

NEW THEATRE.

THIS EVENING, December 21, Will be presented, A COMEDY, called The Road to Ruin.

- Dornton, Harry Dornton, Sulky, Silky, Goldfinch, Milford, Smith, Trademen, Sheriff's Officer, Jacob, Marker, Poffillion, Mrs. Warren, first time, Sophia, Jenny, Mrs. Ledger, Mr. Warren, Mr. Cooper, Mr. L'Esfrange, Mr. Francis, Mr. Harwood, Mr. Fox, Mr. Darley, jun., Mitchell, Morgan, &c., Mr. Warrell, Mr. Bliffett, Mr. Warrell, jun., Master Warrell, Mrs. Oldmixon, Mrs. Merry, Mrs. Francis, Mrs. Doctor

To which will be added, A FARCE, called

The Irishman in London.

- Captain Seymour, Mr. Fox, Mr. Frost, Mr. Francis, Mr. Callooney, Mr. Darley, jun., Murloch Delany, (with a song in character) Mr. Warren, Edward, Mr. Harwood, Cymon, Mr. Bliffett, Louisa, Mrs. Harvey, Caroline, Miss L'Esfrange, Cubba, Mrs. Francis

On FRIDAY the Tragedy of

The ORPHAN;

Or, The Unhappy Marriage.

With a New Ballet, composed by Mrs. Byrn, called THE BOUQUET: In which will be introduced, the favorite TAMBOURINE DANCE.

The French company of Comedians, having been honored with considerable applause on their first appearance, will perform again on Saturday next, and every Saturday, until further notice. Particulars will be expressed in future Bills.

Box, One Dollar twenty-five cents. Pit one Dollar. And Gallery, half a dollar.

Tickets to be had at H. & P. Rice's Book-store, No. 50 High-street, and at the Office adjoining the Theatre.

Places for the Boxes to be taken at the Office in the front of the theatre, from 10 o'clock, and from 10 till 4 on the days of performance.

VIVAT REPUBLICA!

Pantheon,

AND RICKETS'S AMPHITHEATRE.

Corner of Chestnut and Sixth-streets. FOR EQUESTRIAN AND STAGE PERFORMANCES.

THIS EVENING, Wednesday, Dec. 21.

Will be presented the following entertainments, viz.

HORSEMANSHIP,

by the Equestrian troop.

A Comedy, in two Acts, called,

The Lying Valet.

- Sharp (the Lying Valet) Mr. Chambers, Gayless, Mr. Jones, Justice Guttle, Mr. Durang, Beam Trippet, Mr. Tompkins, Dick, Mr. Sully, Melissa, Miss Robinson, Mrs. Gadabout, Mrs. Durang, Mrs. Trippet, Mrs. Tompkins, Kitty Pry, Mrs. Chambers

A COMIC DANCE, called

The Dwarf; or,

The Warsaw Wonder.

A Song by Miss Robinson.

In the course of the evening, a Duet by Mr. and Mrs. Chambers.

The whole to conclude with the Grand Pantomime of

Don Juan; or,

The Libertine Destroyed.

This Day is Published,

PORCUPINE'S

POLITICAL CENSOR,

For NOVEMBER, 1796.

CONTAINING

OBSERVATIONS

On the Insolent and Seditious Notes,

(Attacking the sovereignty and independence of the United States)

Communicated to the People, by the late French minister, ADET.

December 21. \*1w

CAUTION.

WHEREAS very large and heavy debts are justly due and owing from Messrs. Blair M'Clanahan and Patrick Moore, of the city of Philadelphia, merchants, trading under the firm of Blair M'Clanahan and P. Moore, and from Blair M'Clanahan in his separate capacity; to which, by the laws of the land, all the joint as well as separate property of the said Gentlemen, is, and ought to be, liable. And whereas it is clearly and satisfactorily ascertained, that Mr. Blair M'Clanahan, of the said firm, has conveyed away to Mr. John H. Huston, his son-in-law, to his daughter, Miss M'Clanahan, and to his son, George M'Clanahan, several large and valuable real estates, as well as considerable personal property, in the city and county of Philadelphia, in the county of Lancaster, in the county of New-Castle on Delaware, and elsewhere, with a view, as it is apprehended, to defeat the Creditors in the recovery of their just debts.—This is, therefore, to forewarn all persons whomsoever, against the purchase from the said grantees, or either of them, of any portion of the said real or personal property, as the most vigorous measures will without delay be taken to render the same liable to the just demands of the Creditors.

By order of the Creditors,

Thomas Fitzsimons,

Philip Nicklin,

Isaac Wharton,

William M'Murtrie,

Samuel W. Fisher,

Committee.

Philadelphia, December 17th, 1796. 20th.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Wednesday, December 14.

Continuation of the debate on the address in answer to the President's speech.

Thursday, December 15.

Mr. Ames said if any man were to call himself more free and enlightened than his fellows, it would be considered as arrogant self-praise. His very declaration would prove that he wanted sense as well as modesty, but a nation might be called so, by a citizen of that nation, without impropriety; because, in doing so, he bestows no praise of superiority on himself, he may be in fact and may be sensible that he is less enlightened than the wife of other nations. This sort of national eulogium may, no doubt, be fostered by vanity and grounded in mistake, it is sometimes just, it is certainly common and not always either ridiculous or offensive. It did not say that France or England had not been remarkable for enlightened men; their literati are more numerous and distinguished than our own. The character with respect to this country, he said was strictly true. Our countrymen, almost universally, possess some property and some portion of learning, two distinctions so remarkably in their favor as to vindicate the expression objected to. But go through France, Germany, and most countries of Europe, and it would be found that out of 50 millions of people not more than two or three had any pretensions to knowledge, the rest being comparatively with Americans ignorant. In France, which contains 25 millions of people, only one was calculated to be in any respect enlightened, and perhaps under the old system, there was not a greater proportion possessed of property; whilst in America, out of four millions of people, scarce any part of them could be classed upon the same ground with the rabble of Europe. That class called vulgar, canaille, rabble so numerous there does not exist here as a class though our towns have many individuals of it. Look at the Lazaroni of Naples—there are 20,000 or more houseless people, wretched and in want! He asked whether, where men wanted every thing, and were in the proportion of 29 to 1, it was possible that they could be trusted with power. Wanting wisdom and morals how would they use it; it was therefore that the iron hand of despotism was called in by the few who had any thing, to preserve any kind of controul over the many. This evil, as it truly was, and which he did not propose to commend, rendered true liberty hopeless. In America out of four millions of people the proportion which cannot read and write and who, having nothing, are interested in plunder and confusion and disposed for both, is small. In the southern states he knew there were people well informed, he disclaimed all design of invidious comparison; the members from the south would be more capable of doing justice to their constituents; but, in the eastern states, he was more particularly conversant, and knew the people in them could generally read and write, and were well informed as to public affairs. In such a country liberty is like to be permanent. It is possible to plant it in such a soil and reasonable to hope that it will take root and flourish long as we see it. But can liberty, such as we understand and enjoy, exist in societies where the few only have property and the many are both ignorant and licentious.

Was there any impropriety, then, in saying what was a fact? As it respects government, the declaration is useful. It is respectful to the people to speak of them with the justice due to them, as eminently formed for liberty, and worthy of it. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Giles) on a former occasion had said he adored the people; but now when there was a wish to pronounce the attributes of his divinity, he was not found more fervent in his adoration than many who had made no such profession. If they are free and enlightened, let us say so—if they are not, he should no longer adore them; they would not certainly be worthy of honors quite divine. Mr. Ames said they ought not only to say this because it was true, but because their saying so would have the effect to produce that self-respect which was the best guard of liberty, and most conducive to the happiness of society. It was useful to show where our hopes and the true safety of our freedom are reposed. It cherished in return from the citizens a just confidence, a spirit of patriotism unminged with foreign alloy, and the courage to defend a constitution that a people really enlightened knows to be worthy of its efforts.

If the words were objectionable, it would be easy to alter them to avoid the objection without impairing essentially their force. A gentleman near him had suggested the propriety of saying we were "among the free and most enlightened." He had no objection to the alteration, though he saw no reason for altering the phraseology. The citizens of a free government ought, he said, to believe they were the most free and enlightened, because, having the power of making the government what they please, if it were not the best, it would be their own fault for not making it so.

He believed the house would not be surpris'd, if he took notice of what had been said in allusion to him in the course of the debate—allusions with which he could not be offended, because they were urged with so many expressions of the most flattering civility. But every gentleman would believe those things were not applicable to him, as their recollections would not fail to prove. What had been his language with respect to Great-Britain? Did he say we were to submit? Did he say we were not to defend our country? Was he then afraid as they were now, that soft words would not be soft enough? No; such language came not from him. Do nothing to irritate; wage no war; no hostility. Such he called sequestration and other acts of that nature. We were, he said, about to make war on British property, and that such a war would have been considered as an open war. He therefore wished to shut ourselves up in our shell like a tortoise. But, at the same time, he recommended troops to be raised, ships to be built, taxes to be laid, and a spirited claim of justice to be

urged. The gentlemen who wished at that time particularly to preserve peace, did not wish to hold out the olive branch alone, by leaving the country defenceless. This many of their opposers absolutely did. These, he said, were their reasons, and they had been effectual. He would not go into an examination of the subject now. It was their wish to urge every exertion of the country, to have called forth the last dollar and the last man in defence of the country in case of necessity. Did this look as if they wished to truckle to Great-Britain? Many of their opposers, so zealous then for retaliation and reprisal, were not for any thing else—neither troops, ships, taxes nor treaty. This the yeas and nays on the journal will establish. Will the opposers shew half the spirit now that we felt and expressed at that day?

How happened it, he asked, that gentlemen were so angry because they had then heard the language of peace, and now because the same language was held? Not one of us desire hostility. Was it because Great-Britain was then the object and France now. Wrongs from the former cannot be refuted enough, and wrongs and insult too from the latter require words of more ardor than a lover's. No man felt more for the wrongs of America than he did. But, was it not the part of dignity and prudence to endeavour to obtain retribution for those wrongs rather than take up arms. But was it suited to national dignity to make use of the language that had been used on that occasion by many of his opposers, he thought both national and personal dignity forbade it, he had thought it equally intemperate and unbecoming.

Did not gentlemen seem to feel more for one individual than for an insult on the whole nation and its government. The administration might suffer contumely and abuse, and the country too without producing any emotions in the breasts of gentlemen; their feelings seemed to take quite another direction; if a British minister should outrage our government as the minister of France had done, every one would be for avenging the wrong. And he thought it right that they should now declare their determination of supporting the executive in the support of our national honour and dignity, or let him see in season that he was to be abandoned.

The gentleman from S. Carolina (Mr. Harper) had justly said, that though we had no navy to support our pretensions, we had yet come off better than Sweden or Denmark—countries which had been produced as patterns of wisdom. Though he did not suppose the British treaty would be carried into effect, so as to satisfy every person who had suffered in his property by the British, yet he trusted, the event would prove in a considerable degree satisfactory. He wished all other deprecation on our commerce might be in the end as nearly compensated.

At the time when government was pursuing her negotiation, we were embarrassed with Spain, with the Indians and with the Western people. On the sea our citizens were suffering in their property. The British treaty was therefore made under disadvantageous circumstances. It was not a little honorable to the government, and truth would in time procure the universal assent to it, that we have saved our peace, recovered our territory, and made provision for the reparation of the spoils.

It seemed as if gentlemen could never say enough on the subject of the British treaty and of Great-Britain. The bank, treasury, and other topics of declamation, which were formerly always in order, seem to be almost forgotten. Was this the way, he asked, in which they meant to recommend to the citizens the due respect for the acts of a majority of that house and of congress. If they think this the best way of answering the ends of government and of producing confidence and harmony amongst the people, they did well. The means appeared disproportioned or rather strangely opposite to that end. He was of a different opinion. He thought, and it was with due seriousness of deliberation he declared the people were called upon to chuse between them; between those who wished to support government, and those who avowed so unreasonable and so excessive a sensibility to a foreign interest and foreign nation; between those who condemned the insults offered to the government and those who seemed to approve them; those who thought the experiment of our government had succeeded and those who were bound in consistency with their own assertions to say it was to be abandoned with disgust and in despair. He was of opinion they could not go on as they were; and the people could remove the evil by chusing those who would be better agreed—the people being free and enlightened, would have no difficulty in chusing between them. Both sorts of men ought not to be there; either those who like the government are in the right or those who dispute, revile and despise it. The people would be doubted not, judge right. He wished the appeal to be made without delay, and so solemnly as to make it effectual.

Mr. Christie said he was not afraid of offending any nation; but he did not think we were the most enlightened, and therefore he was unwilling to say so. If the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Parker) would permit him to amend his motion, he would move to have inserted after the word "free" and "among the most enlightened."

Mr. Parker consented. Mr. Swanwick thought the amendment had great advantages; but he thought the word "among" should come before, instead of after "free" because, notwithstanding all that had passed, nothing would tend more to preserve the peace of the country, than the treating of others with respect.

Mr. Christie objected to Mr. Swanwick's proposition, because he believed we were the free, but not the most enlightened nation.

Mr. Coit thought the present was an idle dispute about words; and that instead of a session of three months, they should require one of twelve to do the necessary business, if they proceeded in this manner. He wished the proposed alteration might take place, amongst the free, &c.

Mr. Giles could not help observing that the gentleman from S. Carolina (Mr. Smith) had brought forward an example from the practice of the French, which he seemed to expect to have great force, as if a precedent from that country was to have influence here. If the gentleman thought it was to have any

effect upon his opinion, he would tell him he was mistaken. He should think for himself, and neither be guided by the French government, or any man in France. Indeed the vaunting stile of the French was one of those things which he liked the least in that country. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Ames) had insinuated that he (Mr. Giles) no longer adored the people, because he declined to call them the free and most enlightened. He would tell that gentleman that he thought as highly of the people as he ever did; and that he was pleased with the picture which Mr. Ames had drawn between the lower classes of Europe and those of this country; but tho' he tho' the height of their enlightened state he did not think it necessary to tell the world we were the free and most enlightened. Mr. Giles did not think the distinction which Mr. Ames had drawn between a nation calling itself the most free and enlightened, and an individual calling himself so, was well supported. However if the house were determined to use the expression, he should say no more on the subject.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Ames) had spoken of individuals being opposed to government. He wished to have this matter rightly understood. If the gentleman meant by government all the branches as organized by the constitution he would assure him he was a firm friend to it; but if he called the Executive alone, the government, in distinction from the other branches, he might think it necessary to be some times opposed to that; for though he believed this to be a part of the government, he could never consent to have it called the government.

Mr. Giles disliked extremely any intimate connection betwixt this country and Great Britain, notwithstanding pecuniary advantages might arise from such a connection; for there was something in the connection itself, that would outweigh all partial advantages which could be derived from it. What, said Mr. Giles, is our present situation? The President's communication was far from agreeable, and some members of that house had received information from Paris which was still more alarming. France he said, was the most powerful enemy we could contend with, & the only one that could affect our territory. She had it also in her power effectually to destroy our commerce. Ought we, then, he asked, to facilitate ourselves upon this situation of things? The gentleman (Mr. Ames) had yesterday said, we were on the eve of a war, and called upon them to come forward, and to say what they would do. If these were the effects of a wife and firm negotiation with Great Britain, he lamented them, as most calamitous.

Mr. Giles concluded with observing that he felt the same adoration for the voice of the people that he had always done; and he trusted no man could charge him with having acted contrary to that sentiment, or with even making a declaration which did not arise from feeling or conviction. He should not make any farther attempt to alter the address. When it came into the house, he doubted not gentlemen would have an opportunity of shewing their disapprobation by voting against different parts, or against the address in toto. He should vote against the thing altogether.

Mr. Dayton (the Speaker) said that some of the observations which had been brought into the present debate were of too delicate a nature to be commented upon or even repeated, he should not therefore follow the gentleman who spoke last in his enquiry how far this country was expected to be annoyed by France in the possible, though happily not probable, event of a rupture with that country.

As to the words "free and most enlightened" which were more immediately the subject of discussion, he did not object against them on the ground of fact, but he considered the expression as relolving itself into a question of decorum and delicacy, the rules of which appeared to him to be violated, in their ascribing to themselves such a superlative preference (however true) in a comparison with every other people. The amendment of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Christie) very much softened the terms and rendered them more palatable.

Some remarks had fallen from the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Ames) which were irrelative to the subject, and Mr. Dayton could have wished had been therefore omitted. Had he contented himself with challenging any member to point out a single instance of inconsistency in him and pursued the subject no farther Mr. D. said that his respect and friendship for the gentleman from Massachusetts would have induced him to be silent, but when that gentleman had wantonly gone out of his way to bring into view and arraign the policy of certain energetic measures which were at a former session contemplated to counteract the encroachments of Great-Britain, he felt himself called upon to take some notice of them. Those measures, and sequestration in particular had been on a former occasion asserted, and now again unnecessarily repeated, to have been intended as acts of hostility. Is it then (enquired Mr. D.) an act of hostility simply to sequester, or in other words to attach and to arrest and detain in this country the property of the British nation as a pledge or security for the indemnification of the citizens of the United States against the depredations of that nation, and is it no act of hostility against this country to have their property not merely sequestered, but condemned, confiscated and wasted by the cruizers, subjects, government and courts of that nation. Such, he was sorry to say, had formerly been the reasoning and assertion of the gentleman from Massachusetts. The United States must not sequester, for it was war; but the plunder and confiscation of the property of our citizens was not to be termed hostility, but was only ground for negotiation. If it were possible for that gentleman to reconcile that striking inconsistency, he might then free himself from the imputation. That he himself had advocated all the energetic measures which were proposed on a former critical occasion in that house, was, Mr. Dayton said, his pride and his boast. He then thought, and he still thought, that if they had been carried into effect, the situation of this country both as it respected the indemnification of our fellow-citizens who had been plundered, and our commercial and political connection with Great-Britain would be far more favorable than it could be said to be at that moment.

[Debate to be continued.]

Tuesday, December 20.

A letter was received from the secretary of state, inclosing the annual report of the director of the mint. This report was very long, and proposed means of rendering the establishment less expensive and more productive, one of the principal of which was that the depositors of bullion should not have the same advantages as heretofore, but be charged with deficiencies on account of the inferior quality of their bullion, and other expences attending the coining of it. As a necessity for this regulation,