, it may be hazardous to ſay much about him. The other of the two caſes is as follows.

* Findley, Chap. XVIII.

John Hamilton was, at that time, high ſheriff of Waſhington county, and colonel of the Mingo Creek regiment of militia. Mr. Findley enumerates his ſucceſsful exertions to prevent miſchief. This man, hearing that a charge had been lodged againſt him, went thirty miles to preſent himſelf to judge Peters. His honour had not time to examine him. He was, however, arreſted, and ſent to the town of Waſhington. He applied again to the judge for examination; but in vain. He was ſent priſoner to Philadelphia, a winter journey of more than three hundred miles. He was paraded, along with others, through the ſtreets, with a badge in his hat, and caſt into the cells. After near TWO MONTHS AND AN HALF, he obtained an examination, and was admitted to bail. In the ſequel, not a ſuſpicious circumſtance could be found againſt him*. The reaſon for this outrage is given by Mr. Findley. The ſecretary of the treaſury had reſolved on his deſtruction. For actions like theſe, James the ſecond was turned out of England, and George the third expelled from this continent.

If Mr. Hamilton wanted to drive the weſtern people into the arms of Britain, and to excite a ſecond inſurrection, worſe than the firſt, this behaviour was judicious and conſiſtent. But while he has thus coolly trampled on law, juſtice, humanity, and every maxim of ſound policy, our ex-ſecretary ſhould not refer to his uniform uprightneſs of character. In paſſing, we cannot withhold a tribute of admiration to the ſpirited and important part acted by the American bench. It is to be lamented that ſome patriotic citizens did not raiſe a ſubſcription for ſupporting an action of damages againſt judge Peters.

* Findley Chap XVIII.

Thus the ſheriff of a county was illegally taken from the exerciſe of his office, an office as ſacred and important as that of judge Peters himſelf; and, at that time, of high conſequence to the peace of the country. Becauſe the judge had not leiſure to examine him, he was hauled to Philadelphia, and confined, for about ſeventy days, before he could obtain a hearing. Mr. Peters, when at Waſhington, had promiſed to examine him within half an hour. What a fine ſpecimen of juſtice was this to hold out before the people beyond the mountains! John Hamilton had to make a ſecond journey to this city, in June, 1795, to ſtand trial, ſo that, firſt, and laſt, he muſt have travelled fifteen hundred miles. Yet this was one of the very men who prevented David Bradford from ſeizing the arms and ammunition in the garriſon at Pittſburgh; and a thouſand dollars would but poorly have compenſated ſheriff Hamilton for his impriſonment; while the ſtab inflicted upon public juſtice demanded more ſevere remembrance. Our federal literati are conſtantly talking about the atrocity of the weſtern riots, which they dignify or degrade with the name of rebellion. They ſhould reflect, alſo, upon the behaviour of a great part of that army by whom it was cruſhed*.

* Some farther notice of Mr. Hamilton's pamphlet will appear in the ſequel of this volume.

CHAPTER VI.

Remarks on the weſtern expedition.

"IT is a maxim deeply ingrafted in that "dark ſyſtem, (the *jacobin*) that no character, "however upright, is a match for conſtantly rei- "terated attacks, however falſe.—Every calumny "makes ſome proſelites, and even retains ſome; "ſince juſtification ſeldom circulates as rapidly "and as widely as ſlander." OBSERVATIONS, p. 8.

Mr. Hamilton himſelf is fond of attacking perſonal characters. A conſiderable portion of Mr. Findley's book conſiſts of details reſpecting the calumnious accuſations which the ſecretary circulated, while acting in his incomprehenſible capacity on the weſtern expedition. It is believed that not even a ſyllable of theſe charges has been contradicted, and far leſs refuted, either by himſelf, or by any body for him. It is impoſſible and uſeleſs to quote in this place a tenth part of theſe details. They were ushered into the world under a name known and reſpected. They are as explicit as they imaginably could be; and as indefenſible as either truth or calumny, or hiſtory or fable, could make them. A ſample or two ſhall be ſelected from the maſs.

Two judges of Weſtmoreland county waited on Mr. Hamilton and judge Peters, to enquire in what way they ought to proceed againſt offenders. Inſtead of a ſuitable anſwer, they were urged to accuſe Mr. Gallatin, as having "expreſſed him- "ſelf in a treaſonable manner at the firſt Parkinſon

" meeting. And when they denied having heard " any such expressions, the secretary asserted, that " *he had sufficient proofs of them already.* They " however, persisted in asserting that he used no " such expressions*." They further subjoined, that his efforts had tended more than perhaps those of any other person, to the restoration of order. They were sifted, also, regarding Mr. John Smilie, but to no effect. At this inquisition, Mr. Hamilton said, that he never would forgive Findley, who " had " told or wrote lies about him†."

One John Baldwin was treated yet worse. He refused to give evidence against sheriff Hamilton. For this he was insulted, told that he evaded swearing truth, and that he had forfeited the benefit of the amnesty by not giving the testimony demanded. Somebody Vaughan, a light horseman from Philadelphia, assisted the secretary at this scene.

Such behaviour was only suitable to an English star chamber, or a Scots court of justiciary. If judge Peters had assumed the command of a wing of the army, or if general Morgan, or any other military officer, had placed himself on the bench with Mr. Peters, the grossness of the fact would have been instantly discerned, and the continent have resounded with outcries of indignation. But the secretary had no office, either civil or military. He was, in every shape, and in every sense of the word, an intruder and an usurper, and he exercised his authority as might have been expected from the way in which he obtained it. Behold him ascending the bench, assisted by a district attorney, an inspector of excise, and a light-horseman. This knot of self-created magistrates attempt to dictate the deposition of a witness; and, as in the case of Baldwin, they threaten his life on the event of

* Findley, Chap. XIX. † Ibid.

his refuſal. Obſerve, alſo, the tremulous judge, ſhrinking into the back ground of the picture, while the laws and liberties of the people are troden under foot. Mr. Hamilton, "by his own authority, wrote "a ſevere reprimand to the commander in chief "of the right wing of the army, in conſequence of "which, he was treated in a manner not becoming "his rank*." This was deſtroying diſcipline, the back bone of an army. It was a ſelf-created power, by far more dangerous, than any contemplated by democratic ſocieties. The preſident ſuffered Mr. Hamilton to aſſume it, and forebore calling him to account for it.

Here is another ſample of Mr. Hamilton's diſcretion. He expreſſed much ſurpriſe at the weſtern people for repoſing ſo much confidence in foreigners. He ſaid, that Gallatin and Findley "were "both foreigners, and therefore *not to be truſted*†." Mr. Findley has been longer, by many years, in the country than our ſecretary himſelf, whoſe father was from Scotland, and his mother from Ireland. Their ſon was born at ſea, or in an iſland of the Weſt-Indies. He had no right to contemn foreigners. This is the general cant of his party. Above all, they deteſt Iriſhmen, becauſe the latter, coming from a moſt oppreſſed country, have a natural bias to political inveſtigation. A great part of the people in the four weſtern counties are natives of that iſland, ſo that this language held out an inſult upon the community at large. It was one of the many direct meaſures, employed by Mr. Hamilton, for the excitement of deep and durable miſchief. At the houſe of captain Dicky, he complained of the *thirteen letters*, publiſhed ſometime before the inſurrection, by Mr. Findley. He ſwore

* Findley, Chap. XVIII. † Ibid, Chap. XIX.

that they contained lies againſt him. His landlord replied, that he believed their contents to be true. Such a fooliſh demeanour, of which Mr. Hamilton afforded many examples, would have been ſcarcely pardonable in a boy.

Another trait in the colonel's conduct deſerves attentive reflection. The money for defraying the expence of this army, was ſupplied by him in direct oppoſition to the conſtitution. That inſtrument, article i. ſection ix. clauſe vi. ſays, that "no money ſhall be drawn from the "treaſury, but in conſequence of appropriations "*made by law.*" There exiſted a ſtatute authoriſing the preſident to call out the militia, in caſe of an inſurrection; but by an overſight in framing the law, he had no power to take money from the treaſury to ſupport them. "The monies "drawn from the treaſury on that occaſion (the "weſtern expedition,) were paid out of a fund "appropriated for *other and diſtinct purpoſes*; they "were not drawn, agreeable to the conſtitution, "in conſequence of any appropriation made by "law. It might be a defect in the law, authoriſing "the expence, not to have provided the means; "but that defect ſhould have been remedied by "the only competent authority, by convening "congreſs*." This omiſſion in the law ſhews the maſterly ſtile in which our ſtatutes are ſometimes compoſed.

If the bombardment of a Britiſh fleet, or the diſembarkation of a French army had not left one moment to ſpare, engulphing neceſſity would juſtly have ſuperceded all forms, and vindicated the irregular abſtraction of a million of dollars. Yet even in that caſe, the preſident, at the next meet-

* Gallatin, p. 82.

ting of congreſs, ought to have explained and apologized for the meaſure.

But no ſuch imminent danger had a being. There was ample time to have aſſembled congreſs. Neville the inſpector's houſe was burnt on the 17th of July, 1794. The firſt proclamation by the preſident was iſſued on the 7th of Auguſt, and the ſecond on the 25th of September following. It was not till after the latter date, that the militia were ordered to march. The ſeven weeks intervening between the two proclamations allowed full time for aſſembling the legiſlature. Of this Mr. Adams hath afforded an inſtance, in the firſt ſeſſion of the fifth congreſs. Inſtead of this legal and practicable meaſure, the preſident and Mr. Hamilton walked ſtraight through the conſtitution, through the privileges of the legiſlature, and the duties of their own reſpective offices.

If congreſs had been previouſly called, the very report of their aſſembling would have ſtruck a mortal damp into this thoughtleſs rabble, who had neither plans, leaders, nor reſources. The ſolemnity of the ſtep was ſure of making a conſiderable impreſſion. Time would have been gained, alſo, for more accurate information; and as the fifteen thouſand militia, who did march over the mountains, never ſaw an enemy, it is to be ſuppoſed that five thouſand could have done the buſineſs equally well.

But Mr. Hamilton had many good reaſons for not wiſhing to call congreſs. The ſound policy of the exciſe law would have met with a ſevere diſcuſſion. The expence and danger of a civil war muſt have rendered exciſe completely odious. Every lenient meaſure was ſure to have been tried before a ſingle regiment would be ordered to march, and the ſequel ſhews that they muſt have

been ſucceſsful. The ſober and ſubſtantial maſs of the weſtern citizens, though averſe to exciſe, were yet firm on the ſide of government. In the proſpect of an agreement, Hamilton ſaw nothing but the reprobation of his meaſures, and the fracture of his importance. The parties in congreſs are nicely poiſed; but every legiſlative aſſembly has a number of doubtful members, and the natural averſion to civil bloodſhed, held out an irreſiſtible cauſe, or a ſolid pretence, for univerſally deſerting the ſix per cent. ſtandard. In this caſe, the latter could not, probably, have muſtered one-third of the members, and minorities are always dangerous to a political party. The republicans abhor the ex-ſecretary with a cordiality of hatred equal to his own. They conſider him as a ſecond Pandora's box, from whoſe tranſcendant capacities for miſchief have excluſively and collectively ſprung the whole political misfortunes of America. The utmoſt force of the party was certain, therefore, to have been levelled perſonally at him, and his vulnerable ſides offered an ample verge for the quivers of invective. Hence he ſhunned a previous meeting of congreſs, where it was more than an equal chance that he ſhould find not protection and triumph, but reproach and defeat. This ſeems to be the only rational key to his conduct in hazarding a civil war, and a rape upon the treaſury, without conſulting the legiſlature.

The inſignificance of their conduct when they did meet, ſhewed, that the victory of Mr. Hamilton was as complete in Philadelphia as at Pittſburg. On the 19th of November, 1794, the preſident addreſſed the two houſes. He began, as uſual, with a reference to divine goodneſs, and to the riches, power, and happineſs, for which America ſeems

deſtined. A pompous and exaggerated ſketch was then given of the inſurrection. Certain ſelf-created ſocieties were referred to, as having aſſumed the tone of condemnation towards the meaſures of government. But the preſident forgot to mention, and much leſs to apologize, for the ſelf-created power of taking a million of dollars from the public treaſury. When he related the outrages committed upon officers of government, he overlooked the provocations by which they had been excited, the numerous inſtances of miſmanagement on the part of the ſecretary of the treaſury, by which they had been foſtered, and the thouſand-fold enormities of the federal army, and of that ſecretary, under which they had been overwhelmed. There is a French fable, of a gardener and a hare, that ſometimes came through the hedge, and cropt his cabbages. He repreſented the caſe to a gentleman, who, next day, with a pack of hounds, entered the garden in chace of her. The dogs did more miſchief in five minutes, than the hare could have done in ſeven years, and after all, puſs got away.

This is a conciſe and impartial picture of the federal army, with one ſmall diſtinction, that the gardener was a fool, and the ſecretary a knave. Never think that you underſtand the ſtory of this inſurrection, till you read Findley and Brackenridge. Compare their copious and intereſting narratives with the collection of papers publiſhed by government. The temperate and manly ſtile of the former hiſtorian is ſometimes clogged with a tireſome length of periods. His reference to dates is occaſionally confuſed*, and the remarks which he in-

* Almoſt every one of the ancient hiſtorians has been remarkably negligent on this point. Salluſt, Livy, and Tacitus, for example, are often inextricably imperfect. Try to follow Cæſar through his own account of his firſt campaign in Belgium, or in his two invaſions of Britain. A modern general gives you the date of every tranſaction. To forbear it, would be puſhing out the right eye of his narrative.

terſperſes, might improve by concentration. But theſe are trifling ſpecks, and only mentioned here to obviate the hoſtility of fiſcal criticiſm. Mr. Findley was a farmer, and a ſoldier in the American army, for many years before he became a profeſſed author; and the wonder ought to be that his faults are ſo few. His accuracy has been atteſted by the ſilence of the ſecretary, while the toothleſs ſcurrility of the treaſury newſpapers announces that he has drawn blood.

Mr. Brackenridge writes with more eaſe and vivacity than Mr. Findley. His perſpicuity, his ſimplicity, his pictureſque minuteneſs, conduct his reader into the ſcene of action. You ſee, hear, and feel, juſt as the author actually did; and this itſelf is a talent of high excellence. Amidſt much entertainment, candour will forgive the ſerious or affected vanity that ſometimes peeps through the curtain of his mind. Theſe two writers have been neglected. An eſtimate of the ſales may induce a belief that they have never been peruſed by more than two or three thouſand American citizens, that is to ſay, by perhaps a two-hundredth part of the community at large. Without ſuch a peruſal, however, it is impoſſible to comprehend the nature and effects of the weſtern riots. The declamation that fills the federal gazettes and pamphlets cannot afford a juſt or luminous conception of this all-important ſubject; which is, therefore, groſsly and almoſt univerſally miſunderſtood. Next to the compoſition of a good book by yourſelf, one of the beſt ſervices to the public is the recommending of another which has been overlooked.

After thus explaining where a proper account of the inſurrection may be found, we go back to the preſident, his congreſs, and his ſpeech. "It has "been a ſpectacle," ſays he, "diſplaying to the

" higheſt advantage, the value of republican govern-
" ment, to behold the moſt and the leaſt wealthy
" of our citizens ſtanding in the ranks as private
" ſoldiers, pre-eminently diſtinguiſhed by being the
" army of the conſtitution." He ought to have ſaid, of *monarchical* government, for every part of the buſineſs bore the ſtamp of deſpotiſm. In the firſt place, the four counties were outlawed, on the ſingle notification of judge Wilſon. That *any* ſingle man ſhould have been entruſted with ſo vaſt a diſcretionary power was inconſiſtent with *republican* freedom.

General Waſhington ſent commiſſioners to treat with the inſurgents, but if Hamilton had been preſident, he would immediately have marched againſt them, and the four counties muſt have been covered with blood and aſhes, by the official temerity of one man, and the ferocious impetuoſity of another. This is but a poor ſpecimen of republican government, and yet it might take place.

Again, the army was raiſed on principles purely *monarchical*. The preſident acted ſolely on the authority of a law inveſting him, during the receſs of congreſs, with unlimited power, a law that may one day overturn the conſtitution. Let us explain it by the following ſuppoſition. The preſent congreſs will ceaſe to exiſt, on the 3d of March, 1799. On the 4th, Mr. Adams may get a certificate from ſome confidential judge, that Virginia or Tenneſſee is in a ſtate of rebellion. Whether the ſtory be true or falſe, reſts entirely within his breaſt. He directly calls out the militia, and, as this inſurrection is ten times more dangerous than that of Braddock's field, he requires an hundred and fifty thouſand men. He ſets out at their head, parades four or eight hundred miles, renews the horrors of the weſtern expedition, and, till the firſt Monday of December thereafter, he

and his militia are abſolute maſters of America. They proceed, at an expence of two hundred thouſand dollars per day, to be drawn from a treaſury which has not one ſpare ſhilling. No part of the conſtitution can, practically, ſtop Mr. Adams in his progreſs. The legiſlature does not aſſemble till the firſt Monday of December, unleſs the mere accident of a law, by their predeceſſors, may have ordained a more early date. Even this remedy could eaſily be prevented. On a preconcerted plan, the majority in the ſenate would be ſure to reject any bill for the more early meeting of congreſs. Thus nine months of a royal *interregnum* might readily put an end to the government. The precedent ſet by general Waſhington, for emptying the treaſury, would greatly facilitate ſuch a conſpiracy. The above explanation clearly proves, that, *according to law*, our lives and properties may ſoon be at the mercy of ſome chief magiſtrate.

The federal army did not, then, diſplay the ſpectacle of a *republic*, but the embryo of royalty hatched in the dregs of legiſlative ignorance. Congreſs gave the preſident authority as good as unlimited, for raiſing an army; but they forgot to inform him in what way that army was to be paid. This was, as if a merchant ſhould ſend a ſhip to the Weſt-Indies, and forget to furniſh her with biſcuit or water. What imbecility, what unacquaintance with the firſt principles of legiſlation, are unfolded in this congreſſional performance! Its worſt parts might be amended by a clauſe like the following.

"The preſident ſhall not be permitted to call "out the militia, till he has held a council with "the vice-preſident, the three ſecretaries, the at-"torney-general, and the governors of at leaſt "four of the ſtates neareſt to the ſeat of the fede-

" ral government. Of theſe nine, ſix with himſelf " may form a quorum; and a majority of at leaſt " five members, ſhall decide. Every opinion ſhall " be given in writing, and each of the council ſhall " be anſwerable and impeachable for his vote. " The proclamation for the actual calling out of " the militia ſhould be directed to contain a ſum- " mons for the meeting of congreſs, it being other- " wiſe high treaſon to obey the call. Leave ſhould " alſo be granted to take the requiſite ſums " from the treaſury; or if not there, a caſe very " likely, the council might be authorized to open a " loan."

Till ſome amendment of this kind ſhall be made, the liberty of the United States muſt be in ſerious hazard. General Waſhington went to the treaſury. Some future preſident may go to the bank. The one ſtep will not be a jot worſe than the other. The act, when amended, ſhould be annexed to the conſtitution, leſt ſome future congreſs might dare to repeal it. The proſpect of miſchief is not diſtant. Its approach may ſoon be expected. Deriving, like Venus, his birth from the deep, the United States have already been harraſſed with their Machiavel. If Waſhington did not act that of Cromwell, it may be aſcribed to the ſoundneſs of his judgment, and the conſciouſneſs that a party who baſked under the ſplendour of his name, left him almoſt nothing to be deſired.

We return to the preſident's ſpeech. He adviſes the citizens of the America to cheriſh their conſtitution, not merely for their own ſakes, but " for " the ſake of thoſe, who, from every clime, are " daily ſeeking a dwelling in our land." This ſounds very well; and, if Mr. Jay's treaty had contained one line for the protection of emigrants from the Britiſh dominions to America, it might have

been believed that, in the above expreſſion, Mr. Waſhington was ſincere. The preſſing of men from Iriſh paſſenger ſhips, on the coaſt of America, is not only, in itſelf, an act of ſhocking cruelty, but an egregious inſult on this country. In November, 1794, when this ſpeech was delivered, Mr. Waſhington had profeſſedly put himſelf at the head of that party who revile emigrants in the maſs, who want to exclude them from voting at elections, and who, in ſummer 1797, wanted to paſs a ſtamp duty of an hundred dollars, on their admiſſion as citizens.

In a ſubſequent paragraph, the preſident ſpeaks of having extended his *protection to the Creeks*. This paſſage has already been criticiſed*; but I ſubjoin a circumſtance that has not yet reached the newſpapers. On the 8th of November, 1794, only eleven days before the delivery of this ſpeech, the ſecretary at war received a letter from the governor of Georgia. It incloſed a depoſition concerning two murders by the Creeks. On the 30th of September, preceeding, they had, near fort Fidius, ſhot down and ſcalped Catharine Ceſſna, a young lady. Five of them had, alſo, ſhot and ſcalped a negro woman. Governor Matthews further mentions, ſome thefts of negroes and horſes, committed by Indians, in Liberty county; and that the Talliſee king, and Broken Arrow, were both for war. With this letter before him, the preſident came forward, and, without one word about avenging the blood of Catharine Ceſſna, and of a multitude of ſimilar victims, harangued on his ſucceſs in the protection of her aſſaſſins. This caſe is only a ſample of, perhaps, a thouſand, equally horrid, and equally unavenged. The honour of America, if one may ſpeak

* Hiſtory of the United States for 1796, Chap. VII.

of non-entities, hath been as baſely proſtrated by land as by ſea.

How little reaſon thoſe ſavages had to complain, appears from the copy of a talk with them, tranſmitted by the governor of Georgia to the ſecretary of war, in a letter dated Auguſta, Auguſt 19th, 1794. The piece is too long to be inſerted here; but the following extracts are made from an atteſted manuſcript of it. After ſtating the treaty of New-York, he ſays, "ſome goods were promiſed to you, "which you received, and you were to make a "plain line between our people and yours. This "you *failed to do*." He then relates, that when they and their families were in want of corn, the preſident ſent them a gratuitous ſupply. He alſo opened a ſtore at St. Mary's to furniſh them with goods. They murdered the men who kept it, and carried off the goods. The murderers were not puniſhed, nor any ſatisfaction given. "You have killed many "of our citizens," ſays the governor, "and car-"ried away a great number of our horſes, cattle, "and negroes. All this your father, general Waſh-"ington, has *borne with*, from a wiſh to be the "friend of your nation.—You aſk about forts.— "They are on the north ſide of the river, and on "the land that was given by your nation at the "treaty at New-York, for which you have been "paid; and I cannot ſee why you complain of it. "By that treaty your nation is to receive twelve "hundred dollars a year for the lands, which is ten "times as much as all the game you can kill on *it* "in one year is worth. I cannot ſee how your na-"tion can diſpute the river's being the line, as it "was agreed on at *three* treaties in Georgia, and "the *one* at New-York." Such were the people to whom the preſident gave his protection. The

ſpeech has not even one hint about the defence of citizens on the Georgian frontier.

"From a deſire, alſo," ſays the preſident, "to "remove the diſcontents of the Six Nations, a ſet-"tlement meditated at Preſqu' Iſle, on lake Erie, "has been ſuſpended; and an agent is now endea-"vouring to rectify any *miſconception*, into which "they may have fallen." The matter was ſhortly this. No miſconception exiſted on the part of the Indians, excepting from Engliſh bribery. A letter from general Wilkins to Clement Biddle, quarter-maſter general of Pennſylvania, explains the ſtory. It is dated April 25th, 1794, and mentions, that Cornplanter and other Indians had been invited to an Engliſh council at Buffaloe creek. "On the re-"ſult of that council," ſays the general, "ſeems "to hang war or peace between us and the Six Na-"tions. *There have been a great deal of pains uſed "lately by the Engliſh to ſour their minds, and they "ſeem, in ſome meaſure, to have effected it.*" A letter from general Gibſon to governor Mifflin, dated Pittſburg, June 11th, 1794, incloſes a depoſition by David Ranſom, informing, that Cornplanter had been bought by the Britiſh, and that there had been a plot to cut off the ſettlers at Preſqu' Iſle. Captain Denny, in a letter to general Gibſon, dated 14th and 16th of June, 1794, confirms this intelligence. The correſpondence contains many other circumſtances, proving the hoſtile deſigns of the Britiſh. It was not, therefore, an Indian miſconception, but an Engliſh conſpiracy; and if the preſident did not chuſe to tell the ſtory candidly, he ſhould have been ſilent. Even without defending Genet, one cannot ſay that he came within an hundred degrees of the guilt of governor Simcoe. Genet wanted the United States to attack the enemies of France; but Simcoe wanted the Indians to attack the United States. We

had not done the ſmalleſt injury either to the Six Nations or to England. The perfidy of the latter cannot, therefore, admit of aggravation. The French had aſſiſted this country in obtaining her liberty, and now ſolicited her to aſſiſt in the ſecuring of theirs. It might be improper in America to grant the requeſt, but it was extremely natural in the French to make it.

Paſſing over the reſt of this ſpeech, we come next to the anſwer of the ſenate. It ran as uſual, in a fulſome echo. As if this triſle had been worth notice, the preſident replied with much ſatisfaction on finding that his conduct was approved by "the "enlightened repreſentatives of a free nation." In the laſt ſentence, he alluded to "thoſe *judicious* "and *ſpirited* exertions, which have brought VIC-"TORY to our weſtern army." He was at the head of an army for ſeven years and an half. He was ſeveral times beaten. His fame, as a conqueror, reſts on the capture of nine hundred Heſſians*. Hence, general Waſhington may have miſunderſtood the meaning of the word *victory*. But in common language a battle muſt always go before a victory. Now, the weſtern army never ſaw a perſon in arms againſt them. They ſtabbed a man who was in liquor or mad. They ſhot a boy, who was ſick†; and theſe two acts of homicide, or murder, include the whole bloodſhed of the campaign. The troops did not ſo much as meet with any ſhare of that fugitive oppoſition, exerted by a gang of Engliſh ſmugglers on the coaſt of Suſſex.

* What a figure would our American campaigns make beſide the hiſtory of the war of ſeven years! In two lines, Frederic relates that Winterfeldt overtook three thouſand Pandours, cut them to pieces, or drove them into a marſh. This is all we hear of the ſtory.

† Findley Chap. XII.

From what hath ſince tranſpired, a ſingle Britiſh regiment of foot, another of horſe, and two field pieces would, at a twentieth part of the expence, have been altogether equal to the performances of our fifteen thouſand militia.

The anſwer of congratulation from the ſenate paſt immediately. That from the repreſentatives coſt more time. They began to debate on Monday the 24th of November, 1794; and this firſt day was ſpent on a notable diſpute. One part of the propoſed addreſs had theſe words: "we cannot "otherwiſe than warmly approve of *a* policy in "our foreign affairs." &c. *Your* policy was recommended as better. After exactly twenty ſpeeches upon it, the clauſe was wholely withdrawn, as the houſe could not agree, and were aſhamed to divide on the reſpective merits of the article and the pronoun. The preſident had caſt an oblique reflection on *ſelf-created ſocieties* as fomenting the inſurrection. It was propoſed that the anſwer ſhould echo this cenſure *verbatim*. The debate laſted till Thurſday afternoon; and the preciſe echo was rejected by forty-ſeven votes againſt forty-ſix. Next morning, ſome loquacious members wanted to renew the conteſt. On this, Mr. M'Dowell ſaid, that *twenty-five* days of the ſeſſion were now elapſed, and he was as at a loſs to know *what the houſe had been doing*. The words *combinations of men* were put inſtead of *ſelf-created ſocieties* into the repercuſſion of cenſure. Thus the anſwer paſt.

It is proper to take ſome notice of theſe traits, as a warning to future legiſlatures. After all this wrangling, the paper in queſtion proved but a poor production. If truth or reaſon, or the public ſervice, had been at all conſulted, the houſe would have begun by aſking the executive why he took from the treaſury eleven hundred thouſand dollars,

without their leave, and in contempt of the conſtitution? Why he did not take meaſures, as he very well might have done, for checking this riot in the bud? Why he raiſed an army of ſuch enormous numbers, when a fifth part of them, at the utmoſt, could have done the buſineſs? Why he permitted Alexander Hamilton to engroſs ſuch extravagant authority? Why the whole country was inſulted, the priſoners, and even witneſſes ſo barbarouſly treated? And why he was awed by ſuch diminutive enemies as the Taliſſee king, Broken Arrow, and the Cornplanter?

It was not from want of good will, in forty-ſeven members, that theſe queſtions were avoided. But, ſuch was the popularity of the preſident, and the univerſal rage excited againſt the rioters, that the ſmalleſt reſiſtance to adulation of the executive, would have been held as bad as treaſon. In alluſion to the aſſembling of the militia, the repreſentatives, amidſt other encomiums, have the following words: "the ſpectacle, therefore, when "viewed in its true light, may well be affirmed to "diſplay, in equal luſtre, the virtues of the Ame-"rican character, and the value of republican "government." Such a racket has been made about the raiſing of this weſtern army, and the ſublime patriotiſm by which it was inſpired, that ſomething more ſhall be ſaid upon it.

If the weſtern people had been able or willing to ſtand an attack, not one half of the militia were fit for fighting. The ranks were crouded by young men, altogether unacquainted with the uſe of arms*. On the 9th of January, 1795, general

* A journeyman printer, from the office of the Philadelphia Gazette, went out upon his firſt eſſay, as a private. He was one of the ſelect corps left in the weſtern country, and returned next ſpring, with the rank of lieutenant or captain. *Ex pede Herculem.*

Smith told the houſe of repreſentatives that "num-
"bers of the militia did not know how to ſet up a
"tent. The Virginian militia who went out, were
"neither trained nor diſciplined. As for the Ma-
"rylanders, when he drew part of them out, and
"ordered them to load, he found that fifty of them
"had put down the ball before the *charge of pow-*
"*der*. Some of them did not even know how
"to lay a gun over their ſhoulders." A merchant would not entruſt, as his book-keeper, a clerk, who put the wrong end of his pen into an ink-ſtandiſh; or who was ignorant of the difference between addition and ſubtraction. Yet ſuch a novice would be juſt as fit for the deſk, as theſe militia were for the camp. When you take up the ſubject in this point of view, when you reflect on the folly of conducting troops like theſe into actual ſervice, your mind muſt feel a ſudden oppreſſion under the burſt of aſtoniſhment. There could be no uſe in ſending ſuch people to reduce an inſurrection. It was the moſt unmilitary management conceivable. If fighting was wanted, theſe raw recruits were uſeleſs. If the country beyond the mountains was peceable, their multitude would only make them inſolent and miſchievous. A ſmall part of their own number of French or Britiſh veterans would have cruſhed them like an apple in the cyder preſs. In his hiſtory of the war of ſeven years, the king of Pruſſia gives a leſſon on this head. He ſays that when his armies had been ordered into winter quarters, the recruits for the next campaign were collected as early as poſſible, becauſe it required three or four months to teach them the exerciſe. Between the two proclamations of the preſident, the one for being in readineſs, and the ſecond for marching, only ſeven weeks intervened, and within that time not all the drill ſergeants of Potzdam could have

taught them the uſe of arms. But if Frederic required three or four months to form a ſoldier, the beſt officer in the United States would need longer time. Whatever then congreſs, or the preſident, might think of ſuch a *ſpectacle*, no reader of ſober and impartial underſtanding will admire that kind of generalſhip which aſſembled ſeveral thouſands of raw lads from the plough and the workſhop, and diſpatched them three hundred miles in queſt of an enemy.

Put the caſe that out of theſe troops one third were real ſoldiers, who had ſeen ſervice, and acquired military feelings. The other ten thouſand who put in the ball before the charge, or who committed acts of equivalent ignorance, were a mere burden on the profeſſional men. The latter would have been more formidable without them. Theſe matters are ſo very clear that it is almoſt a ſhame to repeat them. Yet, if the government of a country chuſes to commit its character by ſuch proceedings, the public have a right to review them.

We ſhall be ſafe in computing that the ſupernumeraries of the exciſe army, coſt ſix hundred thouſand dollars of extra and uſeleſs expence. Five thouſand good ſoldiers, if the camp contained as many, would have been quite equal to the buſineſs. Suppoſe that the remaining ten thouſand were abſent from their common employments for ninety working days. At the common and moderate computation of a dollar per day, the loſs of labour, by the enliſtment of theſe ten thouſand hands, comes to nine hundred thouſand dollars. Add this to, perhaps, ſix hundred thouſand dollars, of money advanced from the treaſury, for the expence of the

march of ſupernumeraries, the two ſums make together dollars, 1,500,000

Intereſt for three years, from November 1ſt, 1794, to November 1ſt, 1797, at thirty per cent. per annum. 1,350,000

Total, 2,850,000

For the laſt three years, or thereabouts, two and an half per cent. per month has been a common rate of intereſt among many of our merchants. It has often been at five per cent. The above eſtimate of thirty per cent. a year falls by far ſhort of the loweſt of theſe two rates, as the monthly compound intereſt is kept out of ſight. Here we ſee that the inſurrection was ſuppreſſed at an enormouſly greater expence than was neceſſary. A general alarm was raiſed in behalf of the conſtitution, an alarm very laudable, if it had been exactly founded on facts. This, along with the ultimate ſucceſs of the expedition, and the intereſted encomiums of Mr. Hamilton's regiment, have ſhed a luſtre over the whole tranſaction, that no part of it deſerves. Before the citizens of the United States ruſh upon the extirpation of a ſecond inſurrection, they will do well to be ſure of its exiſtence.

A caſe has been imagined, in a former page, of a preſident, during the receſs of congreſs, haſting the country into a civil war. It is poſſible that his conduct might merit impeachment; and for this, or other offences, the conſtitution has reſerved a remedy. He is to be tried by the ſenate, and the chief juſtice ſhall preſide. He cannot be convicted unleſs by the concurrence of two-thirds of the members preſent. The latter clauſe is equitable; for candour will preſume that a preſident acts for the beſt; and it would be iniquitous to condemn him by the caſting vote of a ſenator, who, in the eye of law, and moſt likely of reaſon, is not a better

man than himſelf. But a ſerious objection lies againſt the tribunal before which he is to be tried. One of the moſt likely caſes of an impeachment would regard foreign treaties, becauſe, in theſe there would be the greateſt riſk of corruption, and of conſequent treachery. Here the conſtitution leaves us, like a whale on the ſtrand, for the preſident cannot act without the advice and conſent of the ſenate*, and if he and two-thirds of them ſhould think fit to ſell America, ſhe has only to ſubmit to the purchaſer. Even in the event of domeſtic miſmanagement, as little can be hoped from the vigilance or virtue of the *upper* houſe. They have already broached a doctrine the wildeſt and moſt criminal, that has probably been ever heard of in a legiſlative aſſembly†; and general Maſon did only one-half of his duty to the country, when he forbore to publiſh that engulphing tenet. There is no aſſurance, nor, indeed, much probability, that any future ſenate will poſſeſs more information, or integrity, or independence, than the members now in office. A preſident has always in his gift a variety of appointments, ſufficient to ſecure a majority of two-thirds. This tribunal, then, for the purpoſe of his impeachment, is entirely uſeleſs.

The proſpect of juſtice would not be much improved by a transference to the houſe of repreſentatives. Perhaps the ſafeſt and faireſt way of proſecuting the chief magiſtrate might be to name delegates from each of the ſtates, in the numbers and proportions that ſhould be found adviſeable. Such perſons only ought to be eligible as have never held an office of profit under the general government,

* Mr. Waſhington, at the nomination of John Jay, did, in ſubſtance, make a partial breach of this part of the conſtitution. See Hiſtory of the United States for 1796, Chap. V.

† American Annual Regiſter, Chap. V.

and who ſhall, by acceptance of this truſt, be rendered incapable to exerciſe any ſuch office for a certain term of years to come. Theſe remarks apply *to no particular ſect of politicians*. They point at an evident and immenſe gap in the conſtitution; for, under the preſent form, it is plain that the trial of a preſident could be nothing but a farce.

CHAPTER VII.

Manlius on democratic ſocieties.—His notorious calumnies.—Negligence of the executive.—Judge Iredell's charge.—Federal diſcipline.—Judge Peters.—His ſingular vigilance and humanity.—Parliamentary definition of exciſe.—Partial indemnification to ſufferers in the whiſky riots.—Remarks on the federal conſtitution.—On arbitrary impriſonment.—Preſidential power of adjourning congreſs.—Its dangerous tendency.

WHOEVER is converſant in the writings of the federal party, muſt have obſerved, that, amidſt mountains of declamation, they labour under a diſtreſſing famine even of alledged facts. The bribery of Randolph by Fauchet; the inſtitution of democratic ſocieties; their conſpiracy with Genet; the encouragement which they gave to the weſtern mob; and, finally, the grand rebellion itſelf, compoſe almoſt the only intelligible charges of all thoſe on which the ſix per cent. cymbals are eternally tinkling. As to Randolph, the party contented themſelves with railing. They never entered the field of argument; but, in as far as evidence and argument can go, the point has been decided without

their aid*. In defence of democratic ſocieties, ſomething has been already advanced†; and as for Genet, it has been proved that, whenever he was underſtood to have quarrelled with the preſident, the great maſs of republicans immediately deſerted him‡. Nay, it is remarkable, and to candid minds it muſt be deciſive, that the favourite of all theſe ſocieties was then, and is now, Thomas Jefferſon, the very man who freed this country from Genet. It muſt, at the ſame time, be allowed, that, in many reſpects, Genet was hardly and uncandidly dealt with; but of him, his inſtructions, and his proceedings, more will be ſaid hereafter.

Seven letters, under the ſignature of Manlius, appeared, ſometime ago, in the Columbian Centinel. The firſt of them is dated the 3d, and the laſt, on the 17th of September, 1794. They conſiſt of furious invective againſt the republican party. In No. III. the writer complains, that "Mr. Dexter, "noted for ſolidity of judgment, ſtrength and "perſpicuity of reaſoning, elegance and accuracy "of ſtile, in an anarchical gazette of Philadelphia, "is made to talk *like a ſchool boy*." If Manlius wanted to mock Mr. Dexter, his attempt is ſucceſsful. If he wanted the public to believe his panegyric, he betrays his own want of judgment or veracity. No perſon has, for the laſt four years, ever ſo intolerably tired the patience of congreſs, as Mr. Dexter, if we except Robert Harper, and even the latter is greatly ſuperior to the former. He has ingenuity, information, and an eaſy delivery, if he could only know when to ſtop. In the ſeſſion of November, 1796, he made two very intereſting ſpeeches; the one for the widow of John de Neuf-

* American Annual Regiſter, Chap. VII. & VIII.
† Ibid. Chap. VII.
‡ Hiſtory of 1796, Chap. II.

ville, and the other, for the inhabitants of Savannah.

Of democratic ſocieties, Manlius, No. I. ſpeaks thus. "They have oppoſed their *veto* to the doings "of the preſident, to the laws of the union, and to "the will of the whole people." [*Veto* is a word borrowed from the tribunes of ancient Rome. By pronouncing it, they prevented the enacting of a law. The ſocieties never made even a motion in any legiſlature whatever, nor have they endeavoured to obſtruct the execution of any law. If they had done ſo, they would have been apprehended, and the diſpute would have been decided in a court of juſtice. They did nothing more than publiſh their opinions. They were warranted to do ſo, by the conſtitution, which declares, that "congreſs ſhall "make no law abridging *the freedom of ſpeech*, or "of *the preſs**." If they went too far the attorney general could ſtop them.] "They have arraigned," ſays Manlius, "the conduct of the moſt wiſe and "virtuous citizen now on earth; they have de-"clared that this beloved firſt magiſtrate hath "trampled on the conſtitution." [There never was a chief magiſtrate in the world, who eſcaped without arraignment. We might as well attempt to keep mankind from coughing, or ſneezing, as expect that any government can give univerſal ſatisfaction. The democratic ſocieties only did what occurs in every aſſembly of the human race. They cenſured their government, and ſo do the ſlaves of Dahomey and Morocco.] "They have excited "oppoſition to the laws; and, an *armed* rebellion, "probably, in conſequence of their falſe ſuggeſ-"tions, is actually raiſed in the very centre of the "United States. MANY of our fellow citizens have

* Additional Articles, No. III.

" been *murdered*, and their dwellings burnt to the " ground. They have endeavoured to involve the " country in all the diſtreſſes of war; while they " have oppoſed the adoption of every meaſure to " prepare for this dreadful calamity."

This extract preſents a fair ſample of the ſtile of Manlius. His letters have been reprinted in a pamphlet, and enjoy ſome ſort of reputation. The preceding paſſage is one of thoſe few, wherein we can diſrobe him of the miſt of declamation, and graſp him on the ground of facts. " *Many of our* " *fellow citizens have been murdered.*" The papers publiſhed by government ſpeak of no ſuch murders. But previous to the burning of Neville's houſe, and in a ſeries of three years, about eight perſons had been maltreated. On the 6th of September, 1791, Robert Johnſton, an exciſe officer, was tarred and feathered at Pigeon-creek, in Waſhington county, by a party in diſguiſe. Four other caſes of the ſame nature occurred ſoon after. One of the ſufferers was a lunatic, and another a private perſon, who had innocently remarked, that, when people did not obey government, they could not look for its protection. It does not appear that any puniſhment was inflicted on theſe offenders, and hence the executive muſt have expected a continuation of outrages. An office of inſpection for Waſhington county was opened in Auguſt, 1792, at the houſe of captain William Faulkner. This man was ſoon after threatened with deſtruction, unleſs he turned away the inſpector. He did ſo and no perſonal violence was committed. Diſorderly meetings went on, and ſtill the executive forbore to cruſh them.

In April, 1793, a party in diſguiſe, broke, during the night, into the houſe of an exciſe officer in Fayette county. He was from home, but they

abuſed his family. Warrants for apprehending them were delivered to the ſheriff at Fayette. He did not, and probably durſt not, execute them. Still government perſiſted in its want of energy. If rebellion had been the object of the cabinet of Philadelphia, this was the very way to nurſe it. Such apparent lenity was the height of real barbarity. Every new act of blackguardiſm ſanctioned that which was to come next; and every day muſt have increaſed the diſreſpect for ſocial order. It was in a high degree culpable for government thus tamely to ſtand by, and permit the flames of brutality and ſedition to extend unreſiſted from one year to another.

On the 22d of November, 1793, a party again viſited the houſe of the collector of exciſe in Fayette county, for whom they had ſearched in April. He gave up his books and commiſſion. Yet it is owned that about the end of 1793, the law appeared to be gaining ground. The ſmalleſt exertion of executive power muſt have enſured its ultimate ſucceſs. Some of the principal recuſant diſtillers began to comply, and others diſcovered a diſpoſition to do ſo. One of the former had his barn burnt. The ſtill-houſe of a ſecond was deſtroyed; that of a third narrowly eſcaped the ſame fate; and his griſt and ſaw mills were damaged. The blame muſt fall entirely on the timidity or negligence of adminiſtration. "The moſt *wiſe* and *virtuous* citizen now "on earth," can gain no more honour by this amazing inattention to his duty than he formerly did by ſhooting the French officer who advanced with a flag of truce*. On the 6th of June, 1794, an act of violence occurred in Waſhington county. The

* See Smollet's Hiſtory of the War of 1756. The court of Verſailles made all Europe ring with complaints on this ſtrange conduct.

office of excise was kept in the house of John Lynn, who was tarred, feathered, and tied to a tree. Some days after, part of his house was pulled down. From the first violence committed on Robert Johnston to the last date, two years and nine months had elapsed. During this long interval, the executive looked on, like the mariner, who sees his vessel springing a leak, but who lets the hold be half filled with water before he tries to stop it. If a thousand well affected militia had been quartered in the vicinage of the rioters who assaulted Mr. Johnston, if they had been driven out of the country, or sent to the workhouse, we should have heard nothing of a western insurrection; or of a waste of public money, of property, and of time, to the value of some millions of dollars. It is well known that a rabble, when unresisted, always proceed from bad to worse, till the violence of the disorder produces a remedy, which is often more dangerous than the disease. The smallest political foresight might have discovered that, first or last, it would be needful to extend the arm of power, and that the sooner this was done so much the better.

This detail of circumstances must, in every candid mind, alleviate the blame of the western rioters. Their ignorance was as much to be pitied, as their barbarity was to be detested. They were permitted to advance by gradual and even by annual steps to the brink of destruction. They were then pitched over the precipice, with an insolence and ferocity of vengeance that sink the judge to a level with the criminal. As for Manlius, and his *numerous murders*, they are the offspring of his own calumnious fancy. The insurgents do not seem ever to have shed so much as a single drop of blood, excepting at Neville's

houſe, where three of the defenders were wounded. From the publications of the times, Manlius muſt have known that his aſſertion was an untruth. With his eyes open, he circulated this falſehood to promote incendiary and infamous purpoſes. Such is the patriot, who rails at democratic ſocieties.

Of this weſtern inſurrection it has become the mark of a party to ſpeak in ſtrong terms. On April 12th, 1796, judge Iredell, of the ſupreme court of the United States, referring chiefly to this rupture, delivered a charge to the grand jury of Pennſylvania. Some parts of it are open to objection. Deſcribing the ſuperior excellence of the American conſtitution, he ſays, that, in other countries, "ſuſpicion has ſupplied the place of evi-"dence.—The higheſt inſtances of public virtue "have been doomed to the puniſhment of the high-"eſt public offences. Happily for the United States, "ſuch ſcenes have been known to them *only by the* "*hiſtory of other nations*." This is wrong. In the caſes of Randolph, and of ſheriff Hamilton, the moſt direct evidence was ſet aſide by ſuſpicion. The numerous inſtances of oppreſſion committed in the weſt, under the eye, though not by the deſire of judge Peters, prove, that here, as in other countries, government may oppreſs with impunity. The judge then alludes to the ſuppreſſion of the inſurrection, "a period which will form as bright a "page, as any in the American annals."

This brightneſs muſt be produced by the particles of luſtre flowing from "the army of the con-"ſtitution." Carliſle is only an hundred and ſeventeen miles weſt from Philadelphia. When the troops arrived there, they quarrelled among themſelves. They were on the brink of mutual maſſacre. "The "ſtreets and avenues of Carliſle were occupied by

" the army, during the night; and an apprehenſion " of the town being burnt excited a general pa- " nic*." The rational part of the troops could not preſerve order; and, it was believed, that nothing but the arrival of the preſident prevented ſerious miſchief†. Meſſrs. Redick and Findley, deputies from the weſtern country, ran the riſk of being aſſaſſinated. As for the inſurgents, it was common to ſwear, that " there was no need of judges or juries. " Let them only ſee the men, and *they would ſkewer* " *them*‡." Thoſe of the troops, who alledged that they were merely come in aid of the law, and that they ought not to uſurp its functions, were branded with the title of *whiſky men;* and, as ſuch, were the objects of menace and indignation. The preſident obliged thoſe who had killed the two perſons above mentioned§, to give ſecurity for ſtanding their trial. Some perſons, of no mean rank, were mortified at this meaſure. Some fooliſh people having, at different times, mixed with the left wing of the army, general Morgan kept his men from killing them, by threatening that he would kill them himſelf. He took them out of the way, and diſmiſſed them privately. On the march, it was his rule to keep his troops on the parade, till he had called on the inhabitants reſiding near the encampment. He immediately paid them for what had been taken or deſtroyed‖. Yet even this officer did ſometimes forget himſelf. He was guilty of the firſt breach of peace in the weſtern country. James M'Alliſter " had charged a quarter of a dollar for a quart of " whiſkey to a ſoldier. The general knocked him

* Findley, Chap. XII.

† When the army came to Carliſle, the inhabitants ſhut up their ſtores. It was not until after a day or two, and ſome threats, that they could be induced to reſume trade. So ſays Clement Biddle.

‡ Findley, Chap. XII. § Ibid. ſupra Chap. VI.

‖ Findley, Chap. XII.

" down with the butt of his whip, and abuſed him " conſiderably*. At fort Cumberland, general Smith of Baltimore, diſcharged about fifty diſorderly men in one day; he did his utmoſt, and with conſiderable ſucceſs, to enforce diſcipline. In the camp at Carnaghan's, in Weſtmoreland, the moſt experienced officers were afraid, that the diſorders committed by the army would ruin the country. General Irwin, at ſome riſk, ſeized two culprits. They were ſeverely puniſhed, and the example had a proper effect. But it was a ſervice of danger. While the ſentence was executed, fears were entertained, that the regiment to which the offenders belonged, might interpoſe to reſcue them; ſo that general Chambers, with his brigade, was placed in a ſituation inſtantly to charge, in caſe of mutiny.

When judge Iredell, Manlius, and other friends of order, indulge themſelves in praiſes of the weſtern army; in declamations againſt the inſurgents; and, in arraignments againſt the democratic ſocieties, they will do wiſely to reflect on the particulars here ſtated. Such an army was, when taken collectively, as great an object of terror as the inſurrection itſelf. No democratic ſociety has done any act that approaches to the bacchanalian project of burning Carliſle. It is affirmed, that the ſocieties wanted to plunge America into a Britiſh war. This project did poſſibly float in the brains of a ſmall number of madmen. That it could be the deſire of any conſiderable part of the members is untrue. But even a Britiſh war was ſtill leſs dreadful than a civil one; and if it had not been for ſome officers of experience, and, above all, for the reſpect paid to the preſident, this ſanctified weſtern army would have produced a ſecond rebellion, before at-

* Brackenridge, Vol. III. Chap. VII.

tempting to quell the firſt one. The ſober portion of the troops were on the point of being obliged to attack the rioters within their own ranks.

How dreadful muſt have been the condition of the United States, if Carliſle had actually been deſtroyed. It is weakneſs to ſhrink from the retroſpect of this woeful probability, or to hold up "*the army* "*of the conſtitution*" as a pattern for future ages. From the hurry with which that corps was huddled together, nothing ſplendid could juſtly be expected. If Alexander Hamilton had adviſed the previous calling of congreſs, or if he had, in 1791, purſued proper meaſures to check the outſet of the riots, he would have rendered an eminent ſervice to the United States. Proceeding with judge Iredell, he tells the grand jury, that the inſurgents were ſeduced "by the baſeſt artifices, and the groſſeſt miſ-"repreſentations of a few deſigning men; whoſe "views, in all probability, were much deeper, and "more malignant than they were *avowed to be*." The judge ought to have ſpecified who theſe *few deſigning men* are, otherwiſe he ſinks to the ſame rank with Manlius, Curtius, Camillus, aad the reſt of that tribe, who prattle about conſpiracies alike incomprehenſible to themſelves and every perſon elſe. If he refers to Findley, Smilie, Brackenridge, and Gallatin, Mr. Hamilton ſtrained every nerve, without finding a ſpark of evidence againſt them. The judge cannot ſurely want to trump up another edition of Fauchet's romance; and if that is not his object, he ſhould, in defence of his own reputation, declare what was his meaning.

Again, we hear that the inſurrection was ſuppreſſed in a manner "worthy of the government "of a free people." He ſhould have added, as in the inſtance of ſheriff Hamilton, of major Powers, of the deputies of ſubmiſſion menaced with murder,

of the expected conflagration of Carliſle, or of the man knocked down for aſking the price of a quart of whiſkey. To this paper the grand jury replied, that the inſurrection "has, however, been attended "with good conſequences.—It has offered another "*proof* of the firmneſs, the wiſdom, and benevo- "lence of our much beloved preſident.—It has "opened the eyes of a once deluded people." This is the ſum total of advantages named by the jury. They have coſt a waſte of two or three millions of dollars; two or three millions of calumnies in the federal newſpapers; and vexation, oppreſſion, and ruin to a great number of people. Eyes have, indeed, been opened; but what have they ſeen? the horrors of military deſpotiſm, inflicted by a raw militia; the impoſſibility, in moſt caſes, of obtaining redreſs; the uſurpation of both civil and military powers, by a ſecretary of the treaſury, who had no title to interfere with either. The grand jury cloſe with referring to the "unexampled proſperity of "our dear and happy country,"—exemplified in the devaſtation of commerce; the exploſion of credit; the contempt of England; and the proſpect of hoſtilities with France.

Of the weſtern army, more yet remains to be ſaid. Andrew Watſon, William H. Beaumont, Jeremiah Sturgeon, and George Robinſon, reſided, in 1794, at Pittſburg. Mr. Brackenridge declares, that the town did not contain four leſs ſuſpected, or leſs offending men. They "were dragged out of "their beds, at two o'clock in the morning; not "ſuffered to dreſs themſelves, but in an unfiniſhed "manner; obliged to march, ſome of them, with- "out putting on their ſhoes, which they had to car- "ry with them in their hands; dragged out of their "beds amidſt the cries of children, and the tears "of mothers; treated with language of the moſt

" inſulting opprobrium, by thoſe apprehending " them; driven before a troop of horſe, at a trot, " through muddy roads, ſeven miles from Pittſ- " burg; *impounded in a pen, on the wet ſoil*; the " guard baying them, and aſking them *how they* " *would like to be hanged*; [what a precious ſpe- cimen of the federal army!] " ſome offering a dol- " lar to have the privilege of *ſhooting at them;* car- " ried thence four miles towards the town; obliged " to lie all night upon the wet earth, without cover- " ing, under a ſeaſon of ſleet, rain, and ſnow; dri- " ven from the fire with bayonets; when ſome of " them, periſhing, had crawled, endeavouring to " be unſeen, towards it;" [This is no better than the hiſtory of Kirk and his regiment; or of the Scots preſbyterians, under Charles the ſecond.] " next day, impounded in a waſte houſe, and de- " tained there five days; then removed to a newly " built and damp room, without fire, in the gar- " riſon at Pittſburg; at the end of ten days brought " before the judiciary, and the information againſt " them found *not to be regarded!*" [Oh moſt lame and impotent concluſion!] " Was this the way " to quell an inſurrection?" [No but it was the way to make one, and that was what Mr. Hamil- ton wanted.] " Was this the way to make good ci- " tizens? Do I blame the judiciary? No." [But every body elſe will. Mr. Brackenridge is a law- yer, and moſt likely unwilling to offend judge Pe- ters. In the Scots court of ſeſſion, it is a rule with their lordſhips to ruin every practitioner who quar- rels with them. Something of this ſort, perhaps prevails at Pittſburg. Judge Peters, when he diſ- miſſed theſe four men would certainly bluſh to look in their faces. Haul people out of their beds at midnight, drag them eleven miles at a trot, barefooted through the mire, impound them for

ten days in mud, before you examine them, and then discharge them, for want of evidence!

"I'd rather be a dog, and bay the moon,
"Than such a JUDGE."

It signifies nothing to rail about Jefferies, or the present lord justice clerk of Scotland, or the other monsters of juridical prostitution, who have so frequently polluted the eastern shore of the Atlantic. These feats have been acted under our eyes; and you must either admire the gentry who atchieved them, or you are an enemy to order, a disorganizer, a jacobin, and a pensioner of France.] "I blame "the management of those concerned to injure "them. These were neighbours and friends "of mine, and that is the secret of their suffer-"ings*." A poor apology for the bench! On the march, Andrew Watson fell sick. The captain of the guard lent his horse to the prisoner. "Gene-"ral Chambers coming up, ordered him to dismount "with opprobrious appellations†." From such bad treatment, the health of Beaumont and Robinson suffered severely. These details should be universally known; when presidential speeches, charges to grand juries, and the whole mass of federal pamphlets and newspapers are crouded with the exploits of the army of the constitution. Nothing can be more terrible to any country than a tumultuous body of soldiers, directed by a revengeful statesman, and sanctioned by an understrapping judge.

To this black narrative, let us see what can be compared on the side of democratic societies. Manlius, No. IV, asks if Americans will confide in men, "who inure their arms to the dextrous use of "this instrument of death‡; in horrid pomp, by its "means, execute the image of one of your first pa-

* Brackenridge Vol. II. Chap. X. † Ibid. ‡ The guillotine.

" triots*; in men who have already excited an ar-
" med rebellion againſt the laws of their country;
" and ſpread havoc and deſolation over the peace-
" ful dwellings of our fellow citizens; who have
" already produced treaſon and *murder*." And again—" the treaſons and *murders* of Pittſburg." The only blood ſpilt was, as already ſaid, by the army; and as for havoc and deſolation, that committed by the inſurgents was but like a grain to the buſhel of the exciſe heroes. Manlius, in a long note, condeſcends upon particulars. In May, 1794, the people of Lexington in Kentucky burnt in effigy John Jay. And what then? before the burning they guillotined him. The *defence* of Mr. Adams was ſuſpended about his neck, and in his left hand he held " Swift's laſt ſpeech in congreſs on the ſub-
" ject of Britiſh depredation." This childiſh flory formed a triumphant article in ſome Kentucky newſpaper. Manlius cites it at full length, and adds; " theſe are ſamples of the doings and the
" reſolutions of the anarchiſts. *Theſe people are*
" *now in arms*."

Hiſtorical knowledge muſt be at a very low ebb in Boſton; otherwiſe no writer durſt have forged the notorious fiction juſt quoted. If, in 1794, the people of Kentucky had been in arms, they might have remained ſo. No federal army, or indeed any other, could have reached them. But, happily, this is the firſt and laſt notice which we have received of a rebellion in that quarter. The lie was good or bad enough to pleaſe the tradeſmen and farmers of Maſſachuſetts. In their irritation, Manlius reaps the harveſt of his labours. He prints a ſwarm of inflammatory fables, and proceeds to rail at inflammation.

* John Jay.

It does not appear that any democratic ſociety had concern in burning of Jay's effigy. Manlius, as the ſecond, and only other *fact*, quotes minutes of a meeting held at Pittſburgh, on the 29th of April, 1794. They contain warm expreſſions, cenſure the appointment of Jay, the ſyſtem of ſtockholding, and declare that "we are almoſt "ready to wiſh for a ſtate of revolution." The parties aſſembled were of no conſequence, and Mr. Fenno, and Manlius himſelf, have employed numberleſs expreſſions quite as inflammatory againſt the republican party, as theſe are againſt the partiſans of Britain.

On the 26th of November, 1794, Dr. Ames, in a ſpeech to the repreſentatives, attacked democratic ſocieties. He repeated the above circumſtances from Manlius. He added others. The ſociety, at Charleſton, in South Carolina, had ſolicited the jacobin club of Paris to adopt it. This was in October, 1793. The plan, it ſeems, had come to nothing. "The club of Pinckney diſtrict, "in Carolina," ſays Dr. Ames, "had voted in fa-"vour of war, and againſt paying taxes." He ſhould have recited a copy of the vote, but this, alſo, ended in ſmoke. "Are the reſolves of the "clubs of this place and New-York forgotten?" ſubjoined he. "Could outrage and audacity "be expected to venture further? One condem-"ned the exciſe as odious and tyrannical; the "other, inforcing that ſentiment, publiſhed its con-"demnation of Mr. Jay's miſſion of peace." Some notice hath already been taken of this ſpeech*. As to exciſe, a committee of the Britiſh houſe of commons, in one of their reports, declared it to be a ſyſtem "pernicious to the manners of the peo-

* American Annual Regiſter, Chap. VII.

"ple; *repugnant to all good government*; and "which threatens the deſtruction of that very re-"venue, which *it is its object to ſecure**." This is the ſtile of a Britiſh parliament; an authority quite in point.

There was another fact omitted both by Dr. Ames and Manlius. The former and his friend, Dr. Smith, were burnt in effigy at Charleſton, (S. C.) for oppoſing Madiſon's reſolutions. Perhaps this, alſo, may be aſcribed to democratic ſocieties. But all theſe indecencies put together, do not balance even half a page of Findley or Brackenridge. It ſignifies nothing to burn one judge in effigy, compared with the dragging of another to the diſtance of three hundred and fifty miles from his diſtrict, and, without examination, confining him for ſeventy days in the cells of Philadelphia jail. But let us go back to the federal army. It would have been happy for the four weſtern counties, if the troops had confined themſelves to burning of an effigy. When they departed, a ſelect body remained behind. "They were noiſy in taverns, late in their patroles "through the ſtreets (of Pittſburg). The cow of "one man, that had but one, was ſtabbed; the "horſe of another run through the body†." Some officers quarrelled with a waggoner. "Two or "three ſlices were taken from his ſcull, and a finger "was cut off‡." An hundred and fifty dollars were paid as a compoſition to the ſufferer. M'Dermot, who gave the wounds, was at the head of a ſecond outrage. After forcing a man, whoſe wife was ſick, to give them entertainment, the company confined him to his chamber, made ſtrokes at him with their ſwords, threw his bedding on the floor, danc-

* See *a Short Hiſtory of Exciſe p.* 27; a work wherein the reader will find many intereſting particulars, relative to this ſubject.

† Brackenridge, Vol. III. Chap. VII. ‡ Ibid.

ed upon it, broke his tables, chairs, and other furniture. The bill of damages was paid, with many imprecations*. Mr. Brackenridge relates other caſes of this ſort, and makes a general reference to many more. Theſe anecdotes ſhould be read and ſtudied by every man who values the lives and properties of American citizens. Dr. Ames would not ſell one of his fingers for an hundred and fifty thouſand dollars. Mr. Jay would rather be burnt in effigy, daily, for an hundred years together, than part with the leaſt ſlice of his ſcull. To celebrate, without diſcrimination, the exploits of ſuch an army, is inſulting the truth of hiſtory. Deſperadoes, like M'Dermot, ought to have been turned out of this *ſelect* corps, with every mark of diſgrace. No ſuch ſtep has been heard of; and hence we may look for ſimilar treatment from the next *conſtitutional* army.

Among the priſoners, Mr. Findley enumerates colonel Crawford and ſon, Mr. Sedgwick, a juſtice of the peace, Mr. Corbly, a baptiſt miniſter, and others. He never could learn that Mr. Sedgwick had done any thing to lay a foundation even for ſuſpicion. Theſe people aſſert, that they had not the opportunity of ſigning the terms of the commiſſioners, until the appointed day was paſt. After an impriſonment of *ſeveral months*, they were admitted to bail. On their trial, no bill was found againſt any of them†.

In the American Annual Regiſter, Chap. X. ſome obſervations are made on the correſpondent caſe of George Lucas, another pretended inſurgent, ſuch as Mr. Sedgwick and Co. Compare this with what follows. The preſident, in his ſpeech to congreſs, on the 19th of November, 1794, ſtrongly recommends

* Brackenridge, Vol. III. Chap. VII. † Findley, Chap. XVI.

an indemnification to perſons in office, who had ſuffered in *defence* of government; ſuch as Neville, the inſpector, whoſe houſe was burnt. "The obligation," ſays he, "and policy of indemnifying "them, are ſtrong and obvious. It may alſo merit "attention, whether policy will not enlarge this "proviſion to the retribution of other citizens, "who, though not under the ties of office, may "have ſuffered damage by their generous exertions "for upholding the conſtitution and the laws. "The amount, even if all the injured were includ-"ed, would not be great; and, on future emer-"gencies, the government would be amply repaid "by the influence of an example, that he who in-"curs a loſs in its defence, ſhall find a recompence "in its liberality."

This reads very well. Send your ſervant on a meſſage, and order him to mount an unruly horſe. He is, in ſpite of his efforts, thrown off and bruiſed. You cannot chuſe but to pay the ſurgeon's bill. Thus far we go with the preſident; for the government of a country proceeds on the ſame principles with that of a family, only that it covers a more extended ſcale. Put the caſe then, that your courier ſhall, with or without deſign, ride over a dozen paſſengers on the road. The ſurgeon brings in a ſecond account. This alſo will fall to be paid either by him or you. Equity requires that ultimate compenſation ſhould be made by the owner of this horſe, who put him into the way of doing the harm.

It demands no depth to ſee the fairneſs of this propoſition, and the propriety of its application to juſtice Sedgwick, to colonel Crawford, ſerjeant Lucas, and Mr. Corbly. In conſequence of the preſident's recommendation, a bill paſt to indemnify thoſe who ſuffered loſſes in the ſervice of government by the inſurgents. The ſame bill ſhould have contained

a clauſe for indemnifying thoſe who had been groſsly abuſed by the weſtern army, or who had endured unjuſt impriſonment by the miſtake of government. Humanity, juſtice, and ſound policy, pled as warmly in the latter inſtance as in the former. The caſe was even ſtronger than that of paſſengers rode down by a horſe. The federal army, that inſtrument which executed ſuch a miſapplication of puniſhment, was, in part, raiſed at the expence of its victims. It was only, by their own conſent, granted ſeven years before, that, as it regarded them, the preſident held his office; for if they had, in 1787, ſet up an independent government, it would have been difficult or impoſſible to hinder them; nor ſhould it be forgotten that the conſtitution was reconciled to their choice by conſiderable management, ſolicitation, and artifice. The officers of exciſe, who loſt property, or were abuſed perſonally, had reaped perſonal emoluments from the executive. Lucas and Sedgwick had not. They drew only blanks in this lottery; while they were juſt as well entitled to protection, and retribution, as officers of exciſe, or any other claſs of citizens. Nay ſome of them, ſheriff Hamilton, and major Powers, for example, had been active inſtruments in ſuppreſſing the riots. Their claim to compenſation was of the moſt forcible nature. They got none.

The policy of ſuch a meaſure is no leſs evident than its juſtice. By paying only the ſufferers on one ſide, congreſs were placing themſelves at the head of a party, and what is yet worſe, of that party who were moſt in the wrong; for, after the explanation already made, candour will admit, that the outrages perpetrated by the whiſkymen, vaniſh in a compariſon with the barbarities and villainies committed by part of the army, and of its conduc-

tors. Now, the government of a party is, in itſelf, illegal, and but for the ſake of expediency, deſerves no attachment. The people to the weſtward could not help ſeeing, and reprobating ſuch groſs partiality againſt their magiſtrates, and other fellow citizens, and in favour of excife officers. Their reſentment may, at this time, be held of ſmall conſequence. But they are a growing ſociety. In the cenſus of 1791, the four counties were eſtimated to contain about ſeventy thouſand people. At preſent, they can hardly have fewer than an hundred thouſand, and, as the country is in a rapid progreſſion, twelve years more will double their numbers. In new ſettlements, the proportion of able bodied men to the general population is very great*. The two hundred thouſand inhabitants of the year 1810, will probably be able to muſter forty thouſand armed citizens. The mountains that ſeperate their territory from the Atlantic country are equivalent to a ſecond army. The maſters of Louiſiana and Canada will be ready to furniſh them with arms; an aſſiſtance equally to be expected from Spain, France, and England. In caſe of ſerious provocation, and actual inſurrection, the memory of ancient injuries will make the people deſperate. Sheriff Hamilton, will hardly give himſelf up, a ſecond time to a tribunal, that he knows, by experience, to be prejudiced and deſpotic. Inſtead of ſtriving to cruſh miſchief, he may poſſibly, at the head of his Mingo creek regiment, ſeize a poſt on the Alleghany, and bid defiance to congreſs and excife. Major Powers will not likely become a ſecond time, an embaſſador of obedience, that he may be impriſoned, for eight days, at the point of the bayonet. A revolt like this, would far better

* See Hiſtory of Vermont; a ſtate wherein more than a fifth part of the people are enrolled in the militia.

promote the views of Britiſh ambition than an alliance with the Miamis, or Simcoe's pitiful conſpiracy with the Six Nations. On this ſubject the remark of general Smith was very fair. "Gentlemen ſay that they hope there will be no "more inſurrections. I hope ſo too. But does "that *inſure the thing?* I believe not ſir. Nothing "was farther from the thoughts of the houſe, "at laſt ſeſſion, than an inſurrection*." This ſhort view explains the impolicy of railing at weſtern people in the maſs; a practice ſo carefully followed by the federal party. They ſhould likewiſe reflect upon its injuſtice. "Though out"rages had been committed on exciſe officers, yet "no ſheriff nor conſtable, had been oppoſed in "arreſting the offenders. They had been brought "in upon proceſs, and proſecuted at the court. "There was no reaſon in the diſtinction; but *it* "*was made*†." If the ſix per cent. orators wants a ſecond inſurrection, their conſtant yelping is the moſt certain way to raiſe it. The ſhorteſt method for making a raſcal of any man, is by aſſuring him that you know him to be one.

The ſixth article of the amendments to the conſtitution ſays, that "no warrants ſhall iſſue, but "upon probable cauſe, ſupported by oath or affir"mation." In many of the caſes already quoted, the ſpirit of this amendment was plainly violated, and, in that of Powers, even the letter; for, after being kept ſo long a priſoner, the judge diſcharged him without even examination.

The ſeventh amendment enjoins, that no perſon ſhall "be deprived of life, liberty, or property, "without *due proceſs of law*." The ſtipulation is illuſive, by the generality of the ſtile; for, the con-

* Debates of congreſs, January 9th, 1795.
† Brackenridge, vol. I. Chap. I.

ſtitution ſhould either have defined what is meant by *due proceſs*, or it iſſues in mere words.

The eighth amendment declares, that, "in all "criminal proſecutions, the accuſed ſhall enjoy the "right to a ſpeedy and public trial, by an impartial "jury, of the ſtate and diſtrict wherein the crime "ſhall have been committed."

This amendment is, likewiſe, unſatisfactory; for a *ſpeedy* trial is an indefinite phraſe, that may be ſtretched to intolerable delay. Thus, in the caſes of the weſtern people, about ſix months, or upwards, intervened between arreſtment and trial. This was any thing, ſurely, but ſpeed. The word *diſtrict* lies, alſo, open to objection. The ſtate of Pennſylvania is a diſtrict four hundred miles broad. A perſon dragged to that diſtance, a whiſkey rioter, for example, is completely ſeparated from his connections, and loſes every benefit of trial by jury from the vicinage. The very length of the journey is, in itſelf, a ſevere puniſhment to any man, who has buſineſs to mind. Suppoſe that he gets bail, returns home, comes back to Philadelphia, and is acquitted, or, perhaps the grand jury throws out the bill, ſo that he does not even ſtand a trial. His three journies amount to twelve hundred miles, which, at twenty miles per day, employ ſixty days. His expences, in travelling, cannot be leſs than a dollar per day, and his loſs of time about as much more. Here is a fine of more than an hundred dollars, and, perhaps, he has not one dollar of his own. This calculation does not include his waſte of time in attending the court, and three prefatory months in priſon, before he could find bail for his appearance, or, perhaps, before judge Peters found leiſure to examine him. To the pooreſt man brought from the weſtern country, the arreſtment muſt, in itſelf, have been equal to an exaction of three or four hundred

dollars. The above three amendments to the conſtitution point out no explicit principle to protect him. As for compenſation, I ſuſpect that no writer on law, has ever ſo much as ſuggeſted a hint of it. The extreme iniquity of this omiſſion has already been explained*. Amidſt the numerous projects for political reformation, I have never met with an effectual remedy propoſed for *arbitrary impriſonment, before trial, on the part of government.*

We have ſeen a few of the abuſes in this way, which occurred during the weſtern inſurrection. While they can be repeated with impunity, it is raſh to ſay much about the rights and liberties of an American citizen. While your government can apprehend you, make you walk four hundred miles on foot, and thereafter lie three months in jail, before examination, it is childiſh, it is even impertinent, to raiſe a racket about the ſuperior public virtue of American citizens, or the ſuperior purity of the federal conſtitution. If the former had ſhone with peculiar ſplendour, it is likely that a certain judge would, long ſince, have been impeached, fined, and diſmiſſed. If the latter had been as excellent, as it is ſaid to be, it would have held out a warning ſufficient to deter him. As for the ſecretary of the treaſury, his non-impeachment by the houſe of repreſentatives, was an eminent neglect of duty. It is true that two-fifths of them, or, perhaps, a majority, would have oppoſed any motion of that ſort. The ſenate, alſo, were ſure to have acquitted the criminal. Yet difficulties, like theſe, ought not to hinder an honeſt member of congreſs from obeying the dictates of his conſcience. Some elder repreſentatives affect to ſmile at the blunt but reſpectable ſincerity of colonel Lyon, of Vermont. It would

* American Annual Regiſter, Chap. X.

be well for the country if every member durſt ſpeak his ſentiments with as much honeſty.

To the amendments above cited, the following addition might be an improvement. "Every "man, apprehended for any crime, ſhall be entitled "to an examination as early as poſſible; to bail, "if the offence be bailable, and to a ſpeedy trial. "But as it is impoſſible, in ſuch matters, to fix "a preciſe rule, the following proviſions will en-"ſure the circumſpection of government in iſſu-"ing warrants to apprehend the accuſed, and its "diſpatch in deciding their fate. From the day "of his arreſt, till that of trial, he ſhall receive "wholeſome and plentiful diet, and be lodged in "an apartment dry, and as well aired as may be*. "In the event of an acquittal he ſhall be entitled to "treble the ordinary wages of a labourer, in "that part of the country where he reſides; or, "if he is a tradeſman, to treble the wages that a "journeyman of his profeſſion can, upon a medi-"dium, earn. The quantum is to be determined by "a jury of his own vicinage, as early as poſſible, "after his diſcharge. Over and above this ſum, "it ſhall bear a weekly compound intereſt of one "per cent. from the day of the priſoner being ap-"prehended, until the day that he ſhall be ultimately "paid the balance found due to him by the ver-"dict of the jury. In caſe of his death before "trial, one half of the ſums ſo due, on his being "acquitted, ſhall be awarded to his neareſt heir

* In the criminal apartment of the jail of Philadelphia, a priſoner is reſtricted to the diet of the houſe, that is, to ſemi-ſtarvation. He is not even allowed to buy food for himſelf, out of his own pocket. Thus, even *before trial*, he is ſeverely puniſhed by famine. Americans ought not to ſpeak of Algerine ſavageneſs, while ſuch enormities exiſt at home. After trial, there may be good cauſes for ſtinting diet.

" at law; the amount being fixed as aforeſaid, " and the proportional compound intereſt conti- " nuing to accumulate till the day of payment. " If ſtrong ſuſpicions remain of the priſoner's " guilt, or, if the accidental death or abſence of a " witneſs hath mutilated the evidence of the pub- " lic proſecutor, the jury of the vicinage are to " have a diſcretionary power of reducing the prin- " cipal ſum to one half, and the compound intereſt " to one per cent. per week of the remaining moi- " tey. If the priſoner ſhall be compelled to travel " on foot for more than fifty miles to the place of " confinement, or of trial, he ſhall receive at the " rate of one day's wages for every thirty miles " ſuch of diſtance. In court, he is to be allowed " able counſel, and any reaſonable number of wit- " neſſes, whom he may wiſh for, ſhall be paid " at public expence. His damages, on acquittal, " are to be defrayed by the county, diſtrict, or " government, at whoſe inſtance he has been tri- " ed. If his health ſufferes materially from " bad diet, or an unwholeſome apartment, addi- " tional damages may be aſſigned at the diſcretion " of the jury. For the time of *his enlargement upon* " *bail*, the priſoner, if finally acquitted, ſhall only " be entitled to the expence of travelling to and " from the place where he reſides."

The reader may ſmile at this effuſion of fancy, but until a ſimilar regulation ſhall be adopted, the conſtitution muſt labour under an important defect. The point of juſtice is not worth an argument, ſince every candid heart muſt echo approbation. This practice of arbitrary impriſonment, both before and after trial, has, in the old countries, been an inſtrument of general and enormous tyranny. In Scotland, when a culprit had been condemned to tranſportation for a number of years, it was, ſome-

times, two or three years before government ſent him off. In equity, this interval ſhould have been deducted from the ſpace of baniſhment; but that was not the practice. The following anecdote refers to this cuſtom. It is publiſhed here by way of conſolation, as ſhewing that public juſtice cannot be more ſtupid or brutal in America, than ſhe often is in Europe. Not many years ago, two brothers were capitally convicted at Edinburgh for houſe breaking. One of them was to be reſpited; but, by a blunder in drawing out the paper, the wrong chriſtian name crept in, and on this miſtake he was hung. The ſurvivor, whom it had ſaved, underwent a long and painful impriſonment, till, ſeeing no termination of miſery, he attempted an eſcape. He was detected, and the blood-thirſty bench inſtantly obtained from the king an order for his execution. One of their lordſhips, leſs barbarous than the reſt, obſerved that the impriſonment which this man had endured was too dreadful for human patience, and hinted that he was a much fitter object of pity than of a halter. The remark was in vain, for pity very ſeldom touches the breaſt of a judge, or at leaſt of a Scots one.

From this excurſion, we go back to the propoſed amendment. As government is erected for an univerſal diſpenſation of juſtice, it is completely monſtrous that government itſelf ſhould be placed beyond the reach of juſtice. With regard to acquitted priſoners, nobody can deny the fact. When a man is apprehended either here, or in Europe, for a capital offence, he is often half ſtarved to death, of cold and hunger, before his trial comes on. If, in the ſequel, he muſt die, that alone is enough; and if he is diſcharged, the court can make no atonement equal to his previous ſufferings. Thus is Juriſprudence transformed into a proſtitute,

a dæmon, ſuch as ſhe diſplayed herſelf on the weſtern expedition.

To an acquitted priſoner the retribution propoſed cannot be thought extravagant. Even with the previous aſſurance of ſafety, if that were poſſible, a labourer, or a journeyman mechanic, would much rather continue at the axe or the anvil, than undergo a ſcene that, like a ſnail on the wall, is ſure of leaving ſlime behind it. The treble wages offer no temptation. To a perſon in extenſive buſineſs, they offer much worſe than none. They hold out the proſpect of certain loſs, which, however, he is better able to ſupport than a poorer man. The compound intereſt would enſure expedition, as thoſe in hazard of paying it, would effectually ſpur the judge to an early diſcharge of his duty. The travelling expences might tend to moderate the inconvenient diſtance to which a perſon accuſed may ſometimes be dragged. The probability of retribution could hold out no encouragement to real guilt; beſides, that the jury of the vicinage could cut compenſation through the middle. The chance of paying ſmartly for miſtakes would render a court cautious in granting warrants. The ſame proſpect would retard the acquittal of a priſoner, when he is known to be guilty. On the 3d of March, 1795, the day on which the third congreſs diſſolved, Mr. Dexter laid before the houſe of repreſentatives a reſolution for mitigating, in ſome inſtances, the ſeverity of penal laws. He ſaid, that he had known a priſoner come to the bar laughing, becauſe, though guilty, he knew before hand that the jury would acquit him. Condemning the ſeverity of the law, they refuſed to condemn the priſoner. Juſtice, or cruelty overſhot its mark; and he was diſcharged in contempt of evidence. But if the jury knew that ſuch an act of perjury,

on their part, was to produce a heavy fine on the county or diſtrict, we ſhould hear no more of this corrupted mercy. It would reflect ſingular dignity on the juriſprudence of America, to ſet the firſt example to the world of ſuch a magnanimous regulation. It might blunt the deriſion that poſterity muſt feel, at thoſe torrents of ſelf-applauſe which the preſent age hath ſo bountifully poured upon itſelf. Such an article in the conſtitution would augment the ſafety, and promote the indemnification of innocence, while, at the ſame time, it multiplied the dangers of guilt. Of ſuch an article every party may, in turn, feel the benefit, or ſuffer by the want. The unavenged exceſſes of the fall of 1794, prove, that, till ſomething of this nature ſhall be adopted, the vaunted liberties of America are but the fragments of a ſyſtem. If the ſixth year of our government hath reached ſuch Mamaluke maturity of deſpotiſm, what prodigies may be expected in the accumulation of a century!

Here it may be uſeful to notice another defect in the federal conſtitution. The king of England can, at pleaſure, diſſolve his parliament. Whenever they become unmanageable, he has a right of directing them to diſperſe. If they neglect his orders, there is nothing to hinder his guards from ſhooting them, under the riot act. This royal privilege has obvious and dreadful conſequences to the independence of parliament. A member in oppoſition, has, perhaps, expended one-half of his eſtate in canvaſſing for his borough. By a ſingle meſſage from the crown, the labour of years, and the waſte of ten thouſand guineas are rendered abortive; and he muſt, a ſecond time, contend with the profuſion of miniſterial bribery. Charles the firſt conſented to ſuſpend this prerogative; and that overſight paved the way to the foundation of the commonwealth

of England. It was by a bold exertion of the right of diſſolution, that William Pitt, in 1784, broke up the coalition parliament. The expedient has been often adopted. It is a ſure card in the hand of a deciſive miniſter, and one of the ſtrongeſt links in the chain of corrupted influence.

With ſuch an example before them, the framers of the conſtitution of 1787, have granted, in ſubſtance, the very ſame prerogative to the preſident. They could not have betrayed a ſtronger mark of incapacity. In article ii. ſection iii. are theſe words: "He may, on extraordinary occaſions, convene "both houſes, or either of them; and, in caſe of "diſagreement between them, with reſpect to the "time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to ſuch "time as HE *ſhall think proper*."

In article i. ſection ii. it is provided, that "con-"greſs ſhall aſſemble at leaſt once in every year." The preſidential privilege reduces this rule to a nullity. Before they have been a week in ſeſſion, *his* ſenate may propoſe an adjournment. The two houſes diſagree, and the preſident determines that they ſhall riſe. With a view to this emergency, the appropriation bill may be poſted through both houſes within a few days after they ſit down. If the repreſentatives become reſtive, he can diſmiſs them, without an appropriation act. He has only to quote the precedent of Mr. Waſhington, and march to the bank or the treaſury.

CHAPTER VIII.

Dr. Ames.—Remarks on his ſpeech on the Britiſh treaty. Project of the ſenate, in 1789, *for introducing titles.—Thomas Paine.—Reſolutions of congreſs in his favour.—The ſpeech of Barras to Monroe.—Mr. Fenno.—Examination of the diſpatches of Mr. Pinckney, and the conduct of Mr. Adams.—Defence of the French directory.—Phineas Bond.—Ruſſian treaty with England.—On the banks of Philadelphia.—Partiality againſt the republican party in granting diſcounts.—Fatal effect to American manufactures from an exceſs of paper money, and from uſury.—Citation from Mr. Fenno.—From Fauchet.—Card from Mr. Muhlenberg.*

ON April 28th, 1796, Dr. Ames delivered, in congreſs, a ſpeech in defence of the Britiſh treaty. "If a treaty," ſays he, "left king "George his iſland, it would not anſwer; not if "he ſtipulated to pay rent for it." [This is wild exaggeration.] "It has been ſaid, [And pray, by whom has it been ſaid? for no ſuch language ever addreſſed the ears of congreſs.] "the world ought "to rejoice if Britain was ſunk in the ſea; if, where "there are now men, and wealth, and laws, and "liberty, there was no more than a ſand-bank for "the ſea monſters to fatten on; a ſpace for the "ſtorms of the ocean to mingle in conflict*."

* Bache's Debates, Vol. II. p. 319.

Dr. Ames has not ſpecified where, or by whom this object of rejoicing was propoſed. If any democratical member of congreſs had uttered that wiſh, Mr. Fenno would have refreſhed the public with an hundred editions of it. To aſcribe to a party opinions which they do not hold is uncandid, and ſerves only to embitter political animoſity. This citation helps to aſcertain the credit due to ſome other aſſertions in that ſpeech*.

In a note ſubjoined to this ſpeech, Dr. Ames adds, that the preſent war "has done more injury to the "*morals* and *happineſs* of nations than all the wars "of the laſt century." As to the quantity of blood ſhed in the revolution, the party have already been told, and they dare not deny the fact, that, in Bengal only, the Engliſh have deſtroyed about as many people as the late kingdom of France contained. Stale objections deſerve ſtale anſwers. The guillotine is tender mercy compared with the rack and the wheel, both of which have been aboliſhed by the revolution. It has likewiſe put an end to the French ſlave trade, which England continues to cultivate. Robeſpierre, and his chief accomplices, expiated their crimes on the ſcaffold; and even they were not worſe than Turrene, ravaging the Palatinate, than Cromwell, extirpating the Iriſh nation, than the New-England ſaints, of the laſt century, burning witches, or, than the Connecticut tories, with Brandt and Butler at their head, breaking up the ſettlement of Wioming. Smith's Wealth of Nations, and Arthur Young's Travels through France, will inform Dr. Ames, that, as to *morals* and *happineſs*, a very large majority of the French nation could fear no change for the worſe. They have freed

* Something like this hath been quoted, be an eminent federal writer, as from *The Political Progreſs of Britain*, where no ſuch ſentiment is to be found.

themſelves from an oppreſſive monarchy and nobility; and from a clergy of enormous expence. The government, as in the United States, is repreſentative, and religion left at liberty. The French were juſt as well entitled to freedom as the Americans. Their revolution has been attended with much violence and iniquity; but ſo was ours. In the affair of September, 1797, the ſimple exile of the vanquiſhed leaders, diſplays unexampled lenity. The French have not merely freed themſelves. They have likewiſe delivered other nations from ſlavery. The perfidious ſtadtholder is expelled from his office. The biſhop of Liege no longer uplifts a revenue from the gaming tables of Aix-la-Chapelle. Flanders, Nice, and Savoy, are admitted to ſhare in the government of the republic. The Auſtrian uſurpers are driven from Italy; and, in a few years, the whole peninſula will enjoy a repreſentative government. The corporation of German tyrants hath been ſhaken to the root, and lopped of numerous branches. Every campaign has been pregnant with horrors, but not more ſo than thoſe of former wars. The progreſs of republican principles hath been gradual, but irreſiſtible. Mankind begin to ſee that they are capable of legiſlating for themſelves, and to laugh at their previous veneration for emperors and kings.

This proſpect ought to gladden the heart of a true republican; but the American revolution ſeems to have gone too far for the feelings of many people in this country. No ſooner had the New-Englanders got rid of their Britiſh monarch, than a conſiderable part of them began to look out for ſomething very like another. It was chiefly through them that the new conſtitution conferred ſuch immenſe power and influence on the office of preſident. And, ever ſince, moſt of the New-England members of con-

greſs have been diſpoſed to ſtrain his prerogatives. Obſerve what follows.

The conſtitution, article i. ſection ix. clauſe vii. ſays that "no title of *nobility* ſhall be granted by "the United States." On April 24th, 1789, the repreſentatives received a meſſage from the ſenate. It ſtated, that they had appointed a committee to conſider "what *ſtile* or *titles* it will be proper to "annex to the office of preſident and vice-preſi- "dent, if any other than thoſe given in the conſti- "tution." The repreſentatives refuſed their concurrence, and the affair was dropt. Nothing could in itſelf, be more deſpicable, nothing could be more oppoſite even to the letter of the conſtitution, or betray a ſtronger taſte for monarchy than this propoſal. The conſtitution prohibits titles of nobility. The ſenate recommend *titles*, and certainly not of degradation. Of courſe they muſt have been adapted, like the ſimilies of Mr. Bayes, to elevate and ſurpriſe. Moſt ſerene, moſt potent, moſt illuſtrious, or any luggage of that kind, would have excited ridicule inſtead of reſpect. But in ſmiling at the childiſhneſs of the ſcheme, we ſhould not overlook its ultimate tendency. The next propoſal was, probably, to have been by what title ſhall members addreſs each other; and the continent might ſoon have reſounded with babbling appellations.—"This "day his grace the moſt ſerene John Adams, vice- "preſident, &c. ſet out for his ſeat at Braintree.— "Laſt night arrived, in this city from Mount "Vernon, his high mightineſs, the moſt potent and "illuſtrious George Waſhington, &c.—To-morrow "his excellency, the right honourable Alexander "Hamilton, with his lady, and their ſuite proceed "to New-York, on a viſit to his excellency the "moſt illuſtrious colonel Duer.—Their ſerene "highneſſes, the moſt puiſſant the ſenate of the

" United States, have reſolved that in future it ſhall " not be lawful for any ſenator to pick his teeth, " to yawn, or emit the like ſymptoms of intellec- " tual vacancy, till half an hour after prayers have " been finiſhed." It was from the ſame ſpirit, that Meſſrs. Dexter and Sedgwick wanted, on the 1ſt of January, 1795, to engraft, on our government, a foreign nobility*. In both inſtances, the innovation would have raiſed infinite diſcontent, and it was to produce no good effect of any kind. It breathed the pure ſpirit of *diſorganization;* a favourite term of reproach with the federal party.

On titles, Thomas Paine has written with great ſucceſs; and this is one reaſon why the friends of order hate him. Abuſe of this author is now as naturally expected in a federal newſpaper as tea and chocolate in a grocer's ſtore. To ſuch things, compare two reſolutions of congreſs of the 26th of Auguſt, and 3d of October 1785. In conſequence of his " early, unſolicited, and continued labours in ex- " plaining and enforcing the principles of the late " revolution, by ingenious and timely publications, " upon the nature of liberty, and civil govern- " ment," they direct the board of treaſury to pay him three thouſand dollars. This atteſtation outweighs the clamour of the ſix per cent. orators. They dread, they revile, and if able, they would perſecute Thomas Paine, becauſe he poſſeſſes talents and courage ſufficient to rend aſunder the mantle of ſpeculation, and to delineate the ricketty growth of our public debt.

In his ſpeech to congreſs, on May 16th, 1797, Mr. Adams complains heavily of France, as wanting to promote civil diſcord in America. The paſſage that has almoſt produced a French war, claims

* See American Annual Regiſter, Chap. V.

particular notice, and is in these words. France "will not abase herself by calculating the conse-"quences of the condescension of the American "government in listening to the suggestions of her "former tyrants. Moreover, the French repub-"lic hopes that the successors of Columbus, Raleigh, "and Penn, always proud of their liberty, will ne-"ver forget that *they owe it to France*. They "will weigh in their wisdom the magnanimous be-"nevolence of the French people with the crafty "caresses of certain persons who meditate bringing "them back to their former slavery." These were the words of Barras, president of the directory, on the 30th December, 1796, in his farewell reply to Mr. Monroe. The stile betrays ostentation that might have been spared; and contempt which has been deserved; but not a spirit of animosity. It is certain that, humanly speaking, America could not have compelled Cornwallis to surrender, but for the interference of France; and even the vanity of a selfish benefactor should be endured with respect. It would have been wise in the president to take no notice whatever of this satirical flight. He opened the door to such harangues as had not before been heard in congress. Among other polite repartees, Mr. Thatcher observed that Barras must have been either *mad* or *drunk*. Thus, in half a minute, we turned the balance of civility to the side of France.

But there is the best reason for affirming that the indignation of Mr. Adams was affected; that he wanted to find a pretence for quarrelling with the republic; and that, if expressions far stronger than those of Barras had been employed by lord Grenville, not a murmur would have been heard about them. We shall examine each of these two points.

First, That the president desired, and still de-

ſires, a French rupture, is evident from his patronage of the Gazette of the United States. Its editor, Mr. Fenno, is printer to the ſenate, and as much at the nod of Mr. Adams, and of them, as their clerk or door keeper. He vindicates all the meaſures of the federal party; and, ſince the beginning of the French revolution, he has railed at that people in the moſt violent tone. The following paragraphs are copied from his newſpaper, ſo late as the 20th of September, 1797. Read them; and then aſk yourſelf whether Mr. Adams and his ſenate can be ſincere in wiſhing for a reconcilement with France? While they countenance the publiſher of ſuch invectives, they cannot be ſuppoſed either to expect or deſire French amity. It is of the utmoſt importance to aſcertain whether our executive is ſerious in its efforts for pacification. Judge if the following language is of that ſort.

"By the advices this day publiſhed, it is ren-
"dered probable that the conſtitution-makers of
"ſans-culotte land, that great nurſery of pirates,
"aſſaſſins, and robbers, are, ere this, once more
"*blown up.*" [This is abundantly brutal, but the writer goes from bad to worſe.]

"A new, long, and violent conteſt will ſucceed;
"but the iſſue will be favourable to France, and
"mankind. THE KING *ſhall have* HIS OWN *again*;
[This is charming doctrine for a republic. Few people will hereafter be hardy enough to deny that there is a monarchical faction among us; and as the printer is the mere organ of his employers, it is but candid to rank Mr. Adams, and his federal majority in the ſenate, as the leaders of that faction.] "and America and the world ſhall have
"peace. Adieu, then, to Meſſidor, and Prairial,
"to Nivoſe, Pluvoiſe, and Ventoſe, and Sans-Cul-

" lotides, and all the long train of cabaliſtic non-
" ſenſe, which have poiſoned the French name in
" all quarters of the world.

" Surgo, [he means Mr. Bache,] take thy laſt
" ſubſidy; ſeize on it quickly, for thy maſters, ere
" this, are no more. Thy occupation's gone!"
[Every body knows in what way Mr. Fenno is ſubſidized. As for *Surgo*, the French do not value the ſentiments of America, and would ſcorn to hire a printer for attempting to direct them. To the arms of the United States the republic is about as impregnable as the moon. She can bombard our ſea-ports, deſtroy our commerce, and leave us to *kick againſt the pricks**.

But while the preſidential gazette ejects ſuch filth, we cannot, in reaſon, hope for a favourable concluſion from the triumvirate embaſſy. Indeed, if our envoys poſſeſs common ſenſibility, they muſt look ſomewhat fooliſh, if they are admitted into the preſence of Barras. Put the caſe that he has on the table before him a volume of Mr. Fenno's newſpaper, and that he ſhall aſk them who are the patrons and prompters of that editor? Their anſwer, if they ſpeak truth, muſt be, that it is the funnel of government. He may then tell them that they are hypocritical raſcals; that, with the olive branch in one hand, they hold a ſtink-pot in the other; that, in the midſt of ſuch publications, their embaſſy is an additional inſult; and that they may be thankful to get ſafely out of the territories of the republic.

The reſtive and ſullen demeanour of Charles Coteſworth Pinckney, at Paris, was both uſeleſs and

* Sixteen days before this prediction iſſued from the preſidential preſs, the ſtorm had burſt at Paris; and like every one that went before it, has ended in the ruin of the royal partizans.

impertinent. It deſerved no part of that praiſe conferred on it by Mr. Giles, and other members, in the late ſeſſion of congreſs. France, in the perſon of her repreſentative, had endured a thouſand affronts from the preſſes of Philadelphia. She had finally, and with intimation of her diſguſt, recalled citizen Adet. She did not, however, enjoin Mr. Monroe to quit Paris, but a ſucceſſor having been appointed in his room, this removal preſented a decent opportunity for getting entirely quit of American ambaſſadors. If Monroe had not been recalled, it is likely that he might ſtill have been permitted to remain at Paris. America would then have eſcaped from eighty thouſand dollars of expence, on account of the late extra ſeſſion of congreſs, beſides about thirty or forty thouſand, as the extra charges of the preſent triple deputation*. What was yet more important, ſhe would have eſcaped from the ſpeech of the 16th of May, 1797; from all the improper harangues of which it was the fountain head; and from all the bad effects which are to be expected by the farther irritation of France.

As the republic had recalled her ambaſſador from the United States, ſhe could not be ſuppoſed anxious for the reſidence of an American envoy at Paris. My declaration, that I ſhall no longer enter your houſe, amounts to a tacit prohibibition of your coming into mine. Beſides, the

* The exact amount of this expence cannot yet be ſtated. Mr. Wolcott, in his report and eſtimates for 1797, p. 16. reckons nine thouſand dollars, as the outfit of an ambaſſador to France. We have at preſent two ſuch outfits, beſides that of Pinckney. This comes in all to twenty-ſeven thouſand dollars, that might have been ſaved by letting Monroe keep his place. As for ſalary, Mr. Wolcott ſtates four foreign miniſters, at nine thouſand dollars each, and one at four thouſand five hundred. At the loweſt rate, the expence of three miniſters to France will come to thirteen thouſand five hundred dollars, per annum, inſtead of paying only one ſalary.

directory well knew why Monroe was recalled. His crime conſiſted in a cordial attachment to the French revolution. They were, therefore, to look with a jealous eye on the perſon appointed to ſucceed him. This alone would have enſured to Mr. Pinckney a cold reception; even if the recall of Adet had not afforded a plauſible reaſon for refuſing to receive him. He was wrong for not leaving France, on the firſt injunction of departure. He improved his delay into a quarrel with the French miniſter. Hence it was highly injudicious in Mr. Adams to ſend him back, as he has done, a ſecond time. This, in itſelf, is a ſpecies of diſreſpect to the French government. If peace with the republic was the point in view, the ſureſt way would have been to ſend back Jefferſon or Monroe. The directory would recognize them, not merely as ambaſſadors, but as friends. From ſuch a deputation there would at leaſt be a chance for the return of mutual confidence. From the preſent choice of envoys there can be but little*.

That it was improper to ſend Mr. Pinckney back to France, appears from his own printed correſpondence. It contains various expreſſions highly diſreſpectful to the directory. The remarks may be very juſt, but the good policy of Mr. Adams, in expoſing them to the world, admits of doubt. Mr. Pinckney gave his letters of credence to the French miniſter, De la Croix, on December 9th, 1796. On the 11th, the latter informed Mr. Monroe, that no envoy could be received, till America had granted the redreſs of grievances demanded by France.

* When Mr. Waſhington wanted to gain the good will of England, he ſent over Jay, the profeſſed advocate of the Britiſh intereſt in America. To ſecure its continuance, he next diſpatched Rufus King, a perſon of the ſame principles. France has an equal title to attention of that kind.

De la Croix, by addreſſing Monroe, gave a broad enough hint that he wanted to have no buſineſs with Pinckney. Yet, next morning, our envoy ſent him a long letter, enquiring, whether he ſhould quit the republic. On the 15th, the French miniſter ſignified his opinion, that this was the deſire of the directory; but that he would conſult them again. Mr. Pinckney ſtood on the ground of diplomatic privileges, though he adds, that the directory had recently ſent off thirteen foreign miniſters. On the 26th, he again ſent to enquire of De la Croix, whether he might reſide in the republic. He received a ſharp anſwer, which his ſecretary wanted the French miniſter to put into writing. This was refuſed, with ſome bad humour. De la Croix wondered at Mr. Pinckney, for having ſtaid ſo long, after he had been informed that it was impoſſible to allow him. Still he lingered in Paris, till the 5th of the enſuing February, having teaſed the directory, till they gave him a written order to quit the French territories. His letter, conveying this laſt news, concludes with an ardent wiſh for a *return* of the good ſenſe and good humour of the republic.

This bickering would not be worth an analyſis; but as the federal party make a prodigious clamour about it, the particulars riſe above their natural degree of intereſt. Inſtead of haraſſing De la Croix, and the directory, and ſtanding upon the tiptoe of diplomatic privilege, Pinckney would have ſerved the United States better, by quitting France on the firſt intimation, that he could not be received in an official character. The previous diſmiſſal of thirteen miniſters, might have convinced him, that the directory would remain inflexible, and that importunity could only ſerve to widen the breach. Admitting that the French were in the wrong, and that is extremely doubtful, a wiſe envoy would

have made some allowance for the pride and insolence of victory. It is the inseparable tribute of human infirmity, at the shrine of fortune. Both parties were highly chagrined, in the act of Mr. Pinckney's ultimate dismission. Ask yourself, then, whether it was a prudent step to send him a second time to Paris? The quarrel of nations had been exasperated into that of persons*.

Mr. Adams has completed this individual rupture. If Pinckney could have had any chance of doing service, the pulication of his confidential correspondence with the executive, has infallibly put an end to it. The French may come to an agreement, because they may not be prepared for attacking us. But this truce will resemble the state of Rome, after the death of Otho. *Potius bellum cessérat, quam pax coperat*†. To shew the good sense of our president, and his plan for pleasing France, it is worth while to cite a few of the passages in Pinckney's letters, that must be sure of offending the directory.

"I think the ground I have taken has *puzzled* "*them;* they wish me gone, but they apprehend "that it would be too harsh a measure, to send "off, "in a peremptory manner, the minister of my "country‡." [He soon saw how little they cared for that; but the directory did not want to be harsh, till civility had failed.]

* "Ambassadors have a just natural right to demand that their pro- "posals should be delivered. But as to an allowance to reside any "time in the state to which they are sent, they may claim it as due "out of humanity, but cannot insist on it as a perfect right. Since "the business of the more active ambassadors is much the same with "that of spies upon the nations where they reside." Hutcheson's Introduction to Moral Philosophy, Book III. Chap X.

† "War had rather ended than peace begun."

‡ Documents, &c. p. 17.

" The letter of the 21ſt of Frimaire, from M. " De la Croix to Mr. Monroe, above recited, ſhews " the diſtinction which this government attempts " to make *between the American people and their* " *government**." [The letter alluded to, compriſes only a few common-place expreſſions of reſpect and kindneſs for the Americans. Its total inſignificance makes the paſſage worth quoting, as it thus more ſtrongly marks the jealouſy of the federal party.] " I pray you to be perſuaded, citizen miniſter," ſays De la Croix, " that this determination† hav- " ing become neceſſary, allows to ſubſiſt between " the French republic, and the American people, " the affection founded upon former benefits, and " reciprocal intereſts; an affection, which you your- " ſelf have taken a pleaſure in cultivating, by every " means in your power‡."

[Theſe words convey little meaning, and certainly no harm. Nothing but the delirium of faction, or the ſourneſs of diſappointed ſelf-conceit, can ſee, in this compliment, any deſign to make an alarming diſtinction between the government and people of America. One-half of the ſhort but wicked addreſs from Barras to Monroe, contains a polite turn in the ſame ſtyle; and, on theſe high and mighty miſdemeanours, Mr. Adams, in his ſpeech to congreſs, founds the charge of inflammation againſt France. After the above reference, Mr. Pinckney ſubjoins:]

" I truſt, that America will ſhew that her ſenti- " ments and thoſe of her government are *one;* and " that ſhe will never ſuffer any foreign nation to " interfere in her concerns; and that an attempt to " divide her citizens will be the ſignal for rallying,

* Documents, &c. p. 18.

† Not to receive an ambaſſador from the United States.

‡ Documents, &c. p. 19.

" and render them the more united*." [Mr. Pinckney brings no evidence that France, on this occaſion, attempted to *interfere*, or *divide*. His ſudden bounce upwards, was needleſs and malicious. But he had known the temper of government, and its wiſhes for a handle to charge France with the plan of ſowing ſedition in this country. He had received nine thouſand dollars of outfit, being eight thouſand, five hundred, more than were neceſſary†; and he was impatient to prove his gratitude. When you ſuffer the executive of a nation to pay public officers extravagantly, they are almoſt ſure of degenerating into the mere creatures and apes of their immediate employer. Mr. Pinckney well knew, that the complimentary phraſes of Barras ſignified no more than *your humble ſervant*, at the bottom of a challange‡.]

" I need not," ſays Mr. Pinckney, " comment " on ſo ſtrange a compoſition;" (the ſpeech of Barras) " it, however, evinces the diſpoſition of the " directors of this country towards us, and the ſyſ- " tem which they have adopted, by endeavouring " to perſuade our countrymen that they can have " a different intereſt from their fellow citizens, " whom themſelves have choſen to manage their " joint concerns‖." [Never was a ſentence of the Bible, or of Ariſtotle, more woefully tortured than

* Documents, &c. p. 18.

† What is the reaſon why four of our foreign miniſters get nine thouſand dollars of ſalary, and a fifth, only half that ſum? Place the whole five on the ſmaller allowance. It is ſufficient; and eſpecially at Paris, where living is far cheaper than in Philadelphia. The reduction of the four larger ſalaries would ſave eighteen thouſand dollars a year. This would enable congreſs to take off *one* of the *two* cents per pound of exciſe upon refined ſugar, which, in 1795, produced only thirty-eight thouſand dollars.

‡ This compariſon is borrowed from lord Cheſterfield.

‖ Documents, p. 28.

this unhappy ſpeech. If Barras was to ſay any thing in the ſhape of cenſure, he could not have ſaid leſs; and he knew, as well as Mr. Pinckney, that the Britiſh treaty was the work of a party. The federal newſpapers are conſtantly reviling the French nation. They deſpiſe all notice of ſuch foolery; though they know, and cannot fail to reſent it. But while the Gazette of the United States declares the French, *en maſſe*, to be robbers and aſſaſſins, while it hopes that their government is *blown up*, and that the Bourbons will be reſtored; with what grace can John Adams, or this Charles Coteſworth Pinckney, pretend to complain of Barras?]

"There are now twenty-five thouſand French "troops in Batavia (Holland); and, it is here no ſe- "cret, that they can direct what meaſures they "pleaſe*." [Had the directory, like our executive, time and patience to pick ſtraws, could they ſink to the frivolity of the Anglo-federal cabinet, a formidable charge might be reared up againſt Pinckney, for conſpiring to ſeparate Holland from the republic. The one accuſation would be juſt as plauſible as the other.]

"I am happy to find that Mr. Adet's diſorganiz- "ing manœuvres have been treated, by my country- "men, as they deſerved, and that his attempts to "divide, have tended to unite them†." The plaiſter of adulation is here laid on pretty thick. When Genet behaved with petulance to Mr. Waſhington, he had, at leaſt, the merit of acting above board. Here is a man, who, under covert, ſeems to do every thing in his power to feſter the animoſity of our executive againſt France. It has been thought of importance to enter into this diſſection of his official correſpondence. It was from his rubbiſh of

* Documents, &c. p. 30. † Ibid. p. 62.

materials, that Mr. Adams fabricated his military harangue. When the papers were read in the houſe of repreſentatives, the ſpirited behaviour of Pinckney met with loud applauſe. The ſpeech of Barras was condemned by every member who took notice of it.

Preſident Adams would find it difficult to give a good reaſon for preſenting this correſpondence, in its full extent, to congreſs. He well knew that it would be printed, that copies of it would be ſent to France, that many parts of it were ſure to offend the directory, and that, from the day of its arrival, they would regard Pinckney as a calumniator and a ſpy. If the preſident wanted the directory to refuſe, for a ſecond time, the admiſſion of his credentials, this was the moſt likely way to ſucceed. Mr. Fenno himſelf would have been as commendable a choice as Mr. Pinckney.

In an early part of this chapter it was affirmed, that Mr. Adams "deſired, and ſtill deſires a rup-"ture with France." Evidence on this charge has now been examined, and the public will decide as to its juſtice.

Along with the above, another point was ſtated, that, "if expreſſions far ſtronger than thoſe of Bar-"ras had been employed by lord Grenville, not a "murmur would have been heard about them."

In proof of this affirmation, there is a letter from Thomas Pinckney, dated London, January 9th, 1794. In a converſation with Pinckney, Grenville made a reference to "evil diſpoſed perſons among "us, who, according to the intelligence he had re-"ceived, were endeavouring to irritate our peo-"ple againſt Great Britain, as well as to oppoſe the "meaſures of our own government, and, in ſhort, "to reduce us to the preſent ſituation of France; a "misfortune which they deprecated, as well for

" our ſakes, as for the common welfare and tran-
" quility of mankind."

As for *the common welfare of mankind*, it was juſt a month after this converſation that Dorcheſter, by deſire of Grenville, delivered his war-talk to the Indians.

Genet was accuſed of threatening to appeal from the preſident to the people. But here ſomething infinitely worſe has been actually performed. Grenville at once appeals from the people to the preſident. He charges a great part of them with wiſhing to involve the continent in anarchy and bloodſhed, and gives notice, in a ſtile plain enough, that England would be glad to aſſiſt our executive in ſupport of order. Compared to this inſolence, the glance of Barras fades beneath criticiſm. If one drop of republican blood had warmed the heart of Thomas Pinckney, he never would have become the agent of this communication. The preſident did not like Genet's propoſed appeal to the people, but he was highly ſatisfied with this appeal to himſelf. From that day forward, he drew more cloſely the bonds of union with England. The hint would have ſuited queen Elizabeth, or Philip the ſecond; in addreſſing the earl of Murray, or a leader of the French league.

The reſidence of Phineas Bond in Philadelphia, as Britiſh conſul, preſents an evidence of pitiful tameneſs. " No ſtate," ſays Hutcheſon, " is bound " to admit any exiled criminal or fugitive ſubject " of theirs, as an ambaſſador from any neighbour-" ing ſtate. But if ſuch a one is ſent with ſuch com-" miſſion, he cannot juſtly be ſeized or puniſhed, " but he may be immediately ordered to quit our " country*." Bond was ſo much attached to Mr.

* Hutcheſon, Book III. Chap. X.

Guelph, that he accompanied the Britiſh army from this city. He did not return to America till ſome years after the revolution. No act of indemnity has been extended to him. His Britiſh commiſſion alone ſaves him from the penalties of an outlaw, which his ſubſequent inſolence has highly deſerved. If general Lee had ſurvived the late war, and been ſent as a conſul or ambaſſador to England, the court of London would have reſented the nomination as an inſult, and he might, perhaps without much impropriety, have been committed to the tower. But the Britiſh government has a ſenſe of dignity, which America is yet to learn. By the way, our tories clamour greatly at the ſevere fate of French emigrants, while their own conduct ſhews how dangerous indulgence might be. It is needleſs to act a revolution by halves. When American priſoners were ſtarved to death at New-York, the republicans ſhould have uſed theirs exactly in the ſame manner. If retaliation had been inſtantly begun, it would have ſaved many thouſands of valuable lives. But what could be expected from America, when her ſoldiers blubbered under the gibbet of a Britiſh ſpy*?

On February 21ſt, 1797, a treaty of commerce, between England and Ruſſia, was ſigned at Peterſburgh. By the third article, Ruſſian ſailors are amply ſecured from impreſſment; as alſo the paſſengers on board of their veſſels, Britiſh ſubjects alone excepted. The tenth eſtabliſhes the maxim that *free bottoms make free goods;* a maxim by which an American veſſel might convey a cargo of French coffee from St. Domingo to Bourdeaux. A reaſonable exception is made againſt ſupplying a

* Andre. This circumſtance was related by an officer then on the ſpot.

nation, at war with either party, with arms or ammunition; and especially places under siege or blockade. "But in all other cases," says the treaty, "shall "the said subjects freely carry into those places, "passengers and all kinds of goods, except ammu- "nition."

The eleventh article specifies ammunition, as a term strictly confined to military stores. It adds, that, in case of seizure, "neither the vessels, nor "the passengers, nor the other goods, shall be de- "tained, or hindered in the prosecution of their "voyage*."

Compare this treaty with ours, in four different points, and then confess that Americans are unequally dealt with. *First*, As for impressment no security is granted. *Second*, The seventeenth article gives up the privilege of neutral bottoms. "If any "property of an enemy shall be found on board such "vessel, that part only, which belongs to the enemy "*shall be made prize*." *Third*, By the second paragraph of the eighteenth article, "provisions and other "articles, not generally contraband," may be seized, the British government paying for them. A jargon stipulation is introduced of their being only seizable when "becoming contraband according to *the* "*laws of nations*." The latter phrase, like a polypus, or a stocking, may, without injury to its texture, have its inside turned out. But the above is the real and practical signification of the clause. Russian provisions are, in no case whatever, seizable. *Fourth*, The next paragraph of the eighteenth article is as inferior as all the rest to the Russian treaty. An American vessel attempting to enter a place besieged, is, in the first instance, to be turned away, and, on a second attempt to get entrance, her cargo,

* Aurora, September 4th, 1797.

though not contraband, ſhall be confiſcated. But a Ruſſian ſhip may enter at any time, and with "all "kinds of goods, *except ammunition*."

Thus, in four points, of the higheſt conſequence, the Ruſſian treaty has the advantage of ours. A ſtranger might wonder that any man in America is capable of defending Jay. Some of his advocates have been impelled by motives diſtinct from internal approbation. Four hundred and thirteen merchants and traders, in Philadelphia, gave an addreſs of thanks to the preſident for paſſing of the treaty. Of this number, it is charitable to believe, that one-half acted under the hope of pleaſing, or the dread of offending Mr. Thomas Willing, preſident of the bank of the United States, and who appears at the head of the liſt. With ſeveral, it was a ſufficient motive to ſee their names in ſuch reputable company. Many dozens of the ſubſcribers have ſince become bankrupt. Morris and Nicholſon were ſo at the time*; and certainly were not "more immediately concerned "than any other claſs of men†," ſince the real intereſt lay with thoſe to whom they were indebted. The following enquiry will prove ſome of the obligations which this country has to Mr. Willing, and to a part of *the gentlemen with whom he had the honour to act.*

A bank is eſtabliſhed by permiſſion from the government of a country, for the univerſal convenience of its citizens. Hence its directors have no title to make a diſtinction between perſons or parties, any farther than reſpecting their *ſolvency*. A bank is, or ought to be, deſigned for the good of

* At leaſt they were indebted to the extent of many millions of dollars; none of their creditors could get a cent; and their bills were ſold at a reduced price.

† The words of the addreſs.

ſociety at large. Individuality of diſcouragement, or of favour, is excluded from the ſcheme. Such partiality would transform it into a nuiſance.

But equality of treatment ſhould more eſpecially be the caſe with the bank of the United States. One fifth part of its paper money capital belongs to the national government. For this reaſon, every citizen is, at ſecond hand, a partner in it; as he pays a proportion of taxes to the public ſtock, from whence that fifth ſhare was derived. But it is notorious that this bank has been employed as an engine of government, to ſerve the views of Britiſh intereſt. Diſcounts have often been refuſed at this national bank to men of moſt undoubted opulence, merely on account of the republican principles of thoſe who drew or accepted of the bill. The deſpotiſm of paper money pervades every muſcle and vein of Philadelphian ſociety. *The domination of Britiſh cuſtom-houſe officers has been exchanged for that of American ſtockjobbers**. As a minute example, ſeveral gentlemen of conſiderable property, declared that they durſt not ſubſcribe for the late Hiſtory of 1796; but that they would be ſure to buy it as ſoon as printed. They feared federal vengeance; of which a ſtoppage of diſcounts at the bank is the foremoſt and favourite weapon. The effects of ſuch a ſtoppage would infallibly ruin the mercantile character of any man in Mr. Willing's liſt.

It has been remarked†, that Philadelphia has thirty offices excluſively for printing of books. This was a year ago; but, ſince that time, and owing to the late torrent of bankruptcies, ſome

* By the act of incorporation, three-fifths of the funds are payable in ſix per cent. public ſtock. Compare ſections 2d and 11th.

† American Annual Regiſter, Chap. V.

have been ſhut up, and others have become half idle. If the paper money of this country had been confined within one-ſixth part of its preſent limits, theſe bankruptcies would have been reſtricted in at leaſt as great a proportion. Inſtead of thirty printing offices, but indifferently employed, there might have been fifty well employed. In Edinburgh or Glaſgow, a good journeyman printer will earn fifteen ſhillings ſterling or a guinea per week. In Dublin, his wages are, it is true, higher, but in Philadelphia, he makes upon a medium, eight or ten dollars. A difference in the expence of labour attends, alſo, the manufacture of paper. By much the greater part of this ſuperior rate of wages may be traced not to the ſcarcity of hands, but to the exceſs of bank notes, and the conſequent riſe of markets. The dearth of wages, to theſe two claſſes of workmen, renders it difficult to pay them. Hence the employer muſt ſometimes borrow money, at an high intereſt, in order to clear their accounts. The difference of wages, with a premium for the advance of money, is laid by the paper-maker on his manufacture. A ſecond upon his own work, is ſuperadded by the printer, and a third by the bookſeller. It is partly by this means, that books are dearer in Philadelphia or New-York than in England, though we have, comparatively, but very few taxes, and the peculiar advantage ariſing from an unbounded extent of fertile territory. The ſureſt way to augment the circulation of a commodity is to be able to ſell it cheap. An American printer is often underſold, at his own door, by the Scots or Iriſh printer, who has labour at a price one-third lower. In London, wages are higher than probably any where elſe in Britain. A journeyman book-printer, who exerts himſelf, can clear two guineas per

week, but even there, by dint of large capitals, and the ſuperiority of an old eſtabliſhment, the printer and bookſeller can afford to deal for leſs profit, and to give longer credit than a printer in America, where the intereſt of money is ſo much higher than in England.

It will be replied that, before the bank of the United States was opened, a journeyman printer could be had for three, or four dollars, that trade was then very dull, and that Engliſh books were imported as faſt as they are now. In reaſoning, it is common to aſcribe effects to imaginary cauſes, merely becauſe the latter occurred at the ſame time with the former. Yeſterday, at noon, the clock ſtruck twelve, but the ſun would have croſſed the zenith, whether the clock had ſtruck or not. It will be ſuppoſed that bank paper arrived only by degrees at its preſent oppreſſive magnitude; that at firſt it promoted a prudent extent of foreign trade; and that trade in turn ſtimulated internal manufactures. It is not the uſe, but the abuſe of paper money, that is liable to objection. Had the quantum of its circulation become ſtationary, five or ſix years ago, it might have done well; but, inſtead of this, it has gone forward to ſet open ſuch floodgates of gambling and of uſury, as hardly ever overwhlemed any country before. If the expence of print and paper had remained ſtationary ſince 1792, the volume which now coſts a dollar, could have been had for four or five ſhillings. This muſt have excluded in whole or nearly ſo, the preſent large importation of paper, and it muſt, at the ſame time, have greatly augmented the preſent manufacture of printing. The like increaſe would have enſued in ſome other branches, more readily than in this one. Both here and in Britain the wages of a printer are higher

than thoſe of moſt other tradeſmen, and nearer the ſame level in the two countries. This is, no doubt, one reaſon why book-printing has thriven more rapidly here than ſo many other manufactures. On the contrary, look at weavers. In the old country their wages are ſo low, and their work can be furniſhed ſo cheap, that, in ſeveral branches, no eſtabliſhment in America can compete them.

Internal manufactures are a more important, becauſe a more ſafe and durable acquiſition than foreign commerce. They can involve no external quarrel, and they are beyond the reach of external piracy. The tanner, at Lancaſter, has nothing to fear from the corſairs of Barbary; and a potter, or cutler, on the Suſquehanna, may ſmile at the menaces of the Britiſh navy. Twice the preſent number of American tradeſmen, though purchaſed by loſing half the preſent number of American merchants, would produce a very deſirable alteration in the real ſtrength and reſources of the United States.

The whole force of the banking ſyſtem has been directed entirely towards the promotion of foreign trade. The encouragement which it afforded to domeſtic improvement was but as by proxy, through the medium of that wealth which commerce tended to produce. But naturally ſpeaking, matters, if left more freely to their own operation, and leſs impeded by mountains of paper money, would have taken a ſurer courſe. A multitude of manufacturing villages, planted over the continent, are preferable to an immenſe quantity of ſhipping diſperſed over the ocean. A carpenter, or a blackſmith, is more likely to be ſober, long-lived, and to leave a family behind him, than that part of our ſeamen employed in diſtant voyages. Dr. Blane, a Scots phyſician, who ſerved under admiral Rod-

ney, remarks, that ſailors look, for the moſt part, older by ten years than landſmen of the ſame age. Great numbers are annually loſt at ſea or periſh by the hardſhips peculiar to their profeſſion. Perhaps not one-half of the aggregate body enjoy the comforts of a dry death. Of thoſe engaged in voyages to foreign countries, only a few are married. The ſailors of New-England have the reputation of being orderly, and attached to their families; but this is not, in moſt parts of the world, the general character of mariners. Of their extreme utility and value to the United States, notice has been formerly taken*. But internal manufacturers are a ſtill more eſſential claſs in the ſcale of national proſperity. If you can find a taylor, or ſhoemaker, at the next plantation, it is ſurely more profitable to employ him than to ſend your wheat three or four thouſand miles by ſea, to be exchanged for cloaths and ſhoes. Beſides the riſk, and the waſte of additional labour in the voyage, the tradeſman whom you employ in France or England is not your fellow citizen. A mechanic, reſiding in America, forms a part of the nation. His earnings are expended among us. His family are blended with and augment the general maſs of population; whereas a ſailor is often but ſlightly connected with his native country, in which he is indeed a ſtranger, while the foreign manufacturer, who is to conſume your commodities, has no alliance whatever with it, but the tranſitory proſpect of receiving employment. Mr. Gallatin† computes the number of American ſeamen at near forty thouſand. Of theſe, it is much to ſay that ſixteen thouſand are married, and raiſe families. Here then we have twenty-four thouſand batchelors, to

* American Annual Regiſter, Chap. III. † Page 16.

ſupport whoſe numbers, recruits are much more frequently wanted than by any other body of men. If they had been on ſhore, as mechanics, five out of ſix of them would have married, and three children to each, arriving at an adult age, would make an increaſe of ſixty thouſand people. Theſe hints are thrown out not to depreciate the real value of the banking ſyſtem, and much leſs of foreign commerce; but merely to ſhew what is now indeed, univerſally granted, that the former has been driven to a ruinous exceſs, and that the latter ought not to be encouraged at the expence of domeſtic manufactures, which, of the two ſyſtems, greatly deſerve the preference.

A ſhort review will diſcover what an enormous maſs of paper has been iſſued in this city. The bank of North America, the eldeſt on the continent, was firſt incorporated by an act of congreſs, dated April 1ſt, 1782. Its preſent charter, granted by the ſtate of Pennſylvania, bears date the 17th of March, 1787.

	Dollars.
Its capital ſtock is reſtricted to,	2,000,000
The act of incorporation by congreſs of the bank of the United States, was approved on the 25th of February, 1791. Its capital is limited to, - - - - -	10,000,000
The ſtatute of aſſembly for the bank of Pennſylvania is dated March 30th, 1793, and its ſtock is not to exceed, - - -	3,000,000
Total,	15,000,000

Thus, within the ſpace of only ſeven years, from 1787, to 1793, incluſive, three batteries of

paper money, extending to FIFTEEN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, were opened, and ſtill continue to play againſt the antient fortreſs of gold and ſilver. The capitals of other banks on the continent amount to about five millions. Bring twice as many turkies to the market as you can poſſibly ſell; and the price of money will inſtantly riſe, or, according to common ideas, that of turkies will fall. In the ſame way, by thruſting ſo many thouſand reams of artificial money into the market, gold ſoon became of much inferior value. Like Swift's pippin, the honeſt old milled dollar, that never deceived any body, that makes its viſits always welcome, and is the only ſtedfaſt friend, found itſelf joſtled out of the market by five or ſix upſtarts. By degrees, as the operations of the banks extended, the neceſſaries of life grew dearer, till, in ſome inſtances, they arrived at an intolerable pitch. Three hundred dollars per annum were lately given for a houſe in Water-ſtreet, Philadelphia, that would not turn rain, and that had not a ſingle tolerable room. Even on the ſkirts of the city, an hundred dollars are often paid for an hovel of rotten boards, comprehending two or three apartments rather wider than a centry box, and which would not, in the vicinage of London, bring a rent of three guineas. It was well obſerved, ſometime ago, by an old citizen, that, if Philadelphia could get but another bank, we ſhould ſoon pay a dollar for a bunch of aſparagus. Some copies of this book will reach France and England; intended emigrants are requeſted to compare theſe details with that cant of *the peculiar facility with which a family can be raiſed in America;* and, in the name of all that is ſacred, let them not envy the happineſs of reſiding in an American ſea-port.

If the capitals of the three banks had extended,

collectively, to three or four millions, they might have done ſervice; as fifty drops of laudanum will cure a cholic, when five hundred would kill the patient. But when congreſs, by a law, which they had not the ſmalleſt title to make, abruptly opened an enormous ſluice of ten millions of dollars, they acted with the foreſight of the ſhepherd, who wiſhed for the Ganges to run through his fields. The bank of Pennſylvania came next, with its three millions, like the ſecond three hundred laſhes on the back of a Britiſh ſoldier, who has ſtolen a couple of hens. No ſcarçaſm is intended on the founders of this inſtitution. They did not foreſee its conſequences to the public at large. It has been of much pecuniary advantage to the government of this ſtate; and the aſſembly reaſonably ſuppoſed, that, while ſuch great ſums were made by banking, they had an equal right, with others, to the profit of an adventure. Their eſtabliſhment had another effect of ſome value. Its operations tended to weaken the vortex of influence which ten millions of capital gave to the bank of the United States. After this explanation, it may be ſafely aſſerted, that the bank of Pennſylvania was injurious to the country, not from any peculiarity in the eſtabliſhment itſelf, but becauſe the market was previouſly overſtocked. In one reſpect it is greatly ſuperior to the Hamilton bank. The government of Pennſylvania derives a conſiderable revenue from its bank, and which is ſaid to defray its whole expences. Congreſs gains only forty thouſand dollars, and even that is acquired by a ſecond breach of the conſtitution, as illegal as the act of incorporation itſelf.

Of the ten millions of paper capital held by the bank of the United States, two millions were advanced by government, in virtue of a clauſe in the charter. But if it was irregular to found a bank, it

muſt be ſtill more ſo to ſport in ſhares of it with public money. In the annual reports from the treaſury to congreſs, an hundred and ſixty thouſand dollars are ſtated as the ſhare of government in the dividends. The two millions of dollars were borrowed, at ſix per cent. from the bank itſelf. Thus, after ſtriking off an hundred and twenty thouſand dollars of intereſt, the clear profit, as above ſtated, is only forty thouſand. It is believed, that either of the banks of North-America, or of Pennſylvania, would give a large ſum for the additional convenience and repute of handling public money. A diſtinction of this nature is intereſting to any banking company. The remittances of revenue from Scotland to the exchequer at London, paſs, of courſe, through the hands of an Edinburgh banker. The agency is ſaid to be worth ten thouſand pounds ſterling per annum, and it ſometimes produces a ſharp competition. William Ramſay, who is underſtood to have a fortune of at leaſt three or four hundred thouſand pounds ſterling, and who was thus far above conteſting for a trifle, miſſed this employment, ſome years ago, in a hard ſtruggle with ſir William Forbes, the foreman of Thomas Muir's jury.

From theſe obſervations it reſults, that, though banks have promoted the extenſion of commerce, the too great amount of their notes in circulation, and the monſtrous uſury for which paper opened an avenue, have, in the iſſue, filled Philadelphia with inſolvencies. By previouſly ſtretching the price of labour to twice its natural height*, they have materially impeded the maturity, or rather infancy, of American manufactures.

In the preſent, as in other parts of this volume, a

* From the ſcarcity of hands in this country, the price of labour will always be higher, in proportion to that of proviſions, than it is in Europe. But that will not account for its preſent exorbitant riſe.

boldneſs of language has been, ſometimes, unavoidable. Before the friends of order haſten to condemn it, let them look at Mr. Fenno's gazette of March 4th, 1797. It has one article which begins thus. "Died, laſt evening, of a two years conſumption, the *houſe of repreſentatives* of the United States. The remains of this *many-headed* MONSTER, like unto thoſe of the Levite's concubine," &c.—The reſt of the paragraph correſponds with ſuch a beginning. Mr. Fenno would certainly be very glad, if the houſe of repreſentatives were aboliſhed. If any writer ſhould ſpeak in this way of the ſenate, the ſame editor would arraign him as a jacobin. To the admirers of the ſenatorial gazette, an author may reply in the words of Boileau: "Sir, while you can reliſh ſuch verſes as thoſe of your marquis, you will do me a particular pleaſure by deſpiſing mine."

"If the Redacteur*," ſays citizen Fauchet, "had contained, againſt the federal government, the hundredth part of what is daily to be found in the Gazette of the United States, againſt the directory; the legiſlative body; and, in general, againſt the republic; ſome forward deputies, with good reaſon, perhaps, would, long ago, have made a motion for calling the directory *to an account on the ſubject*. A writer, openly known to be in the pay of the Britiſh legation, publiſhes, periodically, in Philadelphia, the moſt atrocious libels againſt us; and it is almoſt certain, that this libeller is encouraged by all thoſe who compoſe the adminiſtration†."

Preſident Adams has obligingly aſcertained, that this Britiſh agent enjoys *his* patronage, by permitting the man to publiſh an edition of his DEFENCE,

* A French newſpaper under the influence of the directory.

† A Sketch of the Preſent State, &c. tranſlated by Bache, p. 25.

No perſon has been more ſeverely attacked by the friends of order than Mr. Frederick Auguſtus Muhlenberg. At the ſame time, his political friends have been offended by his caſting vote in favour of Jay's treaty. The following paper, written by himſelf, explains the motives of his conduct.

"Since the deciſion of the treaty buſineſs, I "have been charged with deſerting the republican "cauſe, and acting with duplicity. A ſhort hiſtory "or ſtate of facts is ſubmitted to impartial "friends.

"I was oppoſed to the treaty from its firſt ap- "pearance, and was one of the committee who "applied to the executive not to ratify it. When "the queſtion for paſſing the laws neceſſary to "carry it into effect was agitated in the commit- "tee of the whole, I continued to oppoſe to it. "But finding the numerous petitions in favour of "it; the unuſual ſenſation, and party rancour, it "had occaſioned, particularly to the eaſtward, and "conſidering that it had been ratified by two-thirds "of the ſenate and the preſident, I did not think "it was prudent to carry the oppoſition farther, "unleſs it appeared probable that there would be "a reſpectable majority in the houſe to counterba- "lance the weight of its friends and ſupporters. I "felt a decided belief that otherwiſe oppoſition would "tend more to injure than benefit the republican "cauſe. I avowed this opinion, at ſeveral private "meetings of members of the houſe, at one of "which I was pointedly aſked what I deemed a reſpec- "table majority, and whether I deemed fifteen, ſuch "as had appeared on the queſtion for obtaining "the papers, a reſpectable one? I replied that I did, "and that I thought eight reſpectable, but in this in- "ſtance would even be content with five. I ex- "preſſed my doubts whether that number would

" eventually appear, although the gentlemen pre-
" ſent were of a different opinion. From the know-
" ledge which I had of the ſentiments of the members,
" which I expreſſed to ſeveral of my friends on
" the morning of the day on which the deciſion took
" place, it terminated much in the manner that I
" expected. To many members of the then con-
" greſs I can appeal for the truth of the above;
" and I challenge any one of my acquaintances,
" either in or out of congreſs, to prove that I ever
" pledged myſelf, at all events, to vote againſt
" appropriations. I had an opinion of my own,
" and was determined to vote as exiſting circum-
" ſtances ſhould direct to be moſt prudent, and for
" the real benefit of my country. As to a ſeem-
" ing inconſiſtency in my conduct, when the queſ-
" tion was before the houſe, I equally deny that.
" I was for the preamble, which declares the treaty
" objectionable. By calling the yeas and nays, I
" knew that this opinion, whether it prevailed or
" not, would be brought on the journals, where
" my name appears in the affirmative. This being
" effected, I cared leſs about the final deciſion, though
" the imperious circumſtances which preſented
" themſelves led me to conſent to the meaſure, lea-
" ving the reſponſibility with thoſe who had for-
" med and ratified the treaty, and had been ſo
" indefatigable in raiſing the ſtorm, and bringing
" the houſe, and this country, into ſo diſgraceful a
" dilemma. If I have erred, I have experienced
" the human lot. If I have injured my country,
" which I cannot yet ſee, it was not done deſign-
" edly. Suffice it to ſay, I acted according to the
" beſt of my judgement, without intereſted views,
" and with a full knowledge that it would injure
" me with thoſe who deem themſelves excluſive
" patriots and republicans. But as neither that

" conſideration, nor any intereſted views whatever " have, ſo I truſt that they never will have, an " influence on my own opinion and judgment in " public affairs. Whatever improper motives may " be aſcribed to me, a conſciouſneſs of having ac- " ted uprightly will conſole me, whilſt I am ſatiſ- " fied that I have the genuine republican intereſt of " this country as much at heart, as any one, though " I may raiſe leſs clamour about it. So far from " having deſerted it, I can with greater truth and " propriety aſſert, that many of my quondam re- " publican friends have deſerted me, and treated " me ungenerouſly.

" PHILADELPHIA, }
" *January 1ſt*, 1798." }

CHAPTER IX.

General remarks on the ſtate of the union.—Dearth of proviſions.—Hardſhips of the poor.—Methods in Europe to prevent famine.—Plan for relieving the poor.—Unequal preſſure of taxes.—Double-head's horſes.—Oppreſſive ſuperiority of the American landed intereſt.—On the preſent ſcarcity of caſh.—Importance of American manufactures.—Hiſtory of the American navy.—Summary of the preſent ſituation of the United States.

IT is clear, at the firſt glance, that ſomething muſt be unnatural in the preſent condition of the United States. Except in ſome parts of New-England, they are free from the expenſive uſurpation of an eſtabliſhed church. Induſtry is not cramped by corporation laws. Excellent land may be had

for a trifle. The people, in proportion to their numbers, are taxed, upon an average, above ſeven times leſs than thoſe of Britain*. Yet with all theſe circumſtances, ſo prodigiouſly favourable to proſperity, government ſtaggers under a heavy debt, of which the intereſt is paid by an effort. Congreſs want to borrow farther ſums, and it is hard to ſee where the ſmalleſt loan can be had. Their ingenuity has been racked in deviſing taxes, of which ſome were unproductive, like that upon ſnuff, and others, like the ſugar exciſe, were oppreſſive. Both impoſt and internal taxes are carried as far as they can go; and the laſt and preſent houſe of repreſentatives have, by a large majority, rejected a land-tax.

Within leſs than nine years from the birth of her new conſtitution†, America ſeems to have completed the career of her funding ſyſtem, and to be as firmly wedged in all its evils, as the monarchy of France was, juſt before it expired. By ſea, an attempt was made to build ſix frigates. After driveling for ſome years, without being able to finiſh them, the propoſed number was reduced to three. By land, it has been found burdenſome to ſupport an eſtabliſhment of three thouſand regulars. At ſea, our commerce has been plundered with impunity, by every nation that choſe to do ſo; while the whole weſtern frontier has been violated by a few ſolitary tribes of ſavages, who make treaties only to break them, and whoſe ſuſpenſion of hoſtility is

* If this country contains five millions of inhabitants, the net amount of taxes for the year ending on September 30th, 1796, came to a dollar and one-third per head. Britain has a population of ten millions. They now (January 1798) are ſaid to pay twenty-two millions and an half ſterling of annual taxes, which make ten dollars per head. The ſupplies for the current year are not here included.

† Congreſs met, for the firſt time, at New-York, on April 1ſt, 1789.

always courted by government with freſh preſents. It is hard to conceive a more conſummate picture of political debility. With excellent ſailors, and the beſt ſhip timber in the world, America cannot obtain a fleet. With a militia of immenſe numbers, the Indians are yet permitted to murder families by the dozen.

In the ſea-port towns of this country proviſions were, for ſome years paſt, at a higher price than, in common ſeaſons, they coſt in any part of Europe. Yet, in 1795, the exports compriſed an hundred and forty one thouſand buſhels of wheat; two millions one hundred and eighty-ſeven thouſand buſhels of other grain and pulſe; ſix hundred and eighty-ſeven thouſand barrels of flour; an hundred and ſeventy-nine thouſand barrels of meal and bread; an hundred and thirty-eight thouſand tierces of rice; two hundred and one thouſand barrels of beef, pork, and lard; four hundred thouſand quintals, and fifty-ſix thouſand barrels of fiſh; twenty-three thouſand hundred weight of cheeſe; twenty-eight thouſand firkins of butter; and ſix hundred and ninety-five thouſand buſhels of potatoes and onions. Nor is this year ſelected for any peculiar magnitude of exports. In 1790, there were ſhipped ſeven hundred and twenty-four thouſand barrels of flour; in 1791, ſix hundred and nineteen thouſand; in 1792, eight hundred and twenty-four thouſand; in 1793, one million and ſeventy-four thouſand; and, in 1794, eight hundred and twenty-eight thouſand. During 1796, an hundred and ninety-ſeven thouſand barrels of flour were ſhipped at the port of Philadelphia only. In the marſh-market of Baltimore, five hundred turkies have been ſometimes ſold in a ſingle day. New-York is famous for the peculiar excellence and variety of its fiſh; and Philadelphia is amply ſupplied with every article of ſubſiſtence.

How then did it happen, that theſe markets were, for ſo long a period, exorbitantly dear? How did it come to paſs that, while America kept other nations from ſtarving, the manufacturers, and labouring poor, in the ſea-ports, and through ſome parts of the country, were condemned to extortion?

At fifteen dollars per barrel, a pound of flour comes to four-pence, and one-ſeventh ſterling. Add one-third for the profit of the baker. It then coſts ſix-pence ſterling, or ten-pence currency. At this price, a labouring man, with a dollar per working day, a wife and four children, could only buy, out of his dollar, nine or ten pounds of bread; and on Sunday he muſt have faſted. For ſix perſons this pittance was juſt able to keep ſoul and body together. But what was he to do for a reliſh to his bread? Himſelf and family could not go naked. A ſwarm of incidents were to ruſh upon his pocket*.

> Each day commences with a cloud of bills,
> For taylors, nurſes, ſpelling-books, and pills;
> To-night, more cradles he muſt buy or borrow,
> And a twelfth ſexton's fee pay down to-morrow.

Houſe rent, alſo, was an important item. He had, if in town, to pay, at leaſt, forty dollars per annum for ſome hole, beſide which, an Engliſh farmer's pig-ſtye was another temple of Epheſus. It is amazing to think of the patience with which poor people do, in this country, endure ſuch treatment; and of the profound ſilence, regarding their wrongs, that is obſerved by our admirable newſpapers. When a tradeſman cannot, with his utmoſt induſtry, keep his children from ſtarving; when not a ſingle ſtatute interpoſes for his relief, what ought he to

* In 1780, in the midſt of a bloody war, in a country comparatively barren, and over-loaded with innumerable taxes, fourteen ounces of the fineſt wheaten bread were ſold at Edinburgh, for one penny ſterling.

care who ſhall be preſident, or what becomes of the legiſlature of the ſtate wherein he lives, or of the repreſentatives of the union? The man to whom government does not extend ſuitable protection, has no obligation to feel towards it either gratitude, attachment, or reſpect. The wages of labour did not riſe in any thing like an equal proportion to the price of proviſions, and the general expence of living. Thus the poor were placed, like Tantalus, juſt within reach of plenty, which they were forbidden to taſte. The beſt economiſt in Philadelphia would be puzzled to ſupport a family of ſix perſons, though he had ten dollars per week, when flour was at fifteen, or even twelve dollars, per barrel. But it is certain that great numbers of tradeſmen and labourers protracted the exiſtence of themſelves and their families, upon a weekly income of ſix or eight dollars, while flour ſtood at fifteen dollars, and while ſome of Mr. Thomas Willing's compurgators* were borrowing and lending wind-bills and paper dollars to each other, at five per cent. a month, to facilitate the exportation of ſeven hundred thouſand barrels of flour. Both ſides of this picture explain why the priſon of Philadelphia has long been as populous as a bee-hive, and why, in the yellow fever of Auguſt, 1797, numbers of citizens were compelled to remain and periſh, becauſe they could dot muſter the expences requiſite for a removal. The poor form the pedeſtal on which ſociety does ultimately reſt; and this is the degree of attention which they and their hardſhips meet with, from the government and police of this wiſeſt of nations.

Such a vaſt and ſudden riſe in the rate of ſubſiſtence muſt, in England, have produced an actual famine,

* See the laſt chapter.

and thouſands were ſure to have died of hunger, though adminiſtration would undoubtedly have done every thing poſſible to prevent it. A London newſpaper of December, 1795, ſays, that two millions ſterling had, in that year, been paid for bounties on the importation of corn. This bounty proved a trap-door to American merchants. Flour was bought here at fourteen dollars per barrel, and ſold in Liverpool for eight dollars. The bounty might, perhaps, cover the expence of freight. Members of parliament, and others, entered into reſolutions for eating coarſe bread, and the homelineſs of that ſerved up at the royal table was deſcribed, in a miniſterial print, with minuteneſs and exultation. But in America, miſery, like that then felt in England, can hardly take place; becauſe the cheapneſs of land outweighs many legiſlative imperfections. Nine-tenths of people are farmers, and of conſequence take care, in the firſt place, to feed themſelves. Of the reſt, a large majority poſſeſs property of ſome kind, and do not live, as the phraſe is, from hand to mouth. Hence the poſitive ſufferers formed a much leſſer proportion to the community than they would have done in France, or England. Now, it always happens that a poor man, reſiding in the midſt of ten others richer than himſelf, contrives to joſtle on with more eaſe than if all his neighbours were, like him, neceſſitous. This is one main reaſon why the more dependent claſs in the ſea-ports did not endure that awful extremity of diſtreſs which, in 1795, almoſt overwhelmed Britain. Beſides, if a poor man has a numerous family, he can find ſome perſon who will take healthy children on an indenture, as ſervants or apprentices*.

* This is the caſe in Pennſylvania, but New-England differs from it. A perſon there will, it is ſaid, be glad to ſupport his ſon during an apprenticeſhip, for the ſake of his learning the trade.

But, for theſe alleviating circumſtances, no thanks are due to the rulers of America; and though people did not abſolutely die of hunger, yet there exiſted between that and competency many modes of ſubſtantial hard fortune. It was culpable in our legiſlators to ſtand tamely by, while part of its citizens laboured under ſuch peculiar penury.

Yet it is more eaſy to point out misfortunes than to provide an effectual remedy. In Europe, five different methods have been practiſed to prevent or to remove the diſtreſſes of famine. One of theſe is to proffer a bounty on the inſtant importation of foreign grain. The ſecond gives premiums for the improvement of agriculture. As for American ſcarcity, both of theſe plans are out of the queſtion. Proviſions always abound, but the poor cannot ſometimes get at them. A third expedient is to prohibit by law the exporting of victuals, when they have riſen in the market beyond a certain price. The maritime parts of Britain are, with this view, divided into diſtricts*, and the ſheriff of each county, has under ſome reſtrictions, a diſcretionary power of opening or ſhutting the ports. But the Britiſh corn laws do not invite imitation. They propagate ſo much confuſion and miſchief as to diſcourage regulations of that nature. A fourth ſource of relief has been by the diſtribution of money, or proviſions, at the public expence. In the caſe of the fire at Savannah, the houſe of repreſentatives determined that the conſtitution did not allow them to beſtow charity. The aſſembly of Penſylvania, however, gave, on the ſame occaſion, fifteen thouſand dollars. But this practice of donations, beſides being

* See particulars in *The Political Progreſs of Britain*, Part 1ſt, 3d edition, Chap. 4th.

altogether a direct and heavy expence, becomes very liable to abuse.

A fifth scheme, practised in Geneva, and Switzerland, is to have large granaries constantly stocked with flour. By a peculiar process of beating it into a hard substance, flour is preserved, without injury, for several years, as lord Gardenstone was assured on the spot, by people concerned in the business. Now, although congress cannot give money, they can lend it. Fifty thousand dollars were, in 1795, appropriated for trading with the Indians, and, in 1796, an hundred and fifty thousand dollars*. Congress have also wandered to the depth of two millions of dollars in banking. It would seem as agreeable both to sound policy, and to the constitution, to establish granaries in a few of the principal towns on the sea-coast that are most liable to a rise of markets. Individual pride, and some rules of restriction, would hinder the rich, or those in easy circumstances, from battening upon this institution. Let a number of poor families be enrolled, and supplied from this source with flour, at all seasons of the year, for six dollars per barrel. This would place the lower classes more at their ease, and tend greatly to cheapness of labour, increase of emigration, and the facility of establishing manufactures.

Besides the good policy of such a plan, of which the above hints are a faint outline, justice requires retribution to the inhabitants of sea-ports, who bear, beyond all proportion, the greatest weight of public taxes. In 1796, the duties on merchandize and tonnage amounted to twelve times more than the whole produce of internal taxes. But it is evident that the inhabitants of the sea-port

* Folwell's edition of Acts of Congress, vol. iii. p. 232 and 259.

towns conſume a greater quantity of the imports than an equal number of people in the country, eſpecially at a diſtance from the ſea-coaſt. For inſtance, take the article of clothing. In towns, a weaver is generally a rare phænomenon. It is believed that Philadelphia does not contain even a ſingle weaver. But in the country, and eſpecially remote from the ſea, the people make their own cloth. In the debates on Mr. Madiſon's reſolutions, general Scott, of Waſhington county, in this ſtate, obſerved, that the union contained about four millions and five hundred thouſand people, and that their bedding and cloathing could not come to leſs than ten dollars annually per head, being, in the whole, forty-five millions of dollars. "Where ſaid he, "do all theſe manufactures "come from? Suppoſe that Britiſh imports were "two millions ſterling, and one half of them in "clothing. The amount is only about four mil-"lions and five hundred thouſand dollars, or one-"tenth part of the annual conſumption." None of theſe calculations can be rigidly exact*. Yet they clearly ſhew that one great branch of impoſt falls by far the moſt heavily on people in the ſea-ports, who, at leaſt to the ſouth of New-England, wear, in general, Britiſh or Iriſh manufactures, while inland inhabitants are ſpinning and weaving for themſelves. Other articles, ſuch as wine, tea, ſugar, and coffee, are uſed much more commonly in towns than in the country. It has always been a favourite maxim in congreſs to throw the ſtreſs of taxation upon impoſt, and recently on exciſe. Hence, it is likely, that the fifty or ſixty thouſand inhabitants of Philadelphia pay thrice as much

* The duty on articles of wearing does not, probably, exceed one-fourth part of the whole impoſt. Conſult Mr. Gallatin p. 18.

money to government as the four weſtern counties of Pennſylvania, the ſtates of Vermont, Tenneſſee, and Kentucky collectively. While the legiſlature give ſix hundred and twenty dollars for the fare of Doublehead's horſes*, and ſixty-four thouſand dollars per annum in the ſhape of penſions and rations to the ſavages†, it would not certainly be extravagant to lay out fifty or an hundred thouſand, upon granaries for the benefit of a moſt uſeful body of citizens.

The landed intereſt enjoys, indeed, entire aſcendancy, in the federal government. The conſtitution, article i. ſection ix. ſays, that "no "tax or duty ſhall be laid on articles *exported* "from any ſtate." Section x. apparently reverſes this article by declaring, that "no ſtate ſhall, "*without the conſent of congreſs*, lay any impoſts "or duties on imports, or *exports*, except what "may be abſolutely neceſſary for executing its "inſpection laws." By the firſt clauſe, defining the power of congreſs, they are diſabled from laying any duty on *exports*. By the ſecond, they can expreſsly grant a power to individual ſtates of laying duties on exports, beyond what is needful for the purpoſe of inſpection. They are authorized to give a right, which they dare not exerciſe in their own capacity. But paſſing over this ſeeming inconſiſtency, the received doctrine is that no duty can be levied on exports. By this exemption, the farmers gain an immenſe, and apparently an unfair advantage. A barrel of flour, or a hogſhead of tobacco, when exported, brings as

* "To David Whitmore, on account of *horſe keeping* for ſundry "Indians, - - - - - - - 620 dollars."
Treaſurer's Accounts for 1796, *p.* 123.

† Mr. Wolcott's report for 1797, p. 22, where the firſt five articles of the Indian department, are excluſively for the uſe of Indians, and come to that ſum.

clear profit to its owner as a loaf of refined ſugar; nor is it obvious that there ſhould be a diſtinction in the right of taxing them. When ſeven or eight hundred thouſand barrels of flour are exported in a ſingle year, at the exorbitant price of twelve or fifteen dollars, one ſhould imagine that the farmer might well afford to pay a duty of one dollar per barrel. This claſs reap undiſturbed the profit of an immenſe exportation, while they caſt the burden of public expence almoſt entirely on the manufacturers, and conſumers of exports. A land tax has been oppoſed as impracticable to be levied. A duty on exports might be collected without the addition of many revenue officers, and perhaps without the ſmalleſt increaſe of their preſent number.

From the prodigious advance in the amount of exports, a queſtion has been ſtarted as to the ſcarcity of money, for the two laſt years. Mr. Harper, in his firſt letter to his conſtituents, ſays, p. 21, that "it would be very much for our intereſt for Bri-"tain to remain at war with all Europe, becauſe "ſhe and her enemies are obliged to purchaſe our "proviſions at *an enormous price*, and our neutra-"lity gives us immenſe advantages in *the carrying* "*trade*." If foreign nations could be prevented from ſea-robbery, the United States might certainly derive benefit, though it would be purchaſed on ſhocking conditions. There is a greater advantage to be hoped from it. The contending powers, by the weakening of each other, may, for ſome years, be diſabled from tyrannizing ſo much as they would, perhaps, be otherwiſe diſpoſed to do, over the defenceleſs navigation of America. The captures which they have made afford one great reaſon for the decline of credit. This loſs falls chiefly on the mercantile intereſt, and the ſcarcity of caſh is moſt felt in that quarter. With augmented profits, the

farmers have, undoubtedly, much augmented their expence of houſe-keeping. Their demands for manufactures increaſed conſiderably, at leaſt in ſome parts of the union, during 1796. But beſides, the country holds out an immenſe field for improvement, and it is improving rapidly in ſpite of the alledged ſcarcity of caſh. A man dealing to the value of ten thouſand dollars, makes often larger gains, than from turning over only two thouſand; but as his projects frequently augment much faſter than his capital, he very often finds himſelf more ſtraitened than when his expected profits were much ſmaller. The ſpirit of exceſſive land-jobbing on one ſide may turn out as diſtreſſing as that of over-trading on the other. Each diſtemper will, in due time, partly cure itſelf. If matters could be reduced to a proper level, it will be found that there has been rather a diſtortion, and partial miſapplication, than a diminution of general wealth, which, when matters can be duly tempered and balanced, has undoubtedly, within the laſt three years, received ſome increaſe. In every part of the country, the area of cultivated land is hourly augmenting. Every newſpaper announces the formation of additional ſettlements, the planning of roads and bridges, and ſometimes of canals, and though our numbers are daily augmenting, yet every man connected with agriculture, finds employment and compenſation. Within the laſt twelve months, land has, indeed, fallen much in its value, and eſpecially in the back countries; but that is becauſe it had been racked beyond its real worth by the dreams of ſpeculation. That fever is now ſubſiding, and the pulſe of prices, by returning to its former and more ſteady height, promiſes, not a decline of vigour, but the reſtoration of political health. One of our inſolvent land-jobbers, whoſe bills are advertiſed for auction,

and knocked down at a ſhilling or ſix-pence per pound, will, perhaps, tell a creditor, that he is one of the richeſt men in the country; but that the bankruptcies in Europe cauſed the return of his bills under proteſt, and he cannot ſubmit to ſell his lands, at this juncture, when they would not bring one-half of their real value. He, therefore, locks himſelf up, and till the return of better days, bids defiance to juſtice. In this explanation, however, that he gives, there occurs no actual deſtruction of real property, but of that which was imaginary. He obtained immenſe ſums in paper money, which he never could have procured in gold and ſilver. He became entangled with the brokers, at thirty or ſixty per cent. and, in his exploſion, ruined an immenſe number of creditors. Still, however, the land remains. The graſs will grow; the corn will ripen; and the ſoil will, in due time, bring its natural price, juſt as if he and his projects never had exiſted. The ruin of ſo many individuals is a conſiderable misfortune; but ſtill it is one of that kind from which the country at large, though not the immediate ſufferers, will ſoon recover. The bank of Ayr, in North Britain, which broke near thirty years ago, is a caſe in point. After a ſhort, but rapid progreſs, it ſtopt payment, having granted credit almoſt indiſcriminately, to every adventurer. To have ſeen the liſts of bankruptcies, and the notices of the ſale of lands, one might have ſuppoſed that the nation was irredeemably ruined. Beſides every other ſort of miſchief, land was, within a few years, ſold, to pay the company's debts, to the value of ſeven hundred thouſand pounds ſterling. But amidſt all this alarm, it was not an extinction but only a tranſference of property. Agriculture continued to extend its progreſs, with more than uſual rapidity; and notwithſtanding the wreck of ſo much private credit, the

effects were not visible in the general mass of property. This fact, however unaccountable, was generally remarked at the time; and as the natural resources of America are infinitely greater than those of North-Britain, she will overcome this embarrassment with still greater facility.

To hasten this amendment, a check should be given to the enormous extent of paper currency. No expedient appears less distressing to individuals, or more simple and expeditious in its operation than to abolish all notes under fifty dollars. An interval of time would, no doubt, be granted to prevent too sudden a jerk in the state of circulation. Some effectual steps ought likewise to be taken for the suppression of usury. Till that bramble shall be grubbed from the roots, all other regulations will be found incomplete, for the recovery of mercantile soundness. This truth is so trite as to be repeated in this place with reluctance. But the practice of exacting enormous interest, has become so frequent, and its professors are now so numerous, that to give, or to receive thirty per cent. is not considered as disgraceful.

It cannot be too often repeated that till the exorbitant quantity of paper money shall be reduced, and till the practice of usury shall also be checked, all hopes of being able to manufacture entirely for ourselves must end with disappointment. The importance of that object has been stated in an advertisement of a late edition of Shakespeare, and the following extract merits preservation. "The "independence of the United States cannot be "secure, till we shall be much farther removed "than at present, from the necessity of importing "the manufactures of Europe. It is ridiculous "and humiliating, that we should so frequently "send four thousand miles for a pair of blankets,

" a pen-knife, a pſalm-book, and a quire of pa-
" per. This ſituation, ſo unnatural and abſurd,
" cannot laſt long, and, the ſooner that we put
" an end to it, the better. It was the conſtant
" policy of Britain, to rivet the ſhackles of this
" country, by ſtrangling in their cradle, her in-
" fant manufactures. Chatham, whoſe ſtatue has
" been erected and demoliſhed in this country,
" declared, in parliament, that he would not ſuf-
" fer the colonies to manufacture a hob-nail for a
" horſeſhoe. If this antagoniſt of America, could
" expreſs himſelf in ſuch language, we know upon
" what quarter public intereſt calls for exertion.
" We no longer ſend for hob-nails, becauſe, by a
" late ingenious invention, we make nails better,
" quicker, and cheaper than any other people; and
" we may ſoon expect other diſcoveries of utility.

" Of manufactures few deſerve encouragement
" better than that of paper. But it can never
" reach maturity, while we continue to import
" annually from Europe, ſuch immenſe quanti-
" ties of printed books. As paper itſelf is made
" out of rags, and as this is the only uſe to which
" they can be put, the price of paper manufactur-
" ed in America, is, in a great meaſure, clear
" gain to the country. This is one reaſon why
" the erection of paper mills claims patronage
" from every friend to the United States.

" But that is not all. By extending the ſcale of
" making paper, we may expect to lower its price,
" and by lowering the price of paper, we encou-
" rage another great and moſt uſeful trade, that
" of printing. The latter, within the laſt ten
" years, has ariſen in this city from almoſt nothing,
" to a conſiderable extent. Typography augments
" the ſtock of public knowledge, and knowledge
" improves the morals, and ſtimulates the diligence

" of the people. So attentive is Britain to her " intereſt, in this reſpect, that no book which " has ever been printed in that iſland, is allowed " to be imported into it. If ſuch a book falls out " of print, the nation muſt remain without it, un- " leſs a Britiſh bookſeller ſhall republiſh it.

" Theſe conſiderations ſhew the propriety of " encouraging a publication like ours. It is time " that American manufactures ſhould begin to " take root, for, in twenty years, we ſhall equal " the population of Britain. To promote all " kinds of domeſtic induſtry, is the moſt ef- " fectual method to explode the ſchemes of fo- " reign monopoly, and the conſpiracies of Euro- " pean deſpotiſm, to invigorate THE POLITICAL " PROGRESS of the United States, to extend the " baſis of their proſperity, and enſure their in- " dependence."

In the outſet of this chapter, notice was taken of the attempt to commence an American navy. Such an eſtabliſhment never can ſucceed in this country, to any real purpoſe, till wages are reduced. The ſame reaſon that retards other manufactures will obſtruct that of ſhips, whenever they are to be built at the expence of *government*; or at leaſt of *ſuch* a government as that which we now enjoy. The Treaſurer's Accounts, for 1796*, mention ſix hundred and ſeventy dollars and eighty cents to *John Barry, for his pay and ſubſiſtence, as captain of one of the frigates*. This was the leader of that banditti, who treated members of the legiſlature of Pennſylvania in the manner already deſcribed†. To entruſt this man with a public commiſſion was, in itſelf, a mark of diſreſpect to public order. But the riot was perpetrated on the

* Page 6. † Hiſtory of 1796, Chap. VII.

federal ſide, and that would have been accepted as an ample excuſe, by his preſent employers, although his rabble had burnt the ſtate-houſe. No mortal, excepting a Philadelphian board of admiralty, ever dreamed of paying the captain of a ſhip for three or four years before ſhe was built. This is an undiſguiſed theft of public money; yet although *theft* is its only proper name, not one of our repreſentatives has dared to challenge it. The ſalary is nine hundred dollars per annum; and ſuppoſing it held for three years before the launch, then each of our three captains has coſt two thouſand ſeven hundred dollars before he had any veſſel to command. Our executive might as well have caſt theſe eight thouſand one hundred dollars, into the Delaware. The duke of Richmond's tax upon coals is a larger but not a plainer job; nor has the ſalary of Dr. James Meaſe, at Mud Iſland, been more woefully thrown away. From ſuch a ſample the inference is that prodigality has engrafted itſelf upon every other part of the expenditure of the eleven hundred thouſand dollars; and that it is imprudent to truſt our exiſting rulers with any money that can be kept out of their hands. Theſe penſions to captains are like an Engliſh county-mark on a ſharper's cheek, which at once unfolds the receſſes of his character. This would have been a powerful anſwer from Mr. Chriſtie, to Meſſrs. Parker and Swanwick's defence of the ſix frigates.

On June 24th, 1797, Mr. Gallatin ſaid, in congreſs, that the building of the frigates would coſt double, and the payment of their ſeamen, almoſt treble of what they would have done in Britain. This is one of the conſequences of an exceſs of paper money. A million of dollars, in 1796, were not, in reality, worth more than ſeven hundred thou-

ſand, or thereby, three years before. The alteration in value has been ſeverely felt by government. From October 1ſt, 1795, to September 30th, 1796, the charges of the military department amounted to twelve hundred and ſixty-three thouſand dollars. Of this ſum, it is likely that one-third or fourth part would have been ſaved, if flour had not riſen beyond eight dollars per barrel. If congreſs had been able to lay a duty upon exports, this inconvenience muſt have found a remedy. A duty of three dollars per barrel on exportation was ſure of making flour as much cheaper at home. But at preſent, the immeſurable influence of the landed intereſt overbears every other part of the community. Commerce cannot be protected without a fleet, and yet the farmers, who reap the largeſt ſhare of the benefits of commerce, refuſe even a penny to build one. "You ſhall not tax our exports," ſays the conſtitution. "You ſhall not tax our lands," exclaim the farming majority in congreſs. "Buy our flour, "at double the former price. Enſure and ſhip it. "You and the underwriters muſt look to that. If "we are paid, it is a matter of indifference in our "eyes, whether your veſſels are captured or not. "We ſhall not pay for mounting a ſingle tier of "guns to protect them." The farmers have treated the merchants with as much ungeneroſity, as the latter have exhibited towards their ſeamen*.

The original object of the frigates was to ſail to the coaſt of Africa, and attack the Algerines. The abſurdity of that plan has already been proved†; but the inference does not follow, that American commerce can ever be ſecure without a navy. Four material objections occur againſt proceeding, at preſent, in the buſineſs. *Firſt*, Government has no

* Hiſtory of 1796, Chap. III.

† American Annual Regiſter, Chap. III. & IX.

money, and could not borrow a ſum equal to any ſerious equipment. *Second*, Unleſs there is either a land-tax, or an amendment of the conſtitution, as to taxing of exports, the treaſury muſt always be in a mendicant condition, and incapable to ſupport a navy, though it were built for nothing. *Third*, It is admitted, that the frigates have coſt much more than they ſhould have done, after allowing for the riſe of wages. Hence, it is diſagreeable to vote money for ſuch bad managers. *Fourth*, If Mr. Adams poſſeſſed a fleet of any tolerable force, he would never be quiet, until he got into ſome quarrel with the French navy. An American ſquadron is highly needful, but till the ſyſtem of finance has been improved, the plan of building one cannot be ſucceſsful. At the ſame time, till public money ſhall be under more frugal management, it could hardly be adviſeable.

The following is a ſhort hiſtory of the progreſs and expence of the federal navy. On March 27th, 1794, an act paſt for building four frigates of forty-four guns, and two of thirty-ſix. A ſecond act of June 9th, 1794, appropriated ſix hundred and eighty-eight thouſand, eight hundred and eighty eight dollars, and eighty two cents "to defray the "expences which ſhall be incurred, purſuant to" that act. This expreſſion is not correct. The former law had likewiſe appointed the number of the crews, their wages and rations; but the appropriation of money, of June 9th, did not extend to theſe articles. It regarded only the charge of building the ſix frigates*. The eſtimates of this expence bore an appearance of great exactneſs,

* In the Aurora, of January 18th, 1798, a writer ſays that this ſum comprehended *ſix months proviſions*. I find nothing in the ſtatute book to ſupport ſuch an aſſertion.

when they extended to eighty-two odd cents. But notice the ſequel. Early in June, 1794, an act paſt for the equipment of gallies, and that of June 9th, the laſt day of the ſeſſion, appropriated eighty thouſand dollars for this uſe. The law for the gallies was ſince repealed, and, on April 20th, 1796, congreſs added the ſum appointed for them to the fund for the frigates. At the ſame time, the latter were reduced from ſix to three, viz. to two of forty-four guns and one of thirty-ſix.

Notwithſtanding this reduction, an act of March 3d, 1797, granted an hundred and ſeventy-two thouſand additional dollars "for finiſhing the fri-"gates *United States*, *Conſtitution*, and *Conſtella-*"*tion*;" beſides five thouſand for the pay and ſubſiſtence of three *captains*, and of labourers employed in taking care of the three frigates. An act of July 10th, 1797, aſſigned two hundred thouſand dollars more for completing of theſe frigates.

The whole ſums appropriated ſtood thus.

		Dollars. Cts.
For the ſix frigates - -		688,888 82
ADDITIONAL to finiſh three of theſe veſſels, - -	80,000	
	172,000	
	200,000	
		452,000
Total,		1,140,888 82

By the firſt eſtimate, ſix frigates were to be completed for ſix hundred and eighty-eight thouſand dollars; and, yet with four hundred and fifty-two thouſand as a ſupplement, three were not finiſhed. In the preſent ſeſſion, of November 1797, an hundred and fifty thouſand dollars were again aſked.

Surpriſed by this new demand, Mr. Livingſton brought into the houſe of repreſentatives a reſolution for appointing a committee of enquiry into the expenditure of money, which had been appropriated for the naval ſervice.

The reſolution was taken up on the 15th of January, 1798. Mr. Harper objected to it, as implying a cenſure on public officers, which was improper; ſince there had not been ſpecified any ground of ſuſpicion againſt them. He ſaid that ſtatements from the public offices were, within a few days, to be laid before the houſe, agreeably to a previous order, and recommended that no committee ſhould be appointed, till theſe papers had been examined. If they did not prove ſatisfactory, he ſhould vote for enquiry.

Mr. Livingſton replied that the patience of the houſe had been worn out by theſe repeated applications for money. The expence had exceeded all belief. The moſt extenſive imagination could not have conceived an amount like that which congreſs had, from time to time, been blindly led to appropriate. The ſtatements expected, and referred to by Mr. Harper, came down only to January 1ſt, 1797. They could not, therefore, even if the houſe had them, give adequate ſatisfaction. The three hundred and ſeventy-two thouſand dollars granted ſince January 1ſt, 1797, and the demand now made, did not come within the period of theſe papers. This was the main ſcope of Mr. Livingſton's obſervations. The reſolution paſt, and a committee were appointed.

Next day, January 16th, 1798, ſome documents from the war-office were laid before the houſe. Inſtead of an hundred and fifty thouſand dollars, the ſum formerly applied for, only an hundred and fifteen thouſand, eight hundred and thirty-three

dollars, are reported as neceſſary. The total charge will then ſtand thus.

	Dollars.	Cents.
Former grants, - - -	1,140,888	82
Wanted now, - - -	115,833	00
Total expence,	1,256,721	82
Original eſtimate for *ſix* ditto,	688,888	82
Overplus, upon the original eſtimate,	567,833	00

By the computation of March, 1794, each of the ſix frigates was to coſt a fraction leſs than one hundred and fifteen thouſand dollars. By the actual iſſue, in January, 1798, each of theſe three ſhips that were to be completed, will coſt, as above ſpecified, an overplus of an hundred and eighty-nine thouſand dollars. This makes, upon a medium for each frigate, three hundred and four thouſand dollars, inſtead of the original eſtimate of an hundred and fifteen thouſand.

Three ſhips are not to be finiſhed. The materials muſt either be ſold or laid up. It is natural to believe that a conſiderable part of them would be applied to the completion of the other three veſſels. Hence the real coſt of the latter will exceed three hundred and four thouſand dollars each, as trenching on more than their proportion of the materials, bought with the original ſix hundred and eighty-eight thouſand dollars. In a word, it may ſafely be affirmed, that the *United States*, and her two ſiſters, have required thrice as much money as they were expected to coſt; and double the ſum for which an architect on the river Thames would have built them. Almoſt four years have been occupied, and this American armada is not yet completed.

In 1794, when the plan was firſt adopted, Dr.

Smith, and his friends, affirmed, that the frigates might be built, manned, and blockading the ſtreights of Gibraltar, within a year. At the end of *two* years, the preſident informed congreſs, that ſome of their keels were laid, and ſome of their ſtern-poſts raiſed, all *in the beſt manner*. So ſkilful were the calculations of Dr. Smith, and ſo rapid the progreſs of our admiralty! The above documents, of January 16th, eſtimate the pay and ſubſiſtence of the officers and crews for a year, at two hundred and eighty thouſand, three hundred and ſeventy-nine dollars. Thus, the total ſum wanted immediately, amounts to three hundred and ninety-ſix thouſand, two hundred and twelve dollars.

This money can only be raiſed by loan; and, in the fullneſs of time, the intereſt of that loan muſt alſo be borrowed. On July 6th, 1797, an act paſt for a ſtamp duty on vellum, parchment, and paper. But ſuch an uproar has been excited againſt it, that, in the preſent ſeſſion, the operation of the law has been ſuſpended until the firſt of July next. On July 8th, when a number of repreſentatives had gone to the country, an act paſt for an additional duty on ſalt. It originated in the diligence of Dr. Smith. A reſolution is, at preſent, before congreſs for the repeal both of theſe ſalt * and ſtamp duties. They were the only taxes laid in the firſt ſeſſion of the fifth congreſs, and they are moſt likely to be repealed†. In the preceeding ſeſſion, although the want of money was ſtrongly urged, no more than two ſtatutes of taxation were paſt. The one laid an additional duty on certain imported articles. The

* In the ſeſſion of December, 1796, Mr. Findley told the repreſentatives that, before leaving the weſtern country, he had paid ſix guineas for ſix buſhels of ſalt. In that part of Pennſylvania, it is ſaid to have ſometimes coſt eight dollars per buſhel.

† The exciſe on refined ſugar ought to ſhare the ſame fate.

other altered the mode of exciſing ſtills. If they produce any augmentation whatever, of the revenue, it can be but trifling. In the interim, the deſtruction of trade enſures an immenſe mutilation of impoſt duties, for 1797. We ſhall ſoon ſee the particulars in a report from the treaſury.

The expences of government are in a ſtate of conſtant augmentation. The abortive efforts of the two laſt ſeſſions prove, that its practical ſources of new revenue are almoſt exhauſted. When expence uniformly exceeds income, the reſult is known. In the event of a French war, the ruin of commerce would enſure an annual *deficit*, at the treaſury, of ſeveral millions of dollars. The intereſt of the national debt could no longer be paid; and bankruptcy muſt, of courſe, enſue. Yet, in ſummer laſt, penſioner Harper told congreſs that, "if "we threw our ſword into the Britiſh ſcale, the "French would *kick the beam!*" America can be but a cracker at the tail of England's exploſion. Mr. Allen, in the ſame ſeſſion, declared, that, "if France "obtained Louiſiana from Spain, we ought to *de*-"*clare war* againſt the republic." He did not inform the houſe on what right he reſted their claim to direct Spain in the diſpoſal of her colonies. On the ſame ground, if congreſs were to aſſign Rhode-Iſland, or Nantucket, to the Dutch, England, or Sweden, would be warranted in commencing hoſtilities againſt this country. We need not ſtartle at jacobin rapacity, or the partition of Poland, or the Britiſh in the Old Jerſey, or the Dutch at Amboyna, or Titus at Jeruſalem, when one of *our own* ineſtimable repreſentatives recommends a project the hermaphrodite offspring of Newgate and of bedlam. It is time to ſpeak diſtinctly, when a few lunatics or traitors have brought this continent to the brink of a French war, that is, to the brink of perdition.

In three months after it ſhall begin, the value of ground property, in Philadelphia, will ſink to fifty per cent. of its preſent value.

Another ſure conſequence muſt be the breaking up of the union. Kentucky and Tenneſſee have been long and juſtly exaſperated at the Hamiltonian ſyſtem of defending the frontiers. The approaching cloſe of this volume does not leave room for inſerting an inveſtigation of that amazing buſineſs*. Many tyrants have wantonly murdered their ſubjects; but the Waſhington cabinet exhibits the firſt example in hiſtory, of a government, that will neither defend its people, nor ſuffer them to defend themſelves. On the Atlantic ſide of the continent, this ſubject is as groſsly miſapprehended, as the weſtern expedition hitherto has been. Kentucky and Tenneſſee are in a rapid progreſs of population†. They know the real cauſe which retards the execution of the Spaniſh treaty, and the ſetting open of the weſtern waters. France is enraged at the compact with England. She ſways, with irreſiſtable weight, in the court of Madrid; and the treaty with Spain will never be fulfilled, till that with England has been modified or diſſolved. The ſouth-weſtern citizens regard a free navigation as the chief object of their wiſhes. The republic, by the medium of Spain, has only to hold out this temptation, as the ſignal of revolt. The Philadelphians would not conſent to ſhut up the Delaware, for the ſake of protracting their

* A paper on this head is ready for the preſs, and will appear at an early opportunity.

† In 1796, twenty-two thouſand white people, and eleven thouſand blacks, emigrated into the weſtern part of Tenneſſee. They had to croſs Cumberland river by two ferries, at which an account was kept of their numbers. I had this from Mr. Andrew Jackſon, one of the ſenators from that ſtate, in the preſent congreſs. He computes the total amount of emigrants, in 1796, at between forty and fifty thouſand.

union with Kentucky. They cannot require that ſelf-denial which they would not exert.

By the calculation, above inſerted, of three times the original eſtimate of the three frigates, the final outfit of each of them comes to three hundred and forty-five thouſand dollars, or in whole to one million and thirty-five thouſand dollars. They carry an hundred and twenty-four guns, which thus coſt, within a minute fraction, eight thouſand three hundred and forty-ſix dollars, and three fourths, per gun. In ſterling money this amounts to eighteen hundred and ſeventy-eight pounds, eight ſhillings and four-pence halfpenny. In England, the common computation for every gun, is a thouſand pounds, including ſtores for ſix months. Theſe do not come within the above American eſtimate; ſo that England can ſend a ſhip to ſea, at half our charge. Yet, from the decline of ſhip-building, in conſequence of Jay's treaty, wages are, at this time, comparatively low. The current wages of American ſeamen are thirty dollars per month; a rate unheard of in the French or Engliſh ſervice. With ſuch an odds of expence againſt the United States, it is needleſs to think of a navy.

Indians have been ſpoke of in this chapter. On January 18th, 1798, an eſtimate was laid before the repreſentatives of the charges of a propoſed treaty with the Cherokees. The whole ſum amounts to twenty-five thouſand, eight hundred and eighty dollars. This includes fifteen thouſand dollars for rations to *two thouſand* Indians; and five thouſand dollars for preſents. It muſt be obſerved that theſe Indians, as well as the Creeks, have never kept a ſingle agreement made with them. Their perfidy is equal to their cruelty. If a new treaty is to be framed, there can be no uſe for the preſence of two thouſand ſavages. Two

hundred are ſufficient; and this would ſave thirteen thouſand five hundred dollars. The ſums annually waſted on theſe people are very conſiderable. It is time to try another way of *treating*. Offer an hundred dollars per ſcalp for the firſt three hundred Cherokee warriors, who ſhall be cut, or ſhot down. The ſouth-weſtern riflemen will ſoon earn the money. This may be called inhumanity. But if one of theſe Indians had ſtabbed your father, and ſtuck the hearts of your children, on the point of his ſcalping knife, perhaps you might endure the propoſal. Government is afraid of a frontier militia. Were the rampart of ſavages removed, thouſands of families would inſtantly wander beyond the reach of cuſtoms and exciſe. The preſident and ſenate, ſupported by a party of repreſentatives, chuſe rather to give the Indians every poſſible meaſure of countenance and protection, to expend very large ſums of money in the purchaſe of treaties that are ſure to be broken, and to connive at ſome hundreds of annual murders.

Our preſent political aſpect does not promiſe much. It combines the helpleſsneſs of infancy with the decrepitude of age; the feebleneſs of a young government without its alledged purity, and the corruption of an old one, without its readineſs of reſources. The world never ſaw a more complicated ſcene of weakneſs, ignorance, and folly, than that now diſplayed in the United States. The preſident, on May 16th, 1797, delivers a ſpeech againſt France, that is only juſt leſs than a declaration of war. In the ſame moment, he pretends to deſire a peace with the French. For this purpoſe he ſends back to Paris Pinckney, the very man who had juſt quarrelled with the directory, and who, by his obſtinacy and impertinence, had

forced them to thruſt him out of their territories. To cut up all chance of future confidence between the two governments, Mr. Adams ſuffers, or invites congreſs to print Pinckney's confidential correſpondence. The repreſentatives deſire a liſt of French and Britiſh depredations. Meſſrs. Adams and Pickering ſuppreſs the Britiſh liſt, and ſend down the French one, with an apology conſiſting of a notorious falſehood*. The repreſentatives pocket this violation of their orders; an inſult that would not have been endured with ſilence in the tameſt houſe of commons which England ever ſaw.

CHAPTER X.

Extracts from the Preſidential Gazette.—Remarks on the firſt ſpeech of Mr. Adams to congreſs.—Correſpondence of Pinckney and Pickering.—Proceedings of congreſs in May, 1797.—*Compariſon between the treatment of Adet and Pinckney.—Candid conduct of Mr. Bache.—Speech of Mr. Nicholas.—Of Dr. Smith.—Of Mr. Otis.—Obſervations on the conduct of our executive.*

THE Gazette of the United States is the profeſſed organ of the political ſentiments of Mr. Adams and his friends. Hence its principles become important, leſs by their intrinſic value than on account of the ſource from whence they ſpring.

In Mr. Fenno's paper, of January 10th, 1798, a writer ſpeaks of "nine hundred and fifty millions

* Hiſtory of 1796, Chap. VII.

" of men corrupt, anarchical, hateful and hating " one another, turned looſe from religious and civil " reſtraint, and blended in one fiery *democracy**. If " malice could vent itſelf in prayer, the actual " ſtate of our *enemies*, the French, exceeds *its laſt* " *ſupreme ejaculation*."

If the French have become our enemies, this ariſes from the mean, pedlar-like ſpirit of our policy. Their *actual ſtate* is certainly different from ours. France is the terror, and the United States are the contempt of Europe. Their friendſhip is univerſally courted, and ours univerſally deſpiſed. In confidence that the republic would be overturned, America haſted to deſert her benefactreſs. By an eventual and offenſive treaty, ſhe guaranteed the French dominions, at a period when, but for the ſake of form, her guarantee was not worth acceptance. In 1794, ſhe could not fulfil the ſtipulations of 1778; but, to prove that her ingratitude was equal to her weakneſs, ſhe inverted them. Jay's treaty compriſes a multitude of conditions injurious to the republic. The plan of this agreement was made by Mr. Waſhington, in April, 1794. At

* The Britiſh party avow their diſlike to this term. It ſignifies a government by the people. The conſtitution begins in theſe words: " We the people of the United States, do ordain," &c. ſo that the deſign was evidently democratical. If the Adamites diſapprove this preamble, they might ſuggeſt an amendment. " We, the well-born holders of bank, and ſix per cent. " ſtock, do ordain." A paper at Walpole, in New-Hampſhire, lately referred to the *leproſy of* REPUBLICANISM. A federaliſt, as he ſigns himſelf, ſpeaks, in the ſame print, of a late fire at Boſton. " The *ſame ſpirit*," ſays he, " which lighted a flame in " *ſeventy-five*, would ſurvey with indifference a blazing ſtreet in " *ninety-ſeven*, rather than forget the fatal *ſpirit of oppoſition*." If this rant has any meaning, it implies a cenſure on the revolution. Probably the printer, at Walpole, is likewiſe poſt-maſter. This is a frequent executive arrangement, and ſecures a preſs to the party.

that time France, like Cæſar at Munda, contended not for empire, but exiſtence. Admit that this compact, if it had been faithfully fulfilled, was beneficial to the mercantile intereſt of America. Still, a *generous* man would have deſpiſed profits that were to be gained by ſacrificing the intereſt of his depreſſed friend. An *honeſt* man muſt have regarded every conceſſion againſt France, as a real violation of the treaty of Paris*. A *wiſe* man might, in July, 1795, the time of ratification, have foreſeen that the republic would be ultimately victorious.

As for the *actual ſtate*, look at ours; a waſted commerce; an empty exchequer; a government without confidence, and a people without union; a bench, where land-jobbing does not diſplace a judge; a legiſlature, where perjury does not unſeat a ſenator; a preſs, from whence an adulterer expatiates on his proud conſcioufneſs of innocence; a cabinet, countenancing publications, which a knot of London porters would be aſhamed to read. In this city of *brotherly love*, uſury ſits on her native throne†; opinions are decided by the bludgeon; and

* "As ſoon," ſays Fauchet, "as the conſtitutional government "was ſettled, and that the directory was in a ſituation to follow "any ſyſtem as to external affairs, it could not be long without "perceiving how we had been the *dupes of America*. The treaty "of London had completely opened all eyes. The material "change which was openly effected in the neutrality of the Uni-"ted States, by virtue of that treaty, has put the ſeal of duplicity "and of falſehood on the aſſurances *ſo often repeated*, that the treaty "ſhould make no change in the ſtate of things prior to that "treaty." A Sketch, &c. p. 26.

He adds in a note that, "the French miniſter was notified, "after the exchange of ratifications, that we ſhould no longer en-"joy the advantage, which till then had been granted us, to "ſell in the American ports our Engliſh prizes.

† "I have been referred to individuals in Mulberry ſtreet, Chef-"nut-ſtreet, Second-ſtreet, Third-ſtreet, Water-ſtreet, and other "ſtreets, as known uſurers, or agents acting for companies of uſurers!

a ruffian may come behind his neighbour's back, knock him down, leave him for dead on the ſpot, laugh, like a recent felon, in the faces of the jury, and march triumphant from the bar, for a fine of fifty dollars!

We return to Mr. Fenno's correſpondent. "Human happineſs," ſays he, "will not be encreaſed, "till all the preſent actors of the *farce of innova-* "*tion*, are rotted and forgotten. To ameliorate the "ſtate of ſociety, by deſtroying *tyranny* and *ſuper-* "*ſtition*, is a benevolent wiſh. I have liſtened to, "and repeated, thoſe fairy tales myſelf. It is a "*dream!*" Theſe are the manly ſentiments propagated by our executive. They imply an expreſs cenſure of the American revolution, which attempted to overturn tyranny, but only half completed its deſign. The party who at preſent hold the government, found means to ſaddle America with a debt which daily grows larger; and they have now taken the ground and the doctrines of George the third.

Mr. Fenno pronounces, that, to attempt the improvement of ſociety, by deſtroying tyranny and ſuperſtition, is a fairy tale and a dream. The mind cannot conceive, nor can language expreſs, a more hateful maxim. Candour will place no confidence in a party capable of inculcating ſuch opinions. As for the attack on France, it chimes in uniſon with the two ſpeeches of preſident Adams.

"And I have been confidentially aſſured, that thoſe very indivi- "duals (with ſhame be it mentioned!) can, and do obtain, diſcounts "regularly at *two* of the banks." Vid. *A Letter to certain bank directors from a merchant*, dated December, 1796, p. 8. This letter was really written by a merchant, a native of this city, and very reſpectably connected. Blackſtone, Book IV. Chap. XII. Sect. IV. ſtates intereſt to be reduced, by an act in the twelfth of queen Anne, to five per cent. and adds, "wherefore, not only all contracts for taking more are "in themſelves totally void, but alſo the lender ſhall forfeit treble "the money borrowed."

A few extracts from the first of these productions will prove this to be true. In that of May 16th, 1797, he speaks thus:

"The refusal, on the part of France, to receive "our minister, is, then, the denial of a right; but "the refusal to receive him until we have acceded "to their demands, without discussion, is to treat "us neither as allies nor as friends, nor as a sove-"reign people."—As for the matter of *right*, Vattel contradicts Mr. Adams*. General Washington refused to open a letter from lord Howe; and the old congress would not treat with Carlisle, and the rest of North's commissioners. Citizen Adet had attempted to negociate at Philadelphia. He was treated with neglect, and Mr. Adams and his friends encouraged a British agent to lampoon him. As for *allies* or *friends*, the United States had no claim to either title. Jay's treaty put an end to it.

Again.—"There is reason to believe, that the "executive directory past a decree, on the 2d of "March last, contravening, in part, the treaty of "amity and commerce of 1778, injurious to our "lawful commerce, and endangering the lives of "our citizens." They acted only in self-defence. This decree is fully explained in the next chapter. The British were then, and are still seizing American ships, and pressing their seamen; but Mr. Adams passes over that.

"Endeavours have been employed to establish "and foster a division between the government and "people of the United States. To investigate the "causes which have encouraged this attempt is not "necessary."—The most likely cause is English gold. Webster and Russel, that ideot of editors, who has defended Hamilton's *Defence*, would not

* See the speech of Mr. Freeman, in the sequel of this chapter.

write ſo much nonſenſe to ſerve Pitt, unleſs he paid them. No man in his wits will believe that Camillus wrote his thirty-eight letters for nothing. Did he ever plead thirty-eight cauſes without a fee?

But Mr. Adams refers not to theſe gentry, for they are his intimate friends. He alludes to the ſpeech of Barras, as alarming; though this trifle could make no more impreſſion on the public mind of America, than a piſtol-ball on the baſtions of Luxembourg. The ſuppoſition, that it was to have a dangerous effect here, betrays groſs affectation, hypocriſy, and impoſture. The people of this country care very little about two or three ſentences of a ſpeech delivered in Paris. But, if Barras was able to do ſo much miſchief, the preſident ought to have ſuppreſſed the ſarcaſm. *Mortui non mordent.* It could do no harm, if we heard nothing about it. If a previous tranſlation had eſcaped into the Aurora, a fortnight muſt have ſunk it in forgetfulneſs. But the point with Mr. Adams was to make a buſtle, in order to make a quarrel. This is the plain truth. Mr. Adams may yet hear of a ſpeech from Barras, that ſhall make both him and congreſs tremble.

"It muſt not be permitted to be doubted," ſays he, "whether the people of the United States will "ſupport the government, eſtabliſhed by their vo-"luntary conſent, and appointed by their free "choice." True. But if they ſee that government evidently driving them into a ruinous war, without taking any one rational ſtep to ſhun it, they will not be tardy in making their importance felt.

Mr. Adams then pledges himſelf to ſupport the Britiſh treaty. "Convinced that the conduct of the "government has been juſt and impartial to foreign "nations,—nothing will ever be done by me to im-"pair the national engagements; to innovate upon "principles, which have been ſo deliberately and

" uprightly eſtabliſhed; or to ſurrender, in any man-
" ner, the rights of the government." As the compact was made for fear of an Engliſh war, it may ſuitably be repealed for fear of a French one. The purport of this bouncing paſſage is to aſſure the French, that they have no chance for conceſſions from the United States, if Mr. Adams can diſappoint them.

In one of his letters, publiſhed by congreſs, Charles Pinckney, when ſpeaking of his diſmiſſion by the directory, puts this queſtion. " You will " judge whether *the anſwer of the Senate and the* " *houſe of repreſentatives to the preſident's ſpeech**, " and the late ſucceſſes in Italy, have not concur-" red to occaſion it†?" The anſwers were only an echo to the ſpeech itſelf, which was quite as inflammatory as them. But the envoy, in a letter to the ſecretary, could not with politeneſs, include that ſacred performance‡ among the cauſes of irritation. This notice of the tendency of ſuch addreſſes and ſpeeches, on the minds of the directory, might have made Mr. Adams cautious in what way he conveyed his ſentiments to congreſs.

Mr. Fenno's gazette of January 18th, 1798, has this paſſage. " Like the Romans, whom they " (the French) imitate, war and rapine are neceſ-" ſary to their exiſtence.—If England is not deſtroy-" ed by internal faction, ſhe will be able to keep " the MONSTERS *in their den*, until they devour " each other." This writer has forgot the unprovoked conſpiracy of Pilnitz, by which the *crowned heads* were to revive in France the tragedy of

* On the 7th of December, 1796. † Documents p. 62.

‡ The infallibility of general Waſhington is a doctrine ſtarted ſince the war. At one period of the revolution, he was on the point of being ſuperceded, as commander in chief, by the talents and popularity of governor Mifflin.

Poland. He has forgot that the duke of Brunſwick menaced Paris, and its eight hundred thouſand inhabitants, with military execution.

Mr. Adams affects to deſire a peace with France. The perſon who believes him is completely diveſted of common ſenſe. Look at the ſtile of his own newſpaper. No farther evidence can be wanted. Pitch a barrel of tar into a bonfire, and ſay that you intend to extinguiſh it. Such is the picture of ſomebody. This old man cannot deſcend to the grave in peace, till he has entangled his conſtituents in a war that muſt put an end to the government of the country, and replunge her into the horrors of 1780. Theſe are our thanks for twenty-five thouſand dollars a year, for eminence, adulation, and immeaſurable patronage. For the complete model of depravity, why ſhould we refer to another world? Can a fallen angel be as baſe as man?

In Mr. Pickering's letter to Pinckney, p. 91, he ſpeaks thus of citizen Adet. "After an exhibition "of complaints in a ſtile ſo exceptionable, he "could add but one more *improper act*, that of "publiſhing his notes in the newſpapers: he had "ſcarcely tranſmitted them to the executive "before he *forwarded them to the printer for pub-* "*lication*." Mr. Pickering here complains of Adet for his precipitate appeal to the preſs. Granting, what is untrue, that the envoy acted wrong, Pickering did an offence againſt the directory of the ſame kind. This letter to Pinckney at Paris bears date the 16th of January, 1796. A copy of it was, on the 19th, ſent by the preſident to congreſs, by them inſtantly to the preſs, and of courſe to the newſpapers. It was fit that congreſs ſhould be acquainted with the letter, but its publication was a ſtill greater affront upon the directory than the

printing of Adet's notes was upon Pickering. The Frenchman did not ſend his pieces to the preſs till they had reached their place of deſtination. This was a degree of politeneſs neglected by Mr. Pickering.

It will be anſwered, that when the preſident ſent the papers to congreſs, he did not know whether the repreſentatives would print them, and that they had a right of doing ſo. When a frigate is to be built, or a ſhip to be freighted with ammunition, for the dey of Algiers, a preſident knows in what way to communicate with the legiſlature, and yet to prevent his papers from being expoſed to the public eye. The federal repreſentatives ſupport a due underſtanding with the executive; and unleſs they had known that the publication would be acceptable to him, the contents of Mr. Pickering's letter would have been kept ſecret.

Mr. Pinckney obſerves, that the French "wiſh "to deſtroy the trade of Great Britain, and they "look upon us as one of her beſt cuſtomers, and, "to obtain their object, *they care not what we ſuf-* "*fer**." This may be very true, but it comes to a plain declaration that the French are intereſted and faithleſs, while the publication permitted by the preſident implies that the remark enjoys his approbation. There is particular reaſon to believe that Rufus King hath tranſmitted to our executive moſt unfavourable accounts of England. But not a word of them tranſpires from the cabinet. The truth of Pinckney's obſervation would not juſtify its publication. If every man were to tell exactly what he thinks of each of his acquaintances, ſociety would be transformed into a bear-garden, and

* Documents, p. 63.

the field of diplomacy into a field of battle. On the plain ſcore of diſcretion and civility, it will be difficult to defend the meaſures of Meſſrs. Adams and Pickering towards the French nation. Theſe remarks explain the degree of merit in our executive. Let us now, in a ſlight ſketch, examine whether congreſs itſelf acted better.

The two houſes met on May 15th, 1797. The ſpeech was made on the 16th. The ſenate did not preſent their anſwer till the 24th. Thus, upon this trifle, they ſpent eight days, and twelve or fifteen hundred dollars worth of their time. They might have made a proper anſwer in fifteen minutes. "We learn," ſay they, "with ſincere concern, "that attempts are in operation to alienate the af- "fection of our fellow citizens from their govern- "ment. Attempts ſo wicked, wherever they ex- "iſt, cannot fail to excite our *utmoſt abhorrence*." They muſt ſurely then have abhorred their own printer, Mr. John Fenno, for calling the preceding houſe of repreſentatives a many-headed *monſter*. The ſpeech of Barras was made at a diſtance; and, before they went ſo far in queſt of affronts offered to this government, the ſenate ſhould have ſilenced this organ of diſcontent, for it was ten thouſand times louder than the French directory. The anſwer of the ſenate was dull and toad-eating, but much leſs faulty than the one reported on May 22d, from the ſelect committee; and which, with a few ſlight alterations, was ultimately preſented. This committee conſiſted of five members. The majority, Mr. Kittera, Mr. Rutledge, and Mr. Griſwold, were truly federal.

Their report was as complaiſant to the ſpeech as Mr. Adams could deſire it to be.—"While we "view with ſatisfaction the wiſdom, dignity, and "moderation, which have marked the meaſures of

"the supreme executive of our country, in its at-
"tempts to remove, by candid explanations, the
"complaints and jealousies of France, we feel the
"full force of that indignity which has been offer-
"ed our country, in *the rejection of its minister.*"
The law of nations, as laid down by Dr. Hutcheson, gave the French a right of sending Pinckney out of their territories; and his own letters shew, that, while he remained in Paris, he proved an inflammatory and dangerous resident. The select committee will not certainly pretend, that the directory were obliged to read and answer any papers that Mr. Pinckney might wish to present. They were to be masters of their own time. They had already, by citizen Adet, explained, as far as they thought necessary, their demands upon America. If Mr. Kittera becomes tired of a correspondent, he will think himself at liberty to return his letters unopened.

Thus much for the rejection of our minister; but put the case that he had been actually received. A hireling, in the pay of an English agent, is next ordered to write pamphlets against him; and, among other epithets, to call him *an unprincipled bully; a gasconading impudent bluff;* and *a dog**. Instead of interfering, as every other government would infallibly do, to check such behaviour, a French Oliver Wolcott visits the bookseller, thanks him for the performance, and offers to make him editor of the *Redacteur*†. In the interim, that executive publication loads the United States with every abusive appellation that malice, or brutality, can suggest; execrates their revolution; reproaches them as atheists; and, finally, expresses an ardent hope that con-

* See remarks on this hospitable treatment, in the American Annual Register, Chap. VI.

† A Paris newspaper, under the influence of the directory. See the fact alluded to in British Honour and Humanity, p. 55.

greſs are *blown up*, and that George the third ſhall once more *have* HIS OWN *again*. This uſage continues, not for a day, or a month, but for four years at a ſtretch.

Mr. Pinckney would be worſe uſed, by permiſſion to reſide in Paris, under ſuch circumſtances, than by a direct diſmiſſal. A man of ſpirit would prefer the latter. The above was preciſely the ſituation of Adet, in Philadelphia. Hence, our complaint, as to the rejection of Pinckney, betrayed the utmoſt hardneſs or ſtupidity. The report next promiſes to convince the world "that we are not a *degraded* "people." In reſpect to foreign envoys, we have degraded ourſelves. After the inſolence and ribbaldry wantonly poured upon Adet, and the chevalier de Yrujo, neither the king of Spain, nor the directory, can undervalue any reputable man of buſineſs, by deſiring him to reſide in this country.

"Knowing, as we do," adds the report, "the "confidence repoſed by the United States in their "government, we cannot heſitate in expreſſing "our indignation," &c. This relates to Barras, a topic already worn to tatters. As for *confidence*, it is now, on the part of the republicans, at an end. On the acceſſion of Mr. Adams, they were very well diſpoſed to live on good terms with him. Moſt of them were ignorant of his correſpondence with ſir John Scott. Several of his late oppoſers declared their belief of his being an honeſt man, and that he had too much ſpirit to be led by any party. With great candour and propriety, Mr. Bache refuſed to admit remarks unfavourable to Mr Adams. "Let "us give him a fair trial," ſaid this editor, to one of his correſpondents, "and then, if he actually "does wrong, our cenſures will fall with the grea-"ter weight." The Aurora was, accordingly, crammed, for ſome time, with encomiums on Mr.

Adams, deduced from the profeſſions of republicaniſm that he made in ſome ſpeeches. For conduct ſo full of juſtice and of good nature, Mr. Bache has been ſince upbraided in the ſix per cent. newſpapers. From the 16th of May, 1797, downwards, Mr. Bache firmly believed, that Mr. Adams was only the leader of a party. His amicable ſtile, until the diſcloſure of that day, deſerved praiſe in place of cenſure. Mr. Adams then convinced all impartial men, that he had entangled himſelf in the Britiſh intereſt. Hence he will conſtantly meet with their cordial oppoſition. This the ſelect committee well knew.

They proceed to ſay, that "fully impreſſed with "the uncertainty of the reſult, we ſhall prepare to "meet, with fortitude, any unfavourable events "which may occur, with all the ſkill we poſſeſs, "and all the efforts in our power."

On this report, Mr. Nicholas, in ſtrong terms, recommended a conciliating ſtile. Upon the anſwer, about to be given, the peace of the United States might, in a great meaſure, depend. He propoſed an amendment, which was, upon the whole, proper. Yet it had this expreſſion. "The rejecting of our "miniſter, and the manner of diſmiſſing him from "the territories of France, have excited our *warmeſt* "*ſenſibility*." This complaint might have been ſpared. Mr. Nicholas, in his ſpeech, alſo ſaid, that "he "hoped, on this occaſion, they ſhould get rid of "that irritation, which *injury* naturally produced "in the mind. He declared, that he felt for the *in-*"*ſult* which had been offered to Mr. Pinckney; "and he felt more for him, from the *dignity* with "which he had borne it, and which had proved him "to be *a proper character for the embaſſy*." A reaſonable ſuſpicion may be entertained that this reſpectable member expreſſed more ſtrongly than he

felt. He saw that the British party were very strong in the house, and that direct opposition to the main principle of the address would be hopeless. But such half-way declarations, although sometimes expedient within doors, have a tendency to mislead the public at large. Mr. Nicholas, indeed, after farther compliments on Mr. Pinckney, and his *good temper*, "confessed, that the business did not strike "him with *all* the force with which it seemed to "have impressed the mind of that respectable "character."

Mr. Nicholas added, that "he considered the "answer, reported to them, as going to decide the "question of *peace* or *war* for this country. He "thought it a thing of that sort, which might have "the worst possible effect, and could have no good "effect. It might tend to irritate, to prevent any "sort of enquiry or settlement taking place, but it "could not tend towards an adjustment of differ-"ences.—We are condemning the French govern-"ment, because they ask for redress, without listen-"ing to negociation; yet we say to them, *we* are "right; you have no cause to complain." Mr. Nicholas shewed the inconsistency of this prejudging tone. He stated, by the way, that the house had the strongest proofs, even the declaration of an English governor, that, in case of success against France, England had designed to declare war against America. The speech, with a small exception, was commendable.

Dr. William Smith rose next. He entered into the feelings of Mr. Pinckney, and the *injurious* treatment which he had received from De la Croix and the directory. He then took a survey of the merits of the British treaty. "The gentlemen," said he, "tell us we are feeble. They know that we "are *not* feeble; and that, if occasion calls us forth,

" we ſhall be found able to defend ourſelves." The United States have the greateſt natural reſources for defence by land, and for attack by ſea. But as government neither has money, nor can tell where to get any important ſum, a war would run the utmoſt riſk of overturning it. This diſability of raiſing caſh ariſes from the half-crown certificates, the bungling aſſumption act, and the deluge of bank notes. The doctor had, no doubt, by this time, a preſcience of his embaſſy to Portugal. Yet he might have reflected that ſix months of a French war would ſink the ſtocks to thirty per cent.

Mr. Freeman read a long paſſage from Vatel. The ſubſtance of it was, that nations were not obliged to receive a perpetual ſucceſſion of foreign miniſters, when there was nothing particular to be negociated. They might be allowed to meet ſuch envoys upon the frontiers, to receive their meſſage, and diſmiſs them, without once permitting them to enter upon the territory of the nation to which they were ſent. Vatel added, that republics, in particular, might have very good reaſons for not chooſing to permit an ambaſſador to reſide among them; becauſe, ſuch a character was frequently employed to excite diſcontent among the citizens. Thus he agrees exactly with the law of nations, as already cited from Hutcheſon*. Mr. Freeman referred to the recent diſmiſſion, by the directory, of thirteen other miniſters. This ſhewed that no particular indignity had been offered to the United States.

Mr. Giles moved that the committee of the whole houſe ſhould riſe, in order to refer the report, and amendment by Mr. Nicholas, back to the ſelect committee.

* Supra Chapter VIII.

This propoſal was objected to, with great violence. At that part of the debate, Mr. Otis made his maiden ſpeech. A few extracts ſhall be given from a copy of it written by himſelf.—" His conſtituents, and himſelf, were diſpoſed to regard " the inhabitants of the ſouthern ſtates as *brothers*." [The party who ſent Mr. Otis to congreſs, take every opening to calumniate the ſouthern ſtates. To ſpeak plainly, the reaſons are as follows. *Firſt*, At the time of funding the national debt, moſt of the ſouthern repreſentatives, reſiſted the ſtock-jobbing views of eaſtern members. *Second*, If the Virginians could obtain an aſcendency in the two houſes, it is likely that they would proceed to tax the public ſtocks, and to lay an impreſſive ſtamp duty on bank notes. If their plan of paying the national debt had been adopted, Dr. Smith, and Mr. Hillhouſe, would have only got the ten-pence or half-crown per pound, which they actually paid for certificates. Thus twenty or thirty millions of dollars might have been ſaved. Seven years ago, four millions of dollars were ſufficient for building ten ſhips of the line, and twenty frigates*. This force, ready to be ſupported by three hundred privateers, would have compelled either France or England to look, like Pompey, both before and behind them, previous to their moleſting an American merchantman. But inſtead of a commanding navy, and a commerce invulnerable in every corner of the globe†, the United States have a regiment of creditors, with doctor William Smith at their head,

* In 1794, the ſix frigates were expected to be built for ſix hundred and ninety thouſand dollars; and in 1790, they could probably have been built for that ſum. Allow then, an hundred thouſand dollars each, for twenty frigates, and two hundred thouſand dollars each, for ten ſhips of the line. This makes up the four millions.

† Still it muſt be obſerved, that nothing but an Algerine treaty could enſure our trade in the Mediterranean.

feaſting on the public revenue, and receiving ſixty, eighty, or an hundred per cent. for the real ſums that they advanced. While this is the caſe, you cannot walk five miles in any inhabited diſtrict of America, without meeting ſome one who will tell that he was formerly half beggared by the exploſion of congreſs paper money. His claim on government is eight or ten times juſter than that of Sedgwick or William Smith, yet he gets not a ſingle cent. They receive twenty ſhillings per pound, while he, poſſibly with a wooden leg, or a pally, earned in the ſervice, muſt pay taxes to defray the demands of theſe creditors, who ſat in congreſs, and voted themſelves into opulence, at the expence of their fellow citizens. This is the ſort of people under whoſe banner Mr. Otis hath enliſted. His ſpeech proceeds thus:]

"The injuries ſuſtained by us were of a high "and atrocious nature, conſiſting in the capture of "our veſſels, depredations upon the property and "perſons of our citizens, the indignity offered "to our miniſter; but what was more aggrava-"vating than the reſt, was, the profeſſed deter-"mination not to receive our miniſter until the "complaints of the French ſhould be redreſſed, "without explanation and without exception; "until we ſhould violate treaties, repeal laws, "and do what the conſtitution would not authoriſe, "vacate ſolemn judgments of our courts of law."

This extract ſhall have a full anſwer. To begin with the Britiſh treaty, it was an injury of a high and atrocious nature towards France. It contravened our previous treaty with her. Beſides an hundred other writers, Mr. Dallas, in his *Features*, has clearly proved this point. With a general reference to that pamphlet, Part V. one or two inſtances are here inſerted.

By the eleventh* article of the treaty of alliance between Louis XVI. and the United States, the latter guarantee to the former "the preſent poſſeſſions "of the crown of France in America, as well as "thoſe which it may acquire by the future treaty "of peace." The king, on his part, guarantees the territories of the United States. The federal party have ſpent thouſands of pages to prove that America owes nothing to France, on the ſcore of gratitude, which was excluſively due to the king himſelf. Nay ſome of them have alledged that the treaties between the two countries were voided by the diſſolution of the monarchy. If the latter poſition is true, France cannot be blamed *for breaking obligations that ceaſe to exiſt*.

Alexander Hamilton, in his long-winded letters of *Pacificus*, argues that the guarantee became void, becauſe the treaty was entitled not *offenſive* and defenſive, but only *eventual* and defenſive; and as the French were the firſt to declare war againſt England, hence they were the *offenſive* party, and the guarantee expired, at leaſt for this time. Such appears to be his inference.

If this was the view of the treaty, it ſhould have been ſo expreſſed. But the twelfth article, though explanatory, makes no diſtinction, and the concluſion ought to be that the two powers never once thought of it. The guarantee is in *general terms*. If we forbear to guarantee the French Weſt-Indies, we ſhould certainly not aſſiſt England in attacking them. If the treaty had any ſignification whatever, this was implied in it, for its whole avowed object was *to reſiſt Britain*. Without proviſions from the United States, the Engliſh could not have attacked Martinique, or Guadaloupe.

* Mr. Dallas, by miſtake, cites it as the ninth.

Every barrel of pork or flour shipped from this continent to the British West-Indies, was as clearly assisting England against France, as if we had sent our three frigates. A suspension of shipping provisions would have entirely prevented English military operations, and have starved the English islands. This was to render to France a very important service; and, being merely of the negative kind, it furnished to England no pretence for hostilities.

It will be said that such a prohibition was to *sacrifice commerce*. Every guarantee implies a sacrifice. If a man is never to fulfil a treaty, when it crosses his personal interest, it is entirely useless to make treaties. By stepping forward in this way, America could have shewed that she was not, what she now is, the mere anvil of the belligerent world. To save her West-Indies, England could not have helped acceding to a peace; while, placed upon an isthmus, between the opposite tides of hostility, America might, in some measure, have dictated the terms of an agreement. By doing nothing, by a mere act of negation, she was to have done every thing. By an embargo against England, for only four months, America could not have lost more than five or six millions of dollars, and very probably not half that sum. The whole exports of 1793, came only to twenty-six millions of dollars; and, on a medium, those of four months, came to less than nine millions. Of these nine millions a great part did not consist of provisions. Such were cotton, indigo, and fifty-nine thousand nine hundred and forty-seven hogsheads of tobacco. Of the provisions various kinds, as pork and beef, were in no danger of spoiling. Much of the flour would have been exported, with other vivres, to the West-Indies, in French bottoms. Much of the remainder could have been kept without suffering damage.

Putting theſe matters together, it will be ſeen that, by four months of patience and fidelity, and at the loſs, comparatively ſmall, of one, two, or three millions of dollars, America might have preſerved her character, along with French amity. She had only to prohibit every American or foreign veſſel from exporting proviſions, with the ſingle exception of France. At preſent, the republic may, in familiar language, explain herſelf thus. You promiſed to help me in defending my houſe. I did not aſk your aid, but you have lent the robber a hatchet to break up my door. This volume is addreſſed only to men, who reſpect the *ſpirit* as well as the *letter* of a bargain. To them enough has been ſaid in demonſtration of American ſelfiſhneſs, ignorance, and duplicity. French depredations are a bitter doſe, for which America may thank herſelf.

CHAPTER XI.

The ſpeech of Mr. Otis continued.—Explanation of the diſpute between France and the United States.—Mr. Giles.—Mr. Swanwick.—Mr. Livingſton.—Mr. Coit.—Mr. Harper.—His equivoque.—Its detection by Mr. Livingſton.—Trimming encomium on Pinckney by Mr. Giles.—Mr. Gallatin.—Harper verſus *Buonaparte.—Strange waſte of time, on an anſwer to the preſident's ſpeech.—Admiſſion by Preſident Adams, that we are a* divided *people.—Invaſion of Pennſylvania by the Suſquehanna company.*

ALONG with the treaty of alliance eventual and defenſive, there was ſubſcribed at Paris another of amity and commerce. The latter inſtrument, in a ſpirit of liberality very different

from Jay's, had fixed the rule that *free bottoms make free goods*. The twenty-third article says, that it shall be lawful "to sail with the ships and merchandises aforementioned, and to trade with the same "liberty and security from the places, ports, and "havens of those who are *enemies of both or either* "*party*, without any opposition, or disturbance "whatsoever, not only directly from the places of "the enemy aforementioned to neutral places; but "also from *one place belonging to an enemy*, to ano-"ther place belonging to an enemy.—And it is "hereby stipulated, that free ships shall also give "a freedom to goods." The article has much more to this effect. The twenty-fourth enumerates all sorts of *provisions* as coming within the definition of free goods. This treaty is dated at Paris, February 6th, 1778.

The eighteenth article of the British treaty has been above cited, and besides abolishing the privilege of free bottoms, it warrants the seizure of provisions, on paying the price of them.

The twenty-fifth article does, indeed, say, that, "nothing in this treaty contained shall, however, be "construed or operate contrary to former and exist-"ing public treaties with *other sovereigns or states*." If this stipulation had been observed, it seems that the republic would have had no cause to complain of that eighteenth article. But the measures of England have been a systematic violation of it. In spite of the treaty of Paris, America has constantly suffered French goods to be taken out of her bottoms. Vast quantities of provisions have been seized from American shipping bound for France, at the very time, when the English were boasting that they would starve her*. In the face

* The plan of starving the French nation was the most diabolical that ever entered into the heart even of an emperor, or a king.

of ſuch matters, it is not wonderful that the French are angry.

Mr. Jay's friends reply, that France, by the ſecond article of the treaty of Paris, was entitled to "any particular favour in reſpect of commerce and navigation" that ſhould be granted by the United States to another nation. Of conſequence, when Jay gave up the right of *free* bottoms, and of proviſion veſſels, to England, the French came to have the ſame privilege of ſtopping them. But the twenty-fifth article, above quoted, ſhews that Jay had really ſaved the republic, in this point. Yet the exception of the French, as to proviſions, and free bottoms, ought, at ſo critical a time, to have been fully and fairly named. The deſertion of neutral rights, even in the ſlighteſt way, opened a pretence for abuſe.

The caſe between France and America appears to be ſhortly this. Jay, in his treaty, gave up the principle of free bottoms, with the exception of treaties already made by the United States. This was wrong; yet the twenty-fifth article ought to

It could not ſerve to diſband French armies, but muſt have had an oppoſite effect.

In 1709, France was ravaged by a terrible famine; and the ranks of their armies were overwhelmed with volunteers; for hunger is an admirable recruiting officer. The very ſame circumſtance has happened both before and ſince. A ſcarcity of proviſions alone would be ſufficient to fill the battalions.

The military part of a nation, are always, in the laſt reſort, its maſters. Hence, in a general famine, they are the laſt claſs of citizens who feel the extremity of hunger. The firſt part of the French nation which die of it muſt be their old men, women, and children.

The Engliſh are fond of repreſenting their neighbours *as in a ſtate of ſtarving*. When they wiſh to revile the Welch, the Scotch, the Iriſh, or the French, goat-milk cheeſe, oatmeal, potatoes, and frogs are favourite topics. *Time about is fair play*, ſays the proverb. Many thouſands of people in England have, ſince that ſcheme of ſtarving France, died of hunger.

have ſaved France. The Engliſh, in reading their copy of the treaty, overleaped this excepting article, and, juſt as if it never had been written, continued to ſeize French property on board of American veſſels, as likewiſe American proviſions freighted for any part of the republic. When this treaty was publiſhed in America, the directory were buſy in arranging affairs of intricate complication, and ſtupendous importance. The recent conqueſt of Flanders and Holland called for their whole attention. Compared with ſuch objects, the capture of five hundred veſſels, either *by* their enemies or *from* them, was a trifle. Beſides, oppoſition to Jay's treaty became ſo violent in America that there was the greateſt chance for congreſs overſetting it, as indeed it eſcaped in the end only by a ſingle vote* out of ninety-ſeven.

In ſummer, 1796, a ſplendid prize was to be contended for in Italy, and till that diſpute had been partly decided, the directory did not wiſh to entangle themſelves in American negociation. Buonaparte, whoſe name hath ſince become ſynonimous to victory, ſoon convinced the world what was to be the fate of Lombardy. When the directory perceived the republic to be proſperous on that ſide, they of courſe turned their attention to this country. Obſerve the following dates.

Jay's treaty had been ſigned on the 19th of November, 1794. It was ratified by the ſenate, on June 24th, 1795, and by Mr. Randolph, as ſecretary of ſtate, on Auguſt 14th, 1795. The appropriations for effecting the Britiſh treaty were not ageeed to, by the repreſentatives, till April 30th, 1796. During this whole

* That of Mr. Muhlenberg, in a committee of the whole houſe of repreſentatives.

time, the French did not plunder American veſſels, unleſs in two or three rare inſtances, while the Britiſh were ſeizing them by hundreds. That this was the caſe has been aſcertained in the Hiſtory of 1796, which contains a copious account of all captures made by French, or Engliſh privateers up to about the end of April. The detail was then ſuſpended from want of room.

This forbearance, on the part of France, from the time that the treaty had been approved by the preſident, till appropriations were made for it by congreſs, was the reſult of honourable and ſound policy. By commencing the capture of American ſhipping, while the fate of Jay's treaty was yet undecided, they would have been ſure to exaſperate the people of this country, and run the chance of driving them into a ſtill cloſer connection with England. They did not furniſh America with any pretence or provocation to quarrel with them, while, at the ſame time, they left her to the free operation of her own mind. The republic, during this interval, ſuffered ſeverely by the treaty; for they reſpected that of Paris, while the United States permitted England to break it. The French, agreeably to its ſtipulations, allowed Britiſh property to go free, if protected by an American bottom; while the Britiſh, in expreſs violation of the twenty-fifth and ſaving article of Jay's treaty, ſeized French property in American ſhipping.

Theſe are facts inconteſtably true; and they place France in the moſt favourable light, when compared to Britain. Under very great diſadvantage, the republic adhered to her treaty of 1778, while England was inceſſantly violating the one, dictated by herſelf, that ſhe had juſt made with Jay. The republic thus acted with ſtrict honour, while England diſplayed treachery. Yet even this perfidy and

effrontery had no effect in rouſing America to manly feelings. On the contrary, in ſpring, 1796, while the treaty was before congreſs, and while Britiſh captures and impreſſments filled every newſpaper, Meſſrs. Harper and Tracy ſtood up in the houſe to deny their exiſtence. An artificial caterwauling was, in the meanwhile, excited all over the country, that unleſs the United States agreed to Jay's treaty, England would declare war. In vain did Mr. Gallatin, and others, urge, that, before the appropriation for effecting it, England ſhould be compelled to ſuſpend her piracies. For urging a propoſition ſo juſt in itſelf, and ſo important to America, they were, in the brutal, paper-jobbing dialect, reproached as penſioners of France.

The republic, in the unavoidable exerciſe of her judgment, could not help deſpiſing a people ſo completely enfeebled by puſillanimity, by ſelfiſhneſs, and by faction. Almoſt one half of congreſs were ſo far from wanting to redreſs the Britiſh injuries committed on their allies, and even on their own conſtituents, that they cenſured every member who wiſhed to complain. When the directory ſaw that the federal faction were entirely victorious; that England continued to ſeize French property in American bottoms; and that our executive took no effective ſteps to prevent it; having waited as long as juſtice to their fellow citizens could permit them to wait; they, on July 2d, 1796, paſſed a decree, of which Mr. Pickering gives this account. "It announces, that the conduct of France "towards neutrals, will be regulated by the man-"ner in which they ſhould ſuffer the Engliſh to "treat them*." If they were to be ruled by that precedent, they could never be at a loſs to vindi-

* Meſſage from the Preſident, of 22d June, 1797, p. 6.

cate all ſorts of crimes. Though the decree was dated July 2d, 1796, it was not, as Mr. Pickering obſerves, "in general operation, until "October." From this account it clearly follows, that French depredations are the conſequence of congreſs having appropriated for Jay's treaty, without making even an attempt to enforce that of Paris, for the protection of French property under the American flag.

The principle laid down in the decree is, in itſelf, equitable. It has been followed, on the 2d of March, 1797, by one ſtill more explicit, and which forms No. II. of the documents, already cited, laid before congreſs, by Mr. Adams, on June 22d, 1797. An abridgement of the chief articles in the latter edict, will explain the greater part of the preſent grounds of complaint, which France has againſt America, and which are fairly deducible from Jay's unhappy deſertion of the doctrine, that free bottoms make free goods; that a French cargo is ſafe under the American flag.

The directory begin by quoting a law of May 9th, 1793, of which, the preſent decree is little more than a ſecond edition. This law, which had either been long ſuſpended, or, indeed, never executed, ſets out with complaining that the enemies of France violate the flag of neutral powers to her prejudice, and therefore, ſays, that ſhe can no longer fulfil, towards thoſe neutral powers in general, the wiſh that ſhe has conſtantly manifeſted for the entire freedom of commerce and navigation.

The law of 1793, then enjoins, that neutral veſſels may be ſtopt, when the property of an enemy is found on board of them. Thus, if a merchant in London, comes over to Norfolk, in Virginia, buys a quantity of tobacco, and ſhips it for England, in an American bottom, the cargo will be ſeizable.

The veſſel, however, is to be diſcharged, as ſoon as unloaded, and what American property ſhe may contain is alſo free. She is to be paid the freight for which ſhe was hired, with a juſt indemnification for the time of her being detained. French tribunals are appointed to determine thoſe matters. The law, with equity, adds, that its operations againſt neutral bottoms are to ceaſe, whenever the enemy ſhall declare that they will no longer moleſt French property in the like ſituation. All this, with the long forbearance of France, till ſo late as October, 1796, evidently proves, that the republic was driven into the preſent attack upon neutral bottoms, by the neceſſity of creating a counterbalance to the previous and ſtill continued piracies of Britain.

Having cited this law, the decree next refers to Jay's treaty, and that of Paris. It explains wherein they differ, and in what way they muſt be reconciled, in order to ſecure an equal advantage to France as to England. The directory quote, in their defence, the ſecond article of the treaty of Paris, which begins in theſe terms.

"The moſt chriſtian king, and the United States, "engage, mutually, not to grant any particular fa- "vour to other nations, in reſpect of commerce and "navigation, which ſhall not immediately be com- "mon to the other party, who ſhall enjoy the ſame "favour."

After explaining the neceſſity for taking advantage of this ſtipulation, the decree quotes the ſeventeenth article of Jay's treaty, and, grounding preciſely on the ſame footing, declares, that *free ſhips are* NOT *to make free cargoes*. It next refers to the eighteenth article, and in like manner extends the liſt of contraband goods beyond what was ſettled by the treaty of Paris. Jay had admitted ſhip-timber, pitch, tar, hemp, and ſome other

articles to be ſeizable, even though American property. The decree follows up this blow, and juſtice cannot blame it.

Jay, by the twenty-firſt article, conſented, that an American ſailor, fighting on board of a French veſſel, and taken priſoner by England, ſhall be treated as a *pirate*. The French decree copies this clauſe, and then makes the ſame declaration. It farther adds, that an American ſhall not be permitted to plead *impreſſment*. This is hard upon individuals, but as to the United States at large, they never made any ſerious efforts to hinder Engliſh kidnapping. Their negligence cauſed great numbers of Americans to be impreſſed, and whether as volunteers, or by compulſion, they are equally effective againſt France. Hence the republic is warranted, in her own defence, to uſe every method for compelling the United States to do juſtice to themſelves, and to her.

Mr. Pinckney* ſays, that American ſailors are at preſent detained in Breſt, as priſoners of war, and "ſuffer much by cloſe confinement and bad "proviſions." They may thank the miſerable clauſe which declared them liable to be conſidered as pirates, if they enliſted on board of French ſhips of war. But for that clauſe, the French would have been glad to ſet them free, and take them into their own ſervice. At preſent, many Americans are, in ſpite of the treaty, in the French navy, and theſe priſoners in Breſt will be kept moſt likely, as a pledge, in caſe that Barney, or ſome other Americans, in the French ſervice, ſhall be captured by the Engliſh. Jay has authoriſed Grenville to hang Barney, and the directory keep another ſet of Americans for the halter of retaliation. To ſuch a climax of independence, reſpect, and

* Documents, &c. p. 33.

dignity, has this country been elevated by the maſterly politics of the federal party. It is impoſſible that we ſhould eſcape the univerſal contempt of Europe. The ſix per cent. cabinet have converted the national character into a ſort of political common ſewer for the reception of every indignity from every government on earth.

The two decrees of the French directory, of July 2d, 1796, and March 2d, 1797, are evidently engrafted on the principles of the Britiſh treaty, and muſt be aſcribed excluſively to it. They differ eſſentially from the buccaneering proclamations of the Britiſh king, for the legal adjudication of American veſſels. They go preciſely as far as the United States already ſuffered England to go, and not a ſtep farther. In executing theſe French decrees, many ſeizures have taken place, which they did not apparently contemplate. Many horrid outrages have been committed on the property and perſons of Americans; for the crew of a French privateer are compoſed of as coarſe materials as thoſe of an Engliſh one. But the conduct of our government led exactly to ſuch a ſituation. For ſome years paſt it has beat up for external indignities. It has ſent out riders to take in commiſſions for inſult. Such were thoſe factors of degradation, Thomas Pinckney and John Jay. "If "the treaty is ratified," ſaid preſident Waſhington, "the partiſans of the French, or rather of "war and confuſion, will excite them to hoſtile "meaſures; or at leaſt to unfriendly ſentiments*." In every word he was miſtaken. The treaty was oppoſed by friends of peace and order. Since it paſt, they have never excited the French to hoſtilities. But war and confuſion were juſtly foreſeen,

* Randolph p. 37.

as the obvious conſequence of the treaty itſelf. It was framed under the auſpices of a party in profeſſed enmity to France. "The ſucceſs of the "duke of Brunſwick was moſt earneſtly wiſhed "for by the principal agents of this ariſtocratic "and fiſcal party, who had not even the decency "to conceal their ſentiments upon the ſubject.— "The pulſe of the whole party beat in uniſon "with him, as he advanced towards Paris, and "with him they were covered with ſhame and "mortification as he retreated*." Yet, with their uſual ſincerity, they affect to date their dread of France from the arrival of Genet, about eight months after.

This explanation has been ſomewhat long, but it accounts for the preſent conduct of the French. It ſhews that they have received atrocious provocation; that they bore it for a conſiderable time, with patience, till they ſaw that no redreſs was to be expected. They are now acting, from honeſt reſentment, what England did from wanton inſolence. This is the real diſtinction between the piracies of the two nations. When a man becomes both judge and avenger in his own cauſe, he is apt not only to get juſtice, but ſomething more than juſtice. This is, no doubt, the way with the French; but for the original miſchief, we are to blame ſuch legiſlators as Harriſon Otis, to whoſe harangue we are now to return.

"Where," ſaid Mr. Otis, "are your ſailors? "Liſten to the paſſing gale of the ocean, and "you will hear their groans iſſuing from French "priſon ſhips." If they were taken in Engliſh ſhips of war, the French are well entitled to confine them. While the Britiſh impreſſed Americans by thouſands,

* An Examination of the late Proceedings in Congreſs, &c. p. 23.

the federal party were troubled with an invincible deafneſs. But whenever the French begin to offend in the ſame way, they become quick of hearing.

Mr. Otis "*defied* the ingenuity of any gentleman to draw a compariſon between the directory and the Britiſh parliament, to the advantage of the former; and *inſiſted* that the demands of Charles de la Croix were upon a parallel with thoſe of lord North." If the orator means to compare the parliament of 1775, with the preſent directory, or to ſay that the diſmiſſion of Pinckney amounts to another Boſton port bill, he commits a groſs violation of truth. Incendiaries, like Mr. Otis, have hurried this country into a ſeries of meaſures offenſive to France, and previouſly deſigned to be ſo. America muſt now retrace her ſteps. If La Croix had ſent forty thouſand men to invade this continent, there would be ſome meaning in the defiance of Mr. Otis. But now, it is the challenge of ignorance, debility, and impoſture.

"There was a time when he (Mr. Otis) was animated with enthuſiaſm in favour of the French revolution, and he cheriſhed it, while civil liberty appeared to be the object; but he now conſidered that revolution as completely atchieved, and that the war was continued, not for liberty, but for conqueſt and aggrandizement, to which he did not believe it was *the intereſt of this country to contribute.*"

The power of France may become dangerous to the United States, becauſe they have treated her as an alien. This cannot be helped. They are but in the griſtle of political ſtrength, and muſt fail with the ſtream. As for the revolution being *completely atchieved*, Mr. Fenno hath ſince affirmed, that it is on the eve of being *blown up**. The hope of a dif-

* Supra Chap. VIII.

ference between the directory and the council of five hundred, induced Malmesbury, as the French affirm, to retard, for some time, his second negociation. This we learn by a message from the former body to the latter. Such a delay, at this late period of the war, shews the good will and unextinguished hope of the combined powers. Civil liberty is as much the object of the revolution as it ever was. Mr. Otis and his party pretend to be republicans. Hence, instead of regretting, they should have been glad at the establishment of an Italian republic. They ought to wish for a similar reformation in the German empire; that mankind might have a choice of their own, and be no longer driven into military service, like an ox to the slaughter. A true republican will rejoice as much at the success of his principles, as a true christian at the propagation of the gospel. Had Otis been an Irish peasant, existing, with his family, upon six-pence sterling per day, he would have seen the propriety of an alteration in government*. If his father, an Austrian farmer, had cut off his thumbs to secure him from conscription, our spokesman would have panted for the deposition of his imperial majesty. The rest of this long speech may, without injuring the fame of Mr. Otis, be suffered to sink in oblivion.

* A London newspaper of September 25, 1796, gives a report from a committee of the whig club of Ireland. They say, that, in many parts of that country, a labourer, during the preceding winter, and spring, had only six-pence per day, while oatmeal was at eighteen-pence, and potatoes at three-pence farthing per stone.

At six-pence per day, the labour of a week amounts to three shillings. With this, the man could buy two stones, or thirty-two pounds of meal, for himself, his wife, and three children. This came to fourteen ounces and an half of oatmeal per day, for each, on the supposition that the family could live without fire, clothes, or lodging. The report adds, that the price of oatmeal and potatoes, during the above period, had been, not less, but often considerably dearer than these rates; and that, for *the last three years*, the general state of the poor had been but in a small degree better.

Mr. Giles roſe ſoon after. He remarked, that while we were ſo loudly denying ourſelves to be a divided people, the very debate proved us to be ſo. This inconteſtable obſervation, ſtrikes at the root of the preſident's ſpeech. Barras had only ſaid what all mankind know to be true.

Mr. Swanwick ſpoke in defence of the amendment of Mr. Nicholas. He "thought, that a number of gentlemen had already *fixed their opinions for* A FRENCH WAR.—It was ſaid, that it would be dictating to the executive to expreſs our opinion of what meaſures ought to be taken. Mr. Swanwick did not underſtand this language. The executive had called us together to tell us the preſent ſtate of affairs. And are we to ſit with our arms folded? Are we to go into the merits of the ſpeech; its arguments; and the circumſtances attending it; and not to ſay a ſingle word of what ought to be done, becauſe it is not our department? What! *Is not the peace of the country within our department? Are we called together only to vote for taxes?* Are we ſo muzzled by the conſtitution, that we muſt be ſilent about the great concerns of the nation? We are not now interfering with the treaty-making power, but merely giving a general opinion. Could ſuch ſilence have been in the view of the framers of the conſtitution? We may not give an advice before hand! After the treaty is made it is the law, and the houſe have no right of doing any thing but to give their money."

This argument was unanſwerable.

If the federal patriots could obtain their apparent object, the legiſlature would ſink into a mere office for the regiſtration of taxes. No Britiſh miniſter durſt forbid a member of parliament from diſcuſſing the preference of peace or war.

Mr. Livingſton was for the amendment. "If we "adhere," ſaid he, "to the ſtile of the addreſs as re- "ported, go to war we muſt. WAR is the idea of the "*ſpeech*.—Mr. Livingſton aſked, if we were to fight "the French becauſe they expreſſed good wiſhes "for the people of America." (This referred to the ſpeech of Barras.) "Mr. Livingſton thought, "that the Dutch had fully as much reaſon to be "offended with Quincy Adams, as we had to com- "plain of Barras." Here he read the paſſage in Mr. Adams' letter, which deſcribes the dependent ſtate of the patriotic party in Holland.

Mr. Coit propoſed ſeveral additions and alterations of his own. He was ſorry that the houſe had ever got into the habit of anſwering preſidential ſpeeches. He recommended the omiſſion of all which related to Barras, and the inſertion of ſomething in a ſofter tone.

Mr. Livingſton had ſpoke of the impreſſment of thouſands of American ſeamen. Mr. Harper, in contradiction to this, declared that he could produce very good authority; being that of the gentleman himſelf. He was appointed chairman of a committee to report on the ſubject; and, after an enquiry of ſeveral months, the reſult ſtood thus:

American ſeamen impreſſed,	42
Natives of Britain,	12
Foreigners,	26
Country unknown,	17
Total,	97

This he thought a ſufficient reply.

Mr. Livingſton ſaid, that, with regard to the impreſſment, returns had only been made by five or ſix collectors; ſo that the accounts contained

nothing like a ſtatement of the real amount of impreſſments.—Among others, the great port of New-York had ſent no return. Even thoſe that were made out referred only to a few months, from the beginning of January, 1796; and thouſands of ſeamen might have been impreſſed before that account began. Mr. Livingſton had never heard that any of the above people were releaſed.

To this explanation Harper made no anſwer. He ſtood plainly convicted of an attempt to deceive the houſe. He wanted, as Henry Fielding expreſſes it, *to convey* A LIE *in the words of truth*. The report contained, indeed, only ninety ſeven names; but then, as Harper well knew, it was confined to a mere handful of the impreſſments.

Mr. Giles made a long ſpeech in favour of the amendment of Mr. Nicholas. He "gave Mr. Pinck-"ney *great* credit for his behaviour. He had ac-"quired as much reputation, as, in ſuch an exigen-"cy, it was poſſible to acquire. But Mr. Giles "could not ſay that the diſmiſſion was entirely "groundleſs." It was very well grounded, as hath already been proved. Mr. Pinckney deſerved no part of this encomium. Mr. Giles ſaid, that "the ten-"dency of the ſpeech and report was to declare "war.—France would think it equal to a declara-"tion of a war, if this amendment was rejected.—"It was no ſecret that the United States *had not* "*done juſtice* to France."

Mr. Gallatin adverted to the ſingular doctrine of the houſe not being at liberty to give their opinion on the preference of peace or war, becauſe it interfered with the power of *making treaties*. Mr. Gallatin ſaid, that "he could cover the table "with parliamentary precedents for giving ſuch "opinions, even in a country where the king is "entruſted with the ſole power of making war."

In a subsequent speech, on May 27th, Mr. Harper said that Buonaparte was fit only for the perpetration of atrocities; that he was a man who had established a reputation upon crimes; that he could be compared to none but the leaders of Goths and Vandals; with other phrases, foreign to the subject, yet well fitted for inflaming his audience against France, and the latter against them. The attempts of Harper to involve the continent in a French and Spanish war, cast Nero and his conflagration into the shade. In presence of the Spanish ambassador, he last summer named his catholic majesty to congress as the *vassal* king of Spain. Mr. Harper has not received the education, nor does he possess the feelings of a gentleman; otherwise this burst of vulgarity could not have escaped from his lips. Behold the being that hisses at the Corsican hero!

After such doings, Mr. Harper and his party pretend to be angry at the dismission of Pinckney. Put the case that Barras had granted him an audience, and had spoke as follows. "Your president "is an old doating fool. His head is turned with "his elevation. He suffers himself to be led by "the nose by a circle of associates in the pay of "Britain. But unless he and his congress chuse "to correct their stile, the republican navy shall "lay New-York and Philadelphia as flat as the floor "that you *stand* on." Such a harrangue would not be more brutal or insolent than the menace which Harper has thrown out of conquering the Spanish colonies. Pluck out the *beam* before you seek for the *mote*.

The words of this legislative luminary were taken down, and published a few days after, in the Merchant's Advertiser, as a part of his speech. By this time he had begun to be ashamed of it. He

went to Mr. Bradford's office, made a conſiderable noiſe, and obtained admiſſion for a *corrected* copy of his harangue. It appeared, for the ſecond time, on the 10th of June. Mr. Harper therein only ſays, that Buonaparte was "a great man, truly qualified to be the inſtrument of ſuch oppreſſion." He afterwards printed a third edition of it, in three ſucceſſive numbers of another newſpaper, wherein it ſwelled to the incredible bulk of ſeven folio pages. It is hard to believe that one half of this matter was ever pronounced in the houſe, for they ſit only four or five hours.

We ſhall here conclude this imperfect glance at the debates on the preſident's ſpeech. The repreſentatives did not get their addreſs ready, till the ſecond of June. They had met on the 15th of May, heard the oration on the 16th, and had tugged for ſixteen days incluſive, from the 17th, to the 2d of June following. The amendment of Mr. Nicholas was rejected. All the paſſages, quoted in the outſet of this ſketch, were retained. The yeas and nays were called over ſeven times. The addreſs finally paſt, by ſixty-two votes againſt thirty-ſix; and, with admirable conſiſtency, cenſured the directory, for gently hinting to Monroe, that we are a divided people. This paper affirmed, alſo, that "the conduct of the government has been *juſt* and *impartial* to foreign nations." The affirmation is univerſally known to be falſe*; and as ſuch, had been conſtantly contradicted by the republican ſide of the houſe. The ſeſſion ended on July 5th, 1797, hav-

* Among other glaring inſtances of partiality, obſerve the following. France and England are at war. Government permits the latter, unmoleſted, to preſs our ſeamen. At the ſame time we agree to a treaty forbidding them to enter into French ſervice. Beſides that the French are greatly in want of able ſailors, an American, by ſpeaking the Engliſh language, and being acquainted with the ſeamanſhip of that people, would be of peculiar uſe in a French privateer.

ing laſted exactly fifty-two days. Of theſe, ſixteen were ſpent upon an anſwer to the preſident. The whole charge of the ſeſſion, by an account given in, was about eighty thouſand dollars, or fifteen hundred and thirty eight dollars, and a fraction, per day. Thus the addreſs required twenty-four thouſand ſix hundred dollars worth of time, and amounted, in the judgment of the minority, to a declaration of war againſt France. The journal of the whole ſeſſion forms but an hundred and forty pages. The reply of Mr. Adams to this addreſs, ends on the forty-fourth.

So much buſtle about a preſident's ſpeech, evidently ſhews that we are ambitious of poſting towards monarchy. Speaking of the late birth day of general Waſhington, a federal newſpaper has theſe words.—"Two public companies, and many pri-"vate parties, obſerved this POLITICAL CHRIST-"MAS, and HALLOWED it*!" It is believed that no Engliſh print was ever polluted with ſuch abject profanation. Mr. Adams was not contented with ſcolding at France. He hath ſince been inveighing againſt thoſe who diſapprove his conduct. He was angry at Barras for attempting, as he alledged, to ſeparate the people from their government. He now declares, that ſuch a project has actually been framed in the United States; and that it has *a high probability of ſucceſs!* The particulars are thus.

On Auguſt 7th, 1797, Mr. Adams dined at Faneuil Hall, in Boſton, with two hundred and fifty of his fellow citizens. An addreſs was preſented to him, which has this paſſage. "When domeſtic *fac-*"*tion* appears to have conſpired with foreign in-"trigue, to deſtroy the peace of our country; when "our conſtituted authorities are reviled and inſul-

* Aurora, 7th March, 1797.

" ted*; and the moſt *daring* attempts to ſeparate " the people from their government are openly " made and avowed; at ſuch a criſis we are excited, " no leſs by our inclination than our duty, to re- " probate," &c.

To this yell of malice and ſtupidity, the preſident made a moſt gracious reply. The addreſs had *fourteen* lines upon faction. Mr. Adams rung the changes through forty-eight. " I cannot," ſays he, " but be of the opinion, that the profligate ſpirit of " falſehood and malignity, which has appeared in " ſome, and the unguarded diſpoſition in others to " encourage it, are ſerious evils, and bear a threat- " ening aſpect upon the union of the ſtates, their " conſtitution of government, and the moral cha- " racter of the nation."

Thus hath our preſident proclaimed his reſentment becauſe a minority of congreſs were unwilling to embark in his French war. He ſeems to juſtify an obſervation made by Mr. Paine. " I have " always," ſays he, " been oppoſed to the mode of " refining government up to an individual, or what " is called a ſingle executive. Such a man will al- " ways be *the chief of a party*. A plurality is far " better. It combines the maſs of a nation better " together; and, beſides this, it is neceſſary to the " manly mind of a republic, that it loſes the debaſ- " ing idea of obeying an individual†."

The houſe of repreſentatives have always poſſeſſed a number of men, equal to Mr. Adams. Nothing but the ſpirit of ſervility would excite ſuch a noiſe about his ſpeech. The debate on making an anſwer to it produced a dozen ſpeeches equal

* The greateſt inſult was that on the repreſentatives, of their not being at liberty to give an opinion to the preſident for or againſt a rupture with France.

† Paine to Waſhington, p. 5.

to his. But then Mr. Adams has the right of appointment to many ſnug places, with an annual ſinecure to himſelf of twenty-five thouſand dollars. Theſe be thy gods O Iſrael! But for his high ſalary, and his unbounded patronage, an anſwer to a preſident's ſpeech would be very conciſe, and the debates upon it very cool.

If the change to a quintuple directory can be accompliſhed, without intermediate miſchief, it may be as well for America if Mr. Adams ſhall be her laſt preſident. This remark is not levelled at the gentleman, but the office. Matters have come to ſuch a height that Mr. Jefferſon, if choſen at the next election, will, perhaps, be forced to take refuge in his party. They can hardly commit as much harm as their predeceſſors have done. The certificates are funded. The bank government is eſtabliſhed. Yet, after all, democratical aſcendency will ſtill be, moſt likely, but the domination of a party. A native citizen of the county of Philadelphia, of the firſt claſs, both in point of information and of fortune, was aſked, during the late preſidential canvaſs, whether he preferred Adams or Jefferſon. "I wiſh for "the latter," he replied, "as, by far, moſt likely to "keep us out of a French war. But I would rather "ſee a ſtick of wood in the chair than either of the "candidates. The very buſtle that you make about "this election proves that your conſtitution is a "monarchy. A pure republic will reſt nothing upon "the choice of a ſingle man."

The anſwer to the ſpeech ſhould be circumſcribed to a verbal meſſage; and congreſs ought to give up the cuſtom of viſiting a preſident at his levees, and on his birth day. A gradual extinction ſhould be promoted of that fulſome ſtile with which, for theſe nine years, our preſidents have been addreſſed.

In his anſwer to the Boſton addreſs, Mr. Adams ſpeaks of "a threatening aſpect upon *the union* of "the ſtates." The ſtrongeſt aſpect of that kind appears in Connecticut. On December 23d, 1796, there was diſtributed to the aſſembly of Pennſylvania, a pamphlet, entitled, *Papers Reſpecting Intruſions by Connecticut Claimants*. It begins with a circular letter of April 16th, 1796, from the governor of this ſtate to thoſe of New-Jerſey, New-York, Rhode-Iſland, Connecticut, and Maſſachuſetts. This incloſed the copy of a proclamation, iſſued by him, at the inſtance of the aſſembly, for preventing intruſions. A requeſt was ſubjoined that it might be publiſhed in their reſpective ſtates; and, that if any attempts were made to emigrate into Pennſylvania, they might be oppoſed.

Obſerve the various reception that this letter met with from theſe five governors. As New-York has a ſimilar quarrel with Connecticut, Mr. Jay not only publiſhed the Pennſylvanian manifeſto, but ſuperadded another of his own. New-Jerſey and Maſſachuſetts have no ſuch intereſt in the cauſe, and in theſe two ſtates it was ſent to the newſpapers, without ſuch an appendage. Rhode-Iſland, influenced by its Connecticut neighbours, appears to have done nothing at all. The governor of Connecticut declined perſonal agency in printing the proclamation, but, with an obliging anſwer, laid it before the two branches of the legiſlature.

From the other papers we learn, that, early in May, 1796, a land ſurveyor, from Connecticut, and four aſſiſtants, were on the Pennſylvania line, near the one hundred and twenty-nine mile ſtone. They deſigned to run off ſix townſhips within this ſtate. A letter from Lycoming county, of June 18th, 1796, informed, that there were five ſetts of ſurveyors on the ſame buſineſs. On June 22d, a committee of

that county was held to counteract the invaders. In a letter of July 6th, to the governor, the committee write thus. "We have further been informed, "that, ſome few days ſince, a party, of fifteen or "twenty men, were ſeen, *well armed with rifles*, "and equipped, proceeding on into the country up "the Cawaneſque, in the neighbourhood of the "ſtate line; and that a party of fifteen ſurveyors, "with their hands, were to ſet out from about the "mouth of Tioga river, to ſurvey in the ſame coun-"try. General report ſays, that this proceeding "has taken place, ſince a council was reſolved upon "and holden at Tioga point, *in conſequence of your "excellency's proclamation being ſent into that coun-"try*. We are aſſured, that they are in numerous "parties, throughout the northern parts of this "country, and we apprehend that they expect "reſiſtance to their intruſions. We are decidedly "of opinion, that a civil magiſtrate, unprotected "by an armed force, would be in imminent danger "in attempting to arreſt any of the intruders." Meaſures were taken to repel them, and their project was, for that time, ſuſpended.

Here we ſee, that a party of armed men entered Pennſylvania, with a purpoſe to reſiſt the governor's proclamation. Granting their claim to be well founded, it ought not to be ſupported by rifles. A ſimilar conduct in other diſputes about land, would fill the continent with carnage. A purchaſer, joſtled out of his farm, has only to charge his gun, and level at his enemy. This precedent is the moſt alarming, the moſt antifederal, that can well be imagined. It came from a body of people firmly devoted to Mr. Adams. If any other ſtate had invaded Connecticut with a detachment of men in arms the whole union would have rung with reproaches, from Trumball, Webſter, and the reſt of her lite-

rati. The deſign was dropt from dread of a ſuperior force, but will, it is likely, be renewed with the firſt opportunity. Our preſident may point out, if he can, what other ſtate entertains any plans which are half ſo dangerous to the general peace. If governor Mifflin had refuſed to publiſh a proclamation againſt the weſtern inſurgents, he would have behaved preciſely as the governor of Connecticut did, in the affair of the Suſquehanna company.

THE END.

60.
18.