

public Representative, vibrates thro' the feelings of every real American citizen in the remotest corner of the United States, who feels himself personally insulted thereby. Let Gracchus, let his abettors know, that thousands and ten thousands in this extensive country, cherish the name of Washington, as the vital blood which animates their hearts. Let these men know that the envenomed shafts of envy which they aim at this unjust character, will fall, like arrows shot against the sun, with vengeful force upon their own heads. Let them know that the people of America, are men of principle, of steady character and the most solid judgment; that they do not change their opinions, men and manners with every moon; and that they subject neither the heads of their despotic citizens to the bloody Guillotine of France, nor their fame to the unceasing guillotine of malicious pens.

Having yielded thus far to the emotions of an indignant, honest heart, roused by its attachment to liberty, which has been wounded in the character of her first-born Son, I can proceed the more patiently to consider the production of Gracchus, in some detail, and offer a few strictures upon it.

His general positions in the beginning are true in themselves, but without an object at this day. They are certainly inapplicable to the case, with which he connects them. He seems, either not to understand, or not to distinguish between an "implicit reliance upon influential men; and a generous confidence in those servants of the public, whose fidelity has been severely tested on many important occasions, & proved incorruptible. Unequivocal proofs of the most inviolable integrity directed the choice of America to the President of the United States; and continued experience confirms their opinion of his merit. His eminent capacity for executing important trusts and his unparalleled fidelity have united all generous, judicious, noble spirits in his favor.

This has called him repeatedly and unapologetically to that conspicuous position which he so worthily represents the sovereignty of the American States.

He is the people collectively; for he is chosen by their suffrage; to speak in their name; to act with their power; and to manage with singular responsibility certain specified and important concerns of the government, on their behalf. He is thus a sovereign not of the people, but for the people, to transact our business with foreign sovereignties, and to carry into execution the public will, lawfully expressed. This kind of supremacy he has obtained by the only legitimate title, the OPINION, the KNOWLEDGE, the CHOICE of the people. And will Gracchus dare to say, that the opinion, the will of the people thus largely collected, ought not to prevail? Will he avow such a sentiment and yet, with unblushing front, pretend to republicanism? Will he impudently suppose for a moment, that we ought to submit our opinion to his, and withdraw our confidence from the man of our hearts, to place it—upon whom? Enlightened fellow-citizens! upon whom? upon some disguised foe to our liberty, happiness, and peace; some dark assassin, whose best security is—his unknown name!! To mention this monstrous phenomenon, as a possible event, even in our æra of political wonders, is to expose it to the most expressive contempt.

The allusions to Tuscany and Rome are the wildest imaginable. Can ignorance itself suppose, or is prejudice hardy enough to suggest a parallel between George Washington, the first of men, and the artful Cosmo, the bloody and terrific Sylla, or the ambitious Cæsar? between power committed in trust by frequent, unbiassed choice, and power assumed and indefinitely exercised, thro' the insidious arts, or the military force devoted to the ambitious will of those despots? between an enlightened and comparatively virtuous nation, in the youth of freedom; and people corrupted by luxury and ready to submit their servile necks to the first master who was bold enough to command them or rich enough to purchase their prostration, by furnishing unbounded entertainments and expensive rarees?

As Gracchus has erred egregiously in the application of ancient facts to the present situation of America, so he is not less mistaken in his interpretation of the recent governmental acts of the President, which he has specified, and which he affirms to have been "incompatible with the spirit of a free government."

The dismissal of Du Plaine from his consular functions for a daring outrage upon the authority of this country, a fact authenticated by the clearest evidence, was an act the most salutary in itself, the most necessary from its circumstances, and performed in a constitutional manner by the President, who in all such public transactions, is the only organ to express the National will. To talk of a trial by jury in a case of that sort, is a weak attempt to mislead by the sound of words; and is just as ridiculous as to expect that the Indians should be tried by a jury before Gen. Wayne shall treat them as enemies; or Great Britain, before Congress had discussed Mr. Madison's Resolutions. Yet Gracchus asserts that this necessary severity was "an outrage upon the trial by jury," which in fact, as has been shewn, was not applicable to a circumstance of that nature; and that "the Consul's conduct was *sub judice*, when the proclamation declared his guilt," nay further, he insinuates, that a jury of our country acquitted him in the very instance wherein the proclamation passed sentence upon him. Is this fact? Or is it not a gross misrepresentation calculated to deceive the unwary? If Du Plaine was tried by a jury at all; was it not with regard to a question of property or damages; altogether distinct from the public breach of the peace, for which his exequatur was revoked? Does this writer ignorantly or insidiously thus confound these two different objects?

The same ignorance or insidious design, has induced Gracchus, to separate, as Mr. Genet also usually does, the people of America, from their government.—This he has attempted in his statement of Henfield's case, as well as that of Du Plaine. But, as well might the body be distinguished from its form, or matter from its colour and shape, as under our constitution, the people and their government be separated. How long time will these unflinching republicans require, to learn, that our government is the appointment of the people themselves, their ostensible representative; and the organ whereby they express their will? Surely the general voice of counties, cities and towns, in various parts of America, in favour of the President's official conduct, is a decided proof that there is no repulsion between the people and their own constituted authority; as falsely asserted by Gracchus from the proceedings of one or two uninformed juries: and the tremendous resolves of a county or two in Virginia, buried in ignorance of what passes in the political world, except what they receive thro' the partial medium of a disappointed party!

The firmness and wisdom with which the President baffled the repeated attempts of Genet to disturb our happiness and peace, have been decidedly and honorably approved by Congress. The "dignity" and candor of that Minister is sufficiently obvious to all, who compare his unequalled declarations on his first arrival in America, with his succeeding and avowed attempts to involve us in war; and those public instructions which he afterwards pulled out of "his pocket" as the *French interpretation* of the treaty. His factious and intemperate conduct, and his "undignified" impertinence, not so much to the President as an individual, or to the delicate sensibilities of some imaginary court, as to the "Sovereign and independent Republic of America," in her Representative or Chief Magistrate, has involved him in just suspicion, and degraded him into an object of just contempt. Finally the affair of the Southern Sicarii, who have received commissions from him to commit the peace of their country with Spain, and his wretched explanation of that dark business has finished his career, and rendered him an odious object of abhorrence. The palliative complaints therefore of Gracchus upon the subject of this, almost, minister of France, and his coarse reflections upon the worthiest Magistrate in all the world; are nothing but the effusions of a fretted and cankered heart, and deserve nothing but indignant reproach, from every honest man.

To conclude, though I dislike and re-

* *Amelia county, the resolves of which were published; I believe also, re-published in our newspapers; and which speak so loftily about Citizen Genet, and so pointedly against Mr. Hamilton, is the native place, and the usual residence of Mr. G—s. Albarque, which passed similar resolves, contains Mr. J——n's seat.*

probate the language and the design of Gracchus, I am neither 'a slave nor a tyrant.' I have not tameness for the one, nor power and influence, nor congeniality enough with Gracchus, Genet or hollow democrats of any party, for the other. I have no more connexion with the President or the officers of government, than the most remote or obscure of our fellow-citizens in the wilderness. I never attended a levee, because no business called me there; and have never seen Mr. Hamilton or Gen. Knox, since their residence in this city. My feelings as a free citizen, on reading the slander of Gracchus, have been my sole prompters upon the present occasion. Urged by these, I have attacked the slanderer in the stile he deserved, and leave him to his fate with the public.

A. B.

CONGRESS.

House of Representatives.

January 25.

In committee of the whole on Mr. Madison's resolutions.

Mr. Clark observed that having made a calculation of the time which had already been expended in the discussion of this business, he found it amounted to seven days.—He believed no legislative body ever before consumed so much time in deliberating on one subject—he hoped therefore, the committee would come to a vote immediately—any further expence of time he said would be to no purpose, and would be disgraceful to the legislature.

Mr. Hillhouse in replying to Mr. Clark said that it was the right of every gentleman to assign the reasons for his public conduct if he saw proper, for his part he did not wish to consume much of the time of the committee—he was not in the habit of making long speeches—and tho' he could not charge the member last up with exhausting the patience of the house, yet he never failed of exercising a right which he now appeared to wish to deprive others of—but notwithstanding the remarks of the gentleman, Mr. Hillhouse said he thought it his duty not to give a silent vote on a subject of such magnitude—he had heard with pleasure, and had been much instructed by the observations that had been made, and wished to hear what further might be said on a subject that might affect the most important interests of his country.—For some time past he had, from his own observation, from the high price which our produce had borne, and the great demand there had been for it in the markets, from the pressing demand for seamen, and from the concurrent testimony of merchants, and people of every occupation, been lead to believe, that the commerce of the United States was in a most prosperous train—he had no reason to suspect his opinion till those resolutions were brought forward—They surprized him the more, as coming from a quarter of the country, from which he least expected any thing of the kind—and from which, only two sessions since opposition was made to measures which had the same object in view, so far as respects the encouragement of navigation and manufactures, because it was said, that such encouragement, tho' it operated to the advantage of the eastern, was a direct tax on the southern states—this made him less solicitous at that time, to urge measures that might have an unequal operation on the different parts of the union.—What great event has turned up since, to work this extraordinary change? He supposed the gentleman must have discovered some great impositions and embarrassments on our trade, which had escaped his attention, he had therefore listened with great attention, to hear them pointed out—as to theories, he thought they ought not to be attempted, but in extreme cases, unless the object was important, and its attainment certain; he had enquired into the restrictions laid by Great-Britain, on the commerce of the United States, and from that enquiry, as well as from the report of the Secretary of State, he found that the same restrictions are laid on other nations, that there is no marked distinction against us, but that the United States enjoyed many, and great advantages over other nations—He thought it unnecessary to go into a particular detail of those advantages, as the other gentleman had already done it. He therefore was of opinion, that to adopt the measure now under consideration, would be hazarding those advantages for the uncertain chance of obtaining something which was only in prospect. A gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Giles) had mentioned the dis-

criminating favoritism of Britain, to other neutral powers, viz. Denmark and Sweden, which was the only instance that even the ingenuity of that gentleman, sagacious in finding out difficulties, could point out in the navigation laws, or commercial regulations of Great-Britain, in which any discrimination was made to the disadvantage of the United States—and even that is not one of which we can complain; it was a regulation adopted in consequence of her present situation, as being in a state of war, and not for commercial purposes—the article complained of, is in these words: "That it shall be lawful for the commanders of his Majesty's ships of war, and privateers, that have, or may have, letters of marque against France, to seize all ships, whatever be their cargoes, that shall be found attempting to enter any blockaded port, and to send the same for condemnation, together with their cargoes, except the ships of Denmark and Sweden, which shall only be prevented from entering on the first attempt, but on the second, shall be sent in for condemnation likewise"—This article needs no other comment, or justification, than to read the remark of the Secretary of State, in his letter to the British Minister on this subject—"We had conjectured, but did not before certainly know, that the distinction which the instructions makes between Denmark and Sweden on the one hand, and the United States on the other, in the cases of vessels bound to ports blockaded, was on the principle explained by you, that it was yielded to those countries by treaty, it is not unfriendly to refuse to us, because, not yielded to us by treaty. I shall not contest the right of the principle, as a right to its reciprocity necessarily results to us." And it is upon this ground, that our conduct in admitting French privateers and prizes into our ports, & excluding those of Great-Britain, is justifiable; if then, the advocates for the resolutions, cannot find out any instance in which Great-Britain has made discriminations to our advantage, and many instances are shewn, in which we enjoy advantages beyond the most favored nations; can we complain?

The United States have not a sufficient number of ships to become the carriers of her own produce, and he much doubted whether the time was come when it would be for the advantage of the United States to extend their navigation so far as to answer that purpose; and should an imprudent adoption of these resolutions deprive us of British vessels, our produce would perish on our hands. Since we have not shipping equal to the carriage of our whole exports, we can surely find sufficient employment for those we have, independent of the trade to the British West-India islands; and tho' it would be a desirable thing to be admitted into that trade, yet is that an object of so much importance, that we could be justified in hazarding the most important interests of our country to obtain it? If the advancement of our navigation and manufactures is the real object, why adopt the discriminating quality? Is it not putting us in the power of other nations, and giving them great advantages without an equivalent?

Since it is admitted that we do not enjoy any special advantage from any commercial treaty we now have—it is my opinion, that if any regulations are adopted they ought to be general—if any nation wishes for an exemption and will give us an equivalent we can secure it to them by treaty—if we secure to them the exemption by law, they will be under no inducement to grant it as an equivalent.—France whose interest is intended to be advanced has never come forward and requested such a discrimination. Why then should we do it unfolicited? Ought we to return the late generous and friendly conduct of Portugal, by extending the discrimination to that nation? The gentleman who brought forward the resolutions seemed to be sensible of the impropriety of such a measure, and therefore, proposed to draw a line which should exclude that kingdom; this would point the resolutions so directly against Great Britain, that it would be much better to come out in an open and manly way and call her by name, than to do it in this indirect mode. He closed his remarks on this part of his argument, by saying that it was a question that admitted of some doubt, whether the commerce of the United States was not at present in as prosperous a situation as was for the interest of the country; and, whether it would be for the general welfare to give