

been in the constant act, under sanction of this treaty of making prize of all property belonging to citizens of the United States, found in English Spanish, Portuguese, Austrian, Dutch and Prussian vessels, I mean since those nations have been at war with her; and what do we gain? It cannot operate in our favor any further than to save French property to them, if found in our vessels, if we had treaties of a similar kind with the world. So that this kind of treaty is uncommonly circumstanced indeed, we can gain nothing but a protection for our friend's property; but lose directly our own: and we never can be in a situation to gain unless we pre-suppose war, which I hope we may avoid; certainly we are not as liable to war, as the nations in Europe, who are generally in war 3 or 4 years in every 7: of course this trait in treaties is no very inviting one to us. If treaties are formed in the common file, that is, place the nation treating, on the basis of the most favored nations, every one can discern, it amounts to little, if any thing, more than complimentary language of course.

One great object of these resolves is, to effect a treaty with Great Britain, and we are told in the same breath, that Great Britain is in a habit of breaking, not only the law of nations, but solemn treaty.

But we are told a free trade or rather a trade on principles of more reciprocity is to be obtained by these regulations: And that France gives us that reciprocity, and of course, we ought to withdraw our trade from the English, and give it to France. If the markets of France, and the benefits of trade in her ports, exceed those of any other nation, our trade will go there of itself if not, why force it? In this part of the argument, I request the liberty of treating both France and England merely as commercial nations, for if commercial benefits are not found in the trade of two nations, I very much doubt the continuation of the trade, from principles of friendship.

What favors do we receive from France, which will justify such an exertion to put down her rival, and build her up? Our trade is at present under no very auspicious circumstances with France; even in the best of times, a merchant having established his correspondence there on the most favored footing, when he sent his cargo, could draw bills for one third of the amount, and they would be honored; the remaining two thirds, after fold, the American merchant would be advised he might draw for, but no interest allowed for the time the French merchant held the property; but if the amount of bills drawn at first, exceeded the third part of sales, interest was charged. The English merchant, would honor his American correspondent's bills, when accompanied by his bill of lading only, for the whole amount, and cargoes have often been purchased and the insurance, wages, and finding of the ship, been paid, out of the avails of her cargo, thus anticipated by bills, before the voyage. This course of trade, as practised by the two nations, needs no comment. Are the fabrics of the French better than the English? Is this a proper time to depend upon France for our articles of clothing, when she is convulsed to her center by a war? And can any man suppose, the column established in Lyons, sacred to Liberty, is any more favorable to her manufacturers than if no such column had been there, and her manufactures were increasing instead of diminishing? Does the government of France admit us into her West-Indies, with any favor peculiar to us?—The act opening her West-Indies, was no more for us, than the British act is against us, the fact is, neither of them cared for us, they each did what they thought would best promote their own interest.

If these regulations are to unshackle our trade, why not leave it unshackled? The fetters are only changed from one side to the other, and France stamped upon them instead of England.

The circumstance of heavily taxing our trade to Great Britain, for the sake of driving it to France, is a proof that it enjoys more freedom where it is.

If it be true, that we injure ourselves in the first instance, by these restrictions, although Great Britain deserves punishment, I have said we should be cautious how we sacrifice ourselves to a principle of revenge: But it may be worth enquiry, how much it is probable we can injure Great Britain?

It is said Great Britain depends upon

the United States, for the bread of her manufacturers and the raw materials which employ them.

It ought to be remarked here, that a principal complaint against Great Britain is, that she prohibits our bread-stuff, and this is a fact, except in times of scarcity. One would think to hear the declarations in this house, that all men were fed at the openings of our hand, and if we shut that hand, the nations starve, and if we but shake the fist after it is shut, they die. This language, to say no more of it, will prove our origin to be British and that not long ago, for the same gentlemen say, the British nation is proud in the extreme. It is well known the Dutch are in treaty with us, and of course are to be favoured by the third resolution, which places all nations in treaty with us, on a footing of lower tonnage: It is likewise known that the English have as much ascendancy over the Dutch as propriety would dictate: What would these restrictions do then, at best, but shape the course of our trade through Holland? Our trade might perhaps come more from the Texel than the Thames, but the names would constitute the chief difference.

Spain and Portugal, in Europe, and their other dominions, if once called upon by necessity, can raise bread stuff to an unlimited amount. And if we refuse our provisions to the West Indies, would not Great Britain thank us, for the bounty we should give, in that very act of denial to the Canadian country, which she is so rapidly filling, even with our own citizens? The provisions of every kind, which may be raised there, no man can limit with any kind of certainty. But cannot Great Britain retaliate, and distress us in a commercial war? I will not enlarge upon this, it has already been shewn, that Great Britain can retaliate with ten-fold advantages. It is said although she can injure us in part, she will suffer in the greatest degree and that our sufferings will be spread nearly over the whole community, each will bear a part, but Great Britain will suffer in one entire class of citizens, her manufacturers. It will be but a poor consolation to our farmers at large, when they find themselves suffering, to inform them, that a very innocent set of men, the manufacturers of Great Britain are suffering much more than they do; and if they should clamour against government, it would be an unsatisfactory answer to them, that there was a greater clamour, and even mob in England.

(To be concluded in our next.)

For the Gazette of the United States.

THE word rabble gives offence to some persons to whom it seems the atrocious deeds of the French give none. Murder, in the name and in mockery of justice, is palliated, while any marks of disgust or fear of the idleness, ignorance and wickedness of those who are as ready to perpetrate as to approve these horrors, is condemned. The paragraph writer in the General Advertiser of Friday last, should know that the word rabble is used as properly and as boldly in the case he alludes to, as the sort of people described by it are now wickedly and destructively employed in other countries.

Lord George Gordon's mob was a rabble. The murderers of Paris are a rabble. Those whom vice, ignorance, idleness, and the rod of despotism, have driven from the just rank of men, are a rabble. Europe is full of rabble, and the overflowings of their multitudes have more or less tainted the healthy mafs of our large towns. Such are the men who were ready to mob for privateering.

The industrious and peaceable poor are not rabble. Few, very few American born, deserve that name. The means of subsistence and the means of knowledge, are too general to permit the degradation of our native citizens to such a state.—The paragraph writer may praise the principles of such persons as much as he may choose—he may step in between them and their proper description. But he will find it no easy matter to set them on.—Philadelphia is not Paris. It is more in his power to puff the glories of distant assassinations, than to find a proper number of pike-men to perpetrate them here.—Ambitious knaves, men loaded with debts and infamy, become formidable, when they put themselves at the head of a rabble, whom they train to the practice of vice by the hypocrisy of more virtue than other men—whom they ripen for anarchy,

by making all government suspected, and all rights but those of violence and licentiousness, odious. Not one of our great towns is without such a party, and such leaders: The body of our citizens, and our country people, are of a very different sort. Happily the rabble of America is infinitely out-numbered; but the corps of officers to lead them, and the principles and objects to bring about a state of what the Jacobins term *sovereign insurrection and permanent revolution*, are already as complete in this country as in France.

A FARMER.

For the GAZETTE of the UNITED STATES.

Some Observations on the Question—Have Governments a right to deprive a Citizen or Citizens of life?

GOVERNMENTS are greater or lesser bodies of people, united for their mutual security, and convenience—the powers which those Governments possess, must be formed from the powers or rights, which individuals in their separate capacities possessed, a part of which being given up for the protection of the rest, form, or compose all the powers which Governments can rightly possess—No community or body of people can possess rights, or powers, which the individuals who compose that community did not, on entering into the social compact, possess individually. A, cannot convey to B, the plantation of C, because it is not his—neither can any man convey to Government, a right in his own life, because that right is not at his disposal, much less can he convey the life of his fellow-citizen; if this principle can be established, it will be clear, that communities cannot possess a right to deprive its citizens of life.

Man has not a right in his own life (to dispose of it) appears to me, for the following reasons:

1st. It is contrary to divine command, as it is no where expressed in Sacred Writ, but abundantly denied.

2d. From that natural fear of death, and love of life, implanted in us, for the best of purposes.

3d. From that universal disapprobation which suicide has met with among civilized man, who have endeavored as much as possible to suppress the practice, by stigmatizing the memory of the dead, and cautioning the living.

It appears then that God, nature, and man, have (few accepted) discouraged, and denied man's power over his own life.

If therefore the powers which governments possess, are formed of the powers which individuals give up—

But individuals possessing no power to give up, or throw their own lives into the common stock.

Government can possess no power to dispose of the lives of its citizens.

The life of man is in a similar situation in my view with the rights of conscience—beyond the reach of any thing but Tyranny.

From the American Daily Advertiser.

Messrs. Dunlap & Claypoole,

ONE of your Correspondents, who had a great esteem for the late *Speaker of the State Senate*, is extremely gratified with every mark of respect which is shewn to his Memory:—Such he must consider the formal visit of condolence which (he hears) has been made to Mrs. P. by the Gentlemen of that Body who served with him in Legislation—a circumstance as favorable to his reputation as to theirs;—for what could better prove the reality of a liberal and generous mind, than the free homage thus paid to the virtues of their deceased Colleague, by men with whom he was not unfrequently at variance in important Legislative questions, and whose tenor of political conduct differed materially from his own.

From the Connecticut Courant.

Messrs. HUDSON and GOODWIN.

MR. JOHN FENNO, Editor of the "Gazette of the United States," has printed in his New-paper, some verses, which he pretends were presented by the carrier of "the Connecticut Courant," to your customers. It is not a little surprising, that a Printer should profess to reprint the writings of other people, and at the same time take upon himself the task of altering those writings at his pleasure. Mr. Fenno in this instance, has not only omitted several lines, without informing mankind of the fact, but has made an alteration totally subversive of the writer's

meaning, and in direct opposition to his sentiments. Whatever Mr. John Fenno may think on the subject, the writer of the New-year verses, considers Samuel Adams, as having little claim to the character of *Patriot*. He therefore is not obliged by the alteration. Nor does he view the transaction as affording any very convincing proof of Mr. Fenno's modesty. The business of a critic, generally requires greater talents, than commonly fall to the share of the Editors of News-papers. This is not the only instance of similar conduct in that gentleman, which has fallen within my notice. I think he will do well to omit republishing entirely; or to omit inserting his own impertinent and nonsensical alterations, in the writings of persons, with whom he is altogether unacquainted, and of the merit of which he is an indifferent judge.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

NATIONAL CONVENTION.

October 22.

A citizen, deputed from the popular society at Moulin, was admitted to the bar, and said, "Citizen Legislators, I come to announce the triumph of reason over fanaticism throughout the department of L'Allier. The Bishop of Moulin now officiates with a pike, and a red cap, instead of the mitre and crozier. The dying are comforted, and not frightened. Upon the gate of the church-yard one reads this inscription—*Death is but an everlasting sleep.*"

"The people are convinced, that if the fall of Kings is the foundation of Republics, the fall of priests can alone complete Liberty. Aristocracy is expiring in our department; the traitors, the malevolent and suspected persons, are under arrest."

The orator concluded with depositing upon the altar of the country a golden cross enriched with precious stones, and several marks of gold and silver extracted from the statues of the ci-devant saints.—Applauded, and the offering accepted.

Barrere, in the name of the committee of public welfare, made a report respecting the supplies of provisions, at the conclusion of which he proposed that the following principles should be decreed.

1. That the territorial productions are a national property.

2. That all real or immovable property belongs to the state.

3. That the revolution and liberty are the first creditors of the citizens, and that the Republic in all purchases ought to have the preference.

October 24.

The Procurator Syndic of the district of Tonnerre acquainted the Convention, that he had issued an order, forbidding the future celebration of religious ceremonies on Sundays, and commanding that these ceremonies should be celebrated on the last day of each decade. He requested that this order should be communicated to the other districts.

The Convention passed to the order of the day, on account of the article in the constitution, allowing the free exercise of all the forms of religion.

The national commissioners at Bourdeaux informed the Convention, that the city was at length firmly attached to the Republic. The republican army made their entry in the midst of the acclamations of long live the Mountain, and the forced congratulations of the Aristocrats. The commissioners also stated, that as soon as they were informed of the troubles of La Lozere and Aveyron, they sent a column of the republican army to Rhodes. This column had received orders to adopt the same conduct as the republican army in La Vendee—to burn the woods, castles and other habitations of the rebellious Royalists,

November 15.

Barrere announced, that the commission of provisions had already given a grand movement to all the parts of its administration, and that it had already taken measures for saving provisions and for supplying the fortresses.

He proposed 4 decrees:

By the first, Citizens are desired not to refuse complying with requisitions, and to make several forts of pastry.

By the second, the fortresses are to be provided with salt meat; no fresh meat will be suffered to enter but for the service of the sick.

By the third, the ministers of Marihe