

placed in the scale against all the other powers of the world, peaceful and belligerent, and with justice and law too on their side, shall determine that the very law itself must become invalid!

But it is said, this declaration of the armed neutrality is only a temporary, and not a permanent compact, and we shall be told that this assertion is supported by an article of the treaty of neutrality itself. In arguing this objection, he felt a degree of uneasiness that he could not suppress, it had given much disquiet, because it very largely implicated the honor and character of our country:—In a document published by the express authority of Government, professedly addressed to a public minister then about to proceed on his mission, our Secretary of State, published in the face of the United States and the whole world a letter which was the instruction of that minister when France, a mutilated half of an article of this treaty, in order to justify the measure of our concession to Great Britain; he had seen such bungling things attempted in courts of law in order to derive an ignominious, or a more ignominious judge, but as an act of a national agent, of one of the principal officers of a government, he believed the like was not to be found in the annals of the most vicious policy in any nation; in that letter the 9th article of the armed neutral convention is thus quoted:—“The Convention being concluded and agreed on for the time the present war shall last, shall serve as a basis for future engagements which circumstances may render necessary, or on account of new naval wars which Europe may have the misfortune to be troubled with.”—and heretofore is broken off short in the middle of the article; it was to be supposed that our minister of State could obtain only a mutilated copy of this important historical record!—the article concludes with this weighty and important declaration, which our Secretary has entirely omitted—“These stipulations shall further be considered as permanent, and shall decide in ALL MATTERS OF Commerce and Navigation; and in short in EVERY CASE where the rights of neutral nations are to be determined.”

But a gentleman has told us this principle of the armed neutrality cannot be a true one; and why? truly because the same Empress of Russia who was at the head of the confederation, has, during the present war, entered into a treaty with that power which formerly denied the principle, and had herself agreed to contravene it; and further, that Spain had acceded to that contravention;—that this conduct of that Empress and of Spain is a melancholy proof of the capriciousness and instability of arbitrary councils and of nations, he was ready to confess; but he did not see upon what ground this partial dereliction of right principles should go to the universal establishment of wrong; France in the convulsions of her revolution had alarmed all Europe, and Britain always jealous of her power, and much more of that power under the influence of liberty, had entered into an engagement with Russia to starve France, and Spain accedes to this purpose; but under what circumstances; under the proclaimed avowal of the measure being adopted, because the revolution of France was a new case; a flame had been lighted up, as they called it, which threatened to destroy all Europe; and to quench this flame they agree to overturn the law of nations, which if obeyed or regarded, would counteract the designs of England and the wishes of Russia and Spain.

But we are told that our government has receded from this principle on a former occasion, and had declared it in our correspondence with Genet; but he would ask any gentleman, does a date alter a principle?—Do principles of right and wrong alter with the seasons of the year? If we abandoned it then or at this day, what is that to France; she tells us we have done it, and we acknowledge it is done; thus the question is then reduced to this point—Have we done right? This question unfortunately does not rest with our partialities to decide; it not only rests upon the powers of Europe whom it may implicate or concern, but upon our own formal recognition and accession to the principles of the armed neutrality, nay with the compliments expressed by our government to the Empress of Russia for promoting it; upon our accepting of this principle too at a period in which we manifested that our love of justice was in perfect consonance with that love of liberty which then engaged us in our revolution; upon our acceptance of it when it was calculated to operate most ferociously to our disadvantage by depriving us of the supplies which could be thereby kept from us; it matters not then what date, or in what manner we relinquished it, if having formally received it we abandoned it to the disadvantage and injury of our allies and of other previously subsisting treaties; we have unquestionably done this evil, perhaps from no malign disposition—but it was our duty, having committed the error, to rectify it; it had been urged that we had been compelled to abandon the principle or go to war with Britain; and we had chosen it as the alternative—what compelled! he would not discuss this unhappy argument—we have inflicted a wound on our commercial neutrality, but what is much worse on our national character, which he feared we should never recover.

Another stipulation is contained in the British treaty relative to provisions, which admits the British, contrary to the law of nations, to seize upon our vessels going to France; it is said that this article does not admit any new principle, and that instead of being disadvantageous to France, he is put on a better footing than before! He would read the article; the first paragraph of the 8th article after defining the new extension of what shall thereafter be deemed contraband, proceeds in the second thus—“and whereas the difficulty of judging of the precise cases in which alone provisions and other articles not generally contraband may be regarded as such, renders it expedient to provide against the inconveniences and misunderstandings which might thence arise: It is further agreed that whenever any such articles so becoming contraband according to the existing law of nations, shall for that reason be seized, the same shall not be confiscated, but the owners thereof shall be speedily and completely indemnified;—and the captors, or in their default the Government under whose authority they act,

shall pay to the master, or owners, of such vessel, the full value of all articles, with a reasonable mercantile profit thereon, together with the freight, and also the demurrage incident to the detention.” Our treaty in the subsequent paragraphs recites the ordinary provision for the circumstances attending ships proceeding through error or inattention, to blockaded ports, but in the above stipulations a new principle is foisted into the law of nations, for which we are to receive the full price of our articles and a reasonable mercantile profit; and after doing this we are told, that we place our ally in a better condition than he was before—that the power of her enemy to seize our ships, which are protected by the law of nations from seizure having nothing contraband on board, when going to the ports of a belligerent power not blockaded—is an advantage to that power so deprived; we might admit that it is not a fact, in the first instance that provisions are contraband, and we accept compensation for our sacrifice of the universal law; we admit the inhuman and horrid principle, that one nation has a right to starve another at its discretion, and while thus starving, and profiting by the collision, affect to be indignant when remonstrance or resentment flow from the injured nation; this is the sad and afflictive picture of error into which we have been blindly seduced! Of all the authors that have written on the law of nations, there is not one—no, not one, that supports the idea of provisions being liable to the description of contraband, in any case but in approaching a blockaded port; the only author indeed that mentions such a thing even in the way of suggestion, is Vattel, who says, that possibly there may be a case where there is a reasonable hope of reducing a nation by want of provisions, they may be deemed contraband; but this is delivered as a mere suggestion, and contrary to his usual diffidence he leaves it naked and unsupported by any one historical example or reference; but gentlemen say, we do not allow provisions to be contraband, although Vattel has used this suggestion, we think the doctrine unfounded; but he would not dispute about opinions while he had facts, and he would say, while you have denied the doctrine you have allowed the practice; you not only do wrong here to France, but we have done it in the most offensive form—and irritated as she must be by the intrigues that have already torn her for so many years, the foreign machinations and the efforts to subjugate her by all the arts which perfidy could suggest, we should not be surprised if she should be reluctantly led to believe, that we had thus bartered our supplies to Britain, reckless of her ruin and regardless of our treaties; I say she may be reluctantly led to believe this, since the error of our blindards or our weakness is visible as noon day.

But we are told that this stipulation is advantageous to France, as it holds out a temptation to mercantile adventurers from the certainty of payment in either event of a voyage; for his part he could not discover in the conduct of the negotiation, nor in the treaty itself, any such intention on our part;—but he could see in the sacrifice an effort, and he would ask any gentleman how far successful it had proved, to guard against British depredations; but he could see in the argument a weak effort to support a weak measure!—But let us see what is the construction of our own government upon this principle; it must be tested by other facts than its adoption or rejection in a treaty; since the execution of the treaty our Executive has put a strong construction on this principle; but our Executive had also, in a letter of instruction to Mr. Thomas Pinckney, expressed his sentiments equally pertinent but conspicuous—speaking of the orders of the British government for seizing provisions in neutral ships, the first article of which was in these words: “That it shall be lawful to stop and detain all vessels loaded wholly or in part with corn, flour, or meal, bound to any port in France, or any port occupied by the armies of France, and to send them to such port as shall be most convenient, in order that such corn, meal, or flour, may be purchased on behalf of his majesty’s government, and the ships be released after such purchase, and after due allowance for freight, &c.” The Executive thus notices the order, this act too tends directly to draw us from that state of peace in which we are wishing to remain: It is an essential character of neutrality, to furnish no aids (not stipulated by treaty) to one party, which we are not equally bound to furnish to another. If we permit corn to be sent to Great Britain and her friends, we are equally bound to permit it to France. To restrain it would be a partiality which would lead to a war with France; and between restraining it ourselves and permitting her enemies to restrain it unjustly is no difference—She would consider this as a mere pretext, of which she would not be the dupe, and on what honorable ground could we otherwise explain it! Thus we should see ourselves plucked by this unauthorized act of Great Britain, into a war with which we meddle not, and which we wish to avoid, if justice to all parties will enable us to avoid it.” Now, sir, if government thought France would not be the dupe of an artifice then, what reason have we to believe that she will now? Let gentlemen who are eager for the report, reply and show wherein the distinction lies. In 1793 our Executive considered it as a *case of war* only to permit the infraction of that law of nations, or the partial supply of one or other party with provisions; and are we to expect France, to whom we were at least under some ties of regard, not to lay obligation, should tamely concede not to notice our sacrifices thus made; gentlemen would not be serious and expect it.

[To be continued.]

For Sale,

A pair of Good Black Carriage Horses, which may be seen by application at No. 124, Spruce Street, between Second and Third, May 12.

The Gazette.

PHILADELPHIA,

TUESDAY EVENING, MAY 30.

From the Log-book of the Ship General Washington, captain Moore.

On the 28th March, sailed from the Elbe, in company with the ship Hampton, Stafford, of and for Baltimore. On the 15th April, the rock of Lisbon bearing S. E. distant 9 leagues, fell in with a Portuguese squadron of two fail of the line and six frigates. On the 16th, at 9 A. M. the Light-house on Cadiz bearing E. S. E. distant 3 leagues, fell in with the British fleet, of 12 fail of the line and 6 frigates—Was brought on board by the Emerald frigate, who informed me that Cadiz was in a state of blockade—that the Admiral’s express orders were that no ship should proceed in; and if the ship was found so near the entrance of Cadiz or St. Lucar harbour, they would fire into her, carry away the masts, &c. &c. Captain Moore in consequence put away for Madeira.

NOTE.

The statement of Mr. Harper’s speech in Markland and Carey’s paper of yesterday, is perfectly false in all its parts. He said not one word to urge a common cause or an alliance with England, nor did he make the most distant insinuation that there were French pensioners in the house or out of it, much less of their being paid out of the spoilsations.

Mr. Harper was so far from urging an early declaration of war, that he expressly declared his object to be the avoiding of war, which in his opinion was best to be done by negotiation, supported by measures of effectual defence.

His mention of Spain, Holland and Belgium was merely by way of warning and example to this country; and when he adverted to Mexico and her allies, it was to show that France and her allies had too much to lose by war for her to think seriously of driving us into one.

Those printers who may copy the above mentioned statement into their papers, are requested to insert this also. They may be assured of its accuracy, as it has been seen and confirmed by Mr. Harper himself.

The Olive Branch, Etheridge, from Liverpool, Philip, Rutter, from the West Indies, and Fair American, Weeks, from New Providence, are arrived at Baltimore.

The *Merchants Advertiser* of this morning undertakes to correct an error in the vote of yesterday, which it states to be 48 in favor of the amendment and 50 against it, instead of 52, as announced by the Chairman. The *intelligent and acute editor*, whose prying-curiosity and discernment every observer must have noticed, attributes this to “an error occasioned by some persons crowding within the bar who were counted by mistake.” The *impartial reporter* would have entitled himself to more credit, had he stated why the mistake occurred on the side of the nays, as there was as much probability of persons crowding within the bar being counted by mistake on the one side as on the other. The fact is that there was an error in the count, there being only 98 members on the floor, and if the Chairman was correct in reporting 52 against the amendment, there could be only 46 (and not 48) for it. We are authorized to declare, on the authority of a gentleman of accuracy who counted the nays, and has since from particular inquiry ascertained the state of the vote, that there were 52 nays and 46 ayes; the majority therefore, including the Chairman, who is known to have been opposed to it, was SEVEN, and not TWO, as ignorantly asserted by the *impartial editor* of the *Merchants Advertiser*.

Whole number of members, if all were present,	106
Absent	7
Present	99
Ayes	46
Noes	52
Chairman	1
	99

Curfery Thoughts on the true Policy of the UNITED STATES.

MR. PENNO.
IT may not, perhaps, be improper for the public to turn their attention to the immediate operation and consequences of a system, embraced by a set of men who would impose themselves upon the people, under the captivating names of Patriots or Republicans. Men, if we are to judge from their conduct and conversation, lay it down as an invariable principle, that every military and naval measure, to put the United States in a situation to repel foreign insults and attacks, ought to be resisted by the representatives, and deprecated by the people. This truth is so notorious, that it would be a waste of time to refer to those documents which contain so many instances of the fact.

In every European war, by which the interest of the United States, or any of their rights of sovereignty may be involved, an adherence to this principle necessarily and unavoidably leads to one of two results; first, “*To a submission to every aggression or insult which may be attempted or inflicted upon them, by any of the belligerent powers.*” Or, second, “*the absolute necessity of the United States throwing themselves upon the protection of one of these powers, in order to preserve their rights or interests from being swallowed up or destroyed by the other.*” This position being supported by the experience of all ages, it would be matter of surprise to see it practised upon in the United States, did not the same experience inform us, that there has been always found, in every country, men who, either from motives of ambition, or some special cause relative to themselves, have opposed or defeated these measures which alone could have saved their country from ruin or dependence.

Let us speak plain in treating on this subject. Is it intended, for example, should England commit depredations on our trade, contrary to the laws of nations and treaty, to submit to the injuries without an attempt at defence, or to implore France to take our trade under her protection? Would not this be to make France the protector of the United States and the arbiter of their fate? On the other hand, should spoliations be committed on our trade by France, contrary to express stipulations and to the law of nations, can the United States submit to receive the protection

of England, without submitting to similar dependence and humiliation? What is the course that ought to be pursued in such a state of things? What the position which the United States ought to assume to avoid mortifying, and eventually ruinous a dependence? Is it to be effected by envoys extraordinary, by concessions, by relinquishments, by humiliations; or is it to be accomplished by drawing upon the resources of the country, and converting them into a maritime and land force competent to yield protection, and sufficient to inspire a reluctance in either of the contending powers to wound our rights, lest we should be thrown into the scale of their enemy? Is the latter the policy the United States ought to pursue? Yes, it is the only policy which can procure to them that consideration to which they are entitled, and to my fellow-citizens that freedom which I trust they would sooner die than relinquish.

Should the councils of those men prevail, who are for keeping the United States without a naval and military defence, what have we to fear during the present war, and what to dread upon its termination? It is vain to expect from any million to France that our trade to the French West-India islands will be placed in a better situation than it is at present, or that while it is left unprotected in that quarter by our own ships, it will not continue to be plundered. Humiliation and concession may indeed prevent its suffering equal injuries in the European and other seas; but nothing short of an armed force can cover it from the buccaners of the West-Indies. During the existence of the war, therefore, a naval and military army cannot be dispensed with, without relinquishing every thing to chance and the good will of a horde of foreign plunderers, aided by the bankrupts and outcasts from our own society. To these evils we must submit; by such buccaners & outcasts our citizens must be plundered, should false systems, erroneous opinions, or any other motive induce those men to withhold defence, who alone have the power to create it.

If unfortunately a system of inaction should prevail, to what a condition do we subject the United States at the close of the war? Should France emerge from it the dominant power, and England be in no situation to prevent her farther aggrandizement, we may find ourselves suddenly awakened from our sleep of security by a treaty between France and Spain, which must plunge us into a war to preserve the unity of our country. Who can doubt of the views of France and Spain upon the western and southern parts of the union? On the other hand, should England ride out the storm and rise upon its ruins to greater power and consequence, she may put forth pretensions, which are at present dormant, and require of the United States concessions or alliance which, if granted, must humble us in our own eyes and in the eyes of all the world.

To avoid then the calamities of war, and to secure to ourselves a position at its termination which may prevent either of the belligerent powers from taking advantage of our weakness, sound policy requires that we should adopt instantaneous measures of defence, and that we should be found prepared for war, at a time when all Europe may seem desirous of repose.

The distance of the United States from the three European powers, with which they are most likely to be entangled in disputes, and to whose colonies they are so contiguous, enables them to assume a respectable position with means very disproportioned to theirs, and yet truly competent to secure them against their attacks, or to annoy or reduce some of their possessions if attacked. Such a position may be maintained at a small expense; and till such he taken the United States must continue to be insulted, abused and plundered by these powers, as often as it shall be their interest to violate their treaties, and set at nought the laws of nations, justice and humanity.

POLITICUS.

In the House of Representatives Yesterday (the House having again formed itself into a Committee of the whole on the Answer Reported to the President’s speech, and Mr. Nicholas’s amendment being under consideration) Mr. Harper resumed his observations against the amendment, which he delivered at great length. Mr. Gallatin followed him, on the contrary side, and having noticed some remarks which fell from Mr. Harper, that gentleman rose to explain. The call for the “*Committee to rise*,” and for the “*Question*,” from different parts of the House became very loud; when Mr. Giles rose and said the gentleman last up had thrown out insinuations of misconduct against (he supposed) one of our late public functionaries in France. Insinuations of a similar kind he had frequently heard out of doors, but he thought them unworthy of notice; but as the gentleman had thought proper to introduce the calumny in that House, & as he was a friend of his, and not here to answer for himself, he wished to know of the gentleman, whether it was to him he alluded, and if it were, he called upon him for proof of his assertions. Mr. Harper replied, that he did allude to that gentleman, and would, at a proper time, produce evidence of what he had said. The Chairman reminded the gentleman that this conversation was out of order. The confused call of the “*Committee to rise*” and the “*Question*,” was again revived; when the motion for the committee to rise, was put and negatived, there being only Thirty in favor of it. The question on Mr. Nicholas’s amendment was then put and negatived, there being 48 votes for it, and 52 against it. Mr. New moved that the House meet in future at ten in the morning, the motion was negatived, there being only 36 in favor of it.

Died, at Charleston, May 15th, capt. Aaron Welch, master of the brig Active, of Philadelphia: a violent paralytic stroke at sea a few days after he left Philadelphia, was the cause of his dissolution. His remains were interred on Saturday, in the Friends burying in that city.

By this day’s Mail.

NEW-YORK, May 29.

Ramsey’s Waterford Chronicle of April 4 contains the following:—“Thursday morning arrived at Cove, the American Brig Fubler, from Portsmouth, in N. Hampshire. On the 26th inst. was boarded by a French privateer about 40 leagues west of Cape Clear, and the captain ordered on-board with his papers, but the sea running high he at first declined going, on which the privateer’s people threatened to fire into him, which forced him to comply, and on returning to his own vessel, the boat being very small, upset, and the master, captain Moses Titcomb, with two hands, Edward Dearing, and William Stephens, were drowned; the privateer then bore away, without endeavoring to assist them, and the Fubler in vain attempted it.”

The defeat of Prince Charles comes various ways—a letter from Waterford, received in this city on Friday, dated April 12, mentions it, and that Vienna was in a confirmation in consequence of it—our late arrival from Bourdeaux also mentions it.—Commissions in Ireland increase. [Argus.]

REMARK.

The ship that brought the letter from Waterford had 48 days passage, and must have sailed the 9th or 10th of April, and consequently 2 or 3 days before the letter was dated.

Ship	Thomas, Olden,	Waterford	48
	Kaporis, L’Ockinson,	St. Thomas	29
	Brig Sally, Thompson,	do.	23

Just Received,

From Batavia (via providence)
170 Sacks Java Coffee of first quality
200 half sacks do. do.
A few Boxes of Spices, consisting of
Nutmegs, Cloves and mace
For sale by
WILLINGS & FRANCIS,
no. 22, Market Street.

LAILSON’S CIRCUS,

South Fifth-Street.

The Performances at the NEW CIRCUS
This Evening, May 30th,
Will begin by a Grand Parade of Equestrian
Performers of both sexes.

A grand display of Horsemanship,
By Messrs. McDonald, Herman, C. Van develde,
Nicholas Corre, (being his first appearance in this
city) Sully, (the Clown) and Lailson.

The Lofty-Tumbling Group,
Composed of Messrs. Sully, Reno, and McDonald,
the Clown, will execute several difficult exercises on the Stage—which will be pleasantly decorated.
MR. SULLY, in the character of Clown, will perform a variety of Comic Feats.
Mr. LAILSON will perform several curious and astonishing exercises, which he will not undertake to enumerate, in order to surprize the spectator; his aim being to please—and nothing shall be neglected to render the exercises worthy the attention of the amateurs of this new art.
BUCCANERS will leap over a table of a very great height with his rider on his back.
Miss VANCE will perform several astonishing feats which has never been attempted but by herself.

After which will be presented, a beautiful French Comic Opera, called
Les Deux Petits Savoyards,
OR,
THE LITTLE CHIMNEY SWEEP.
The music by D’Aleyras.
Lord, Mr. Douvillers
Clermont, Mr. Poignard
Judge, Mr. Viillard
James, Mr. St. Marc
The Sweep } Michael, Miss Tefaire
} Joseph, Miss Sophie
The evening’s entertainment will conclude with a representation of
The four Travelling Brothers.
N. B. No person can be admitted in the centre of the Circus, which is exclusively appropriated to the Equestrian Exercises.
No person can be admitted without a ticket, which will serve for the day only.
Days of performance, Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday.
Box, one dollar. Pit, half a dollar.
The doors will be opened at half past five o’clock, and the performances begin precisely at seven.

A few bds. N. E. Rum,
OF A SUPERIOR QUALITY,
HYSON
YOUNG HYSON } TEAS, is quarter chests,
AND IMPERIAL }
FOR SALE BY
A. Marple & Israel W. Morris,
No. 60 Dock-Street.
May 22. mww&fyt

300 Dollars Reward.

WHEREAS a certain Christopher F. Parnell, who failed from Bolton, on or about the 27th of October last, in the sloop Union, with a valuable cargo, bound to Baltimore, but went off to the West-Indies where he sold the vessel and cargo. On or about the first inst. he was apprehended (as a suspicious character) in this town, and examined before several magistrates, but for the want of sufficient proof to detect him in his villainy he was discharged.

The fact is, the said Parnell is a villain, and is attempting to defraud sundry persons to the amount of 20,000 dollars.

He left this town about the 12th inst. he rode in a chair (painted green) drawn by a grey mare, and went on the Newberna road, but on this side Trenton, took the road of Fayetteville, and most probably is passing through the back part of the state into the western countries.

He had when he left this town, upwards of 2000 dollars in gold, and about 7000 dollars in bank notes.

Parnell is a small man, about 30 years of age, remarkably well-looked, and has long black hair, remarkable small eyes, and has a down look when spoken to.

Whoever will secure the said Parnell, and the money he has with him, and give information to Benj. Williams of Baltimore, John Hogg, Esq. at Hillsborough, to Mr. A. Jocelin, of this town, or to the subscriber, who is in pursuit of the villain, shall receive the above reward.

WILMINGTON, (N. C.) April 26, 1799

J. BENNER CRAFT.