

The Gazette.

PHILADELPHIA, TUESDAY EVENING, JUNE 6.

BY A CORRESPONDENT.

ON THE IMPUDENT CALUMNIES AGAINST MESSRS. HARPER AND SMITH, In the enemy's Newspapers.

THAT VIRTUE'S cause hath sure succeeded well, And her friends' efforts plac'd her foes in Hell; Needs little penetration quick to tell, By their loud howl, and dire Cerberian yell.

For the Gazette of the UNITED STATES.

FARMER GILES declared a few days since, that Genet had no party in America to support his measures, and that he was universally reprobated, except by a few disorderly persons. A question arises who were the disorderly persons alluded to, and I think we may fairly conclude they were the members who composed the first Jacobin Clubs in this country, of which Mr. Genet was the founder and patron. Faking for granted that Mr. G's meaning was as supposed, it would be but fair to say who were the members of the societies in question; but as their meetings were always held in private and the names of their patriots in general concealed from the public, we can only have reference to what is contained in an extract from the minutes of the first or mother society, dated 3d July 1793 and published by their friend Bache.

Officers of the Democratic Society for the City and County of Philadelphia. D. RITTENHOUSE, President. Wm. COATS, Vice-Presidents. C. BIDDLE, Vice-Presidents. ALEX. JAMES DALLAS, Vice-Presidents. MICHAEL LEIB, David Jackson, J. D. SERGEANT, J. HUTCHINSON, ISRAEL ISRAEL, Treasurer. P. St DUPONCEAU, Secretaries. JNO. PORTER, Secretaries.

It has been said that the worthy representative from the city was admitted to the honors of the sitting, and that his colleague from the county succeeded to the presidential chair, but resigned it in a pet to citizen Bache, because a leading member, who, either from the want of nerves, or from having been disappointed in a flour contract, did not choose to go all lengths on some questions which were agitated respecting the western insurrection.

A CITIZEN. Philadelphia, June 5, 1797.

A letter from the Attorney-General of Ireland, to George Hardinge, Solicitor-General to the Queen. Dublin, Jan. 16th, 1797.

MY DEAR FRIEND, Your letter, desiring the portraits of those you call the great men of Ireland, was duly attended to previous to the arrival of the French fleet, on board which there are supposed to have been many experienced artists, who, without the aid of the sculptor, would have taken off the head of any great man most expeditiously—however, as we were aware of their sharp practices, we had prepared some capital performers, called yeomen—so as to have insured the engraving of their whole army in case of landing. It is to be lamented that not a single head was struck off—particularly as the first impressions would have been ineluctable. It would require a mauler's hand to give an adequate picture of Ireland on the late memorable occasion. The subject is worthy of the most lively colours; and I trust that Irish colours will never fly. We are all anxious for the Bridport Squadron. Yours truly.

Extract of a letter from Gibbon to Lord Sheffield, p. 65, dated 11th September, '83. "The other day the French ambassador mentioned that the empress of Russia (a precious) had postponed to ratify the principles of the armed neutrality by a definitive treaty, but that the French, obliging creatures! had declared that they would neither propose nor accept an article so disagreeable to England."

Gibbon was secretary of embassy at Paris. The above anecdote is a curious fact, and proves what dupes the Americans would have been to have gone to war with England, as the French faction have long wished, merely to compel England to ratify the principles of the armed neutrality, to please the French.

Communication from Benjamin Shreve and James Laurason, merchants, Alexandria. On Dr. PERKINS'S METALLIC INSTRUMENTS.

I have been a witness to an operation of Dr. Perkins's Metallic Points on my son, for the relief of epileptic fits. He has been subject to these fits for about eighteen months.

On the 23d day of the 4th month, he was seized with one, with entire loss of reason—his hands so clenched together by spasms, that the efforts of Mr. James Laurason, whose assistance I called in, and my own, could not open them. In this situation we applied Dr. Perkins's metallic instruments, one on each arm, from the elbow down to his hand, and, to our great surprise, his hands soon became perfectly lax, and opened with ease, and by continuing the operation on his head for a few minutes, he came to his reason and went to sleep, since which he has had no more fits of them.

On all former attacks they have continued half the night, and from twelve to twenty in number. Bleeding and other experiments have been used, but he was never before relieved of them, so immediately. I am confident the Points effected the cure.

Conceiving it the duty of every friend to human happiness to encourage new and useful discoveries, I have stated the above.

BENJAMIN SHREVE. The subscriber was a witness to the above operation, and can testify to the facts stated. JAMES LAURASON. Alexandria, 5th Month, 16th day, 1797.

AUTHENTIC AND INTERESTING. Extract of a letter from Holland, February 23, 1797.

General Pinckney and his family have arrived here—on the other hand, Mr. Monroe has arrived in Paris, upon his return from his tour through this country. What was the cause of Mr. Pinckney's being ordered to leave France is yet unknown. But the conduct of the French government and its dependents, at the same time towards Mr. Monroe, and his conduct towards them, give serious uneasiness. The views and designs which these circumstances seem to indicate, are of a nature so important to the constitution, and even union of our country, that I cannot but feel anxious to discover how far they really extend; and cannot but observe, with concern, the apparent concert, of an internal American party with the present government of France, to overthrow that of the United States.

You will doubtless, before this reaches you, be informed of official communications made to the American minister, from this government, in the course of the last Autumn, wherein they formally, without disguise or hesitation, call upon the United States, to violate their treaty with Great-Britain, to go to war with her, and make a common cause with the French and Batavian republics. Such, probably is still the intention of the French Directory. But, as at present they totally despair of affecting their purpose by negotiating with our executive government, they will probably turn all their efforts towards the House of Representatives. The act of June 5, 1794, against which Adet complains so indecently, expires with the present session of Congress. This is the law of which Fauchet, in his dispatch, No. 3, says, that Randolph told him, "a bill had passed the House of Representatives, which wounded liberty." An indisputable proof of it is, the next clause of the dispatch, which represents Randolph as adding, "They have at least taken away the article, which prevents the sale of the French prizes in our ports." Fauchet, in his plastering certificate, pretends, that this passage of his No. 3, refers to a conversation which he had with Randolph, in April 1794, and that it related to the political divisions in different parts of the United States, and a bill which gave the executive powers, that might be abused and wound liberty. The impudence with which this story is told, when the clause about taking away the article relative to the sale of prizes comes so immediately after, in the dispatch, is not one of the least curious particulars in the strange publication of Randolph. This clause about the sale of prizes was struck out on the 2d of June, 1794, and Fauchet certifies that the conversation was the April before. In fact, from the internal evidence of Fauchet's dispatch, compared with Adet's last note, it is clearly the 7th section of the act of June 5, 1794, which was so extremely obnoxious to Mr. Randolph, and at the same time is so to the French government. Under these circumstances, the attempt to pass an imposition upon the public as to the object of the conversation, is itself deserving of attention. Why was there any desire of disguise in this particular? Why but because Mr. Randolph's conference with Mr. Fauchet, upon subjects to which the same 7th section naturally leads the contemplation, were such as it was judged unfit to disclose. This 7th section is indeed an important thing, and I am not a little curious to see how it will be treated in the House of Representatives when the law is to be continued; that is, in the course of the present session.

What expedition or enterprise there may be views of carrying on from the territories of the United States against the dominions of another sovereign, I am not qualified to say. France is at this time not only at peace, but in close alliance with Spain. But neither peace nor alliance are complete or effectual guards against projects of invasion or revolution. There is no doubt but that the French, in their negotiation for peace with Spain, endeavored long to obtain a cession of Louisiana, and have since the peace been equally solicitous to receive it in exchange for the part of St. Domingo, which was ceded to them. You will observe both in one of the Paris papers which I have lately sent, and in the Leyden Gazette, an article of news, published at Paris, as coming from Madrid, that an inevitable revolution is upon the point of taking place in Mexico; and that the people there will soon shake off the yoke of Spain. The pretence that this disposition is fomented by the English may be true or false, the material object of observation is the paragraph itself, and the quarter from whence it comes. You best will know, whether I am merely fanciful in combining it with Genet's arrival at Charleston, and his intended expedition at that period; together with the various other symptoms that have appeared down to a certain letter to colonel Thomas Fulham, a North Carolinian, which I find in the American newspapers of the last summer, and to the return of the same colonel Fulham to France, immediately after the ratification of the treaty with Great-Britain. The part of the President's address to the people, applying particularly to the inhabitants of our western states and territory, indicates the evidence of a plan advanced to a considerable maturity. An obscure outline of a vast plan, calculated exactly for the French meridian, suitable at once to their ambition and their jealousy, discovers itself in these various incidents. If this plan really exists in the extent, which may be rationally suspected, the 7th section of the act of June 5, 1794, is a very important obstacle to views for conducting expeditions against the territories of a foreign power, with which we are at peace.

But, however, that may be, it is certain there is another plan, with the success of which the other part of this section is totally incompatible; and that is, the plan for suspending totally the commerce between the United States and Great-Britain. This design, which ever since the middle of last summer, there has been strong and increasing reason for suspecting, is now in a manner fully avowed, notwithstanding all the ambiguity which pervades all their official papers on the subject, and which indicates nothing more than the view of retreating from the system, in case they should find it impracticable, with a pretence that they never adopted it. To carry it into effect, they have two different modes of proceeding: the one, by producing a war between us and Great Britain; the other by making a fort of war upon us themselves, and forcibly intercepting all our navigation to and from British ports; at least as far as they can. But this 7th section is an impediment equally to both these processes. It prevents them from carrying on a privateering trade by means of our own citizens, which would be altogether inconsistent with neutrality; and which, if not suppressed, would at once harass the commerce and provoke a state of hostilities; and at the same time, it takes from them the means of intercepting forcibly the navigation to and from British ports, by depriving them of the means of keeping a line of privateers along the whole extent of our own coast, which should be ready to meet every vessel which they should choose to stop, upon its entering into or issuing from the several ports. To them this is an essential object; for our navigation with British ports could not be forcibly interrupted, to a very material degree, but by arresting the vessels at the moment of departure or of arrival. This they cannot do in the European seas, because the British naval superiority keeps them generally clear, and a privateer or frigate seldom has a chance of picking up more than a single vessel or two, before it is itself taken. Neither can they do it upon the American coast, while they are prevented from fitting out their privateers in our own ports, and while our citizens find their property protected by the jurisdiction of our own tribunals. The consequences, therefore, of an unrenewed expiration of this law, are, in every point of view, so momentous, that I consider it as one of the principal purposes for which they are now undertaking to negotiate with the House of Representatives against the Executive of the United States.

At present I am told here, that it is not desired that we should go to war with England; that it would not even be for the interest of France that we should. I have conversed, repeatedly, with the persons upon whom the principal executive functions for foreign affairs rest, and have urged to them the obvious and inevitable consequences to this country, of a war between the United States and either France or Great-Britain. Some of them, I have reason to believe, are alarmed. The merchants, the renters, have already perceived the effects of the mere prospect, which is threatened; and I know that they are alarmed. The disposition therefore here is right. I am even told that the French Directory will not pursue their system to an absolute rupture, and a hint has been given me, that Adet's powers will be renewed to discuss the differences which have arisen, or rather that the suspension of his functions will be removed. But all this may be intended merely as a cloak to conceal designs of hostility, and prevent a state of preparation to quarrel against them.

The measure of ordering Mr. Pinckney away, is so violent in its nature, that it is absolutely necessary to consider the Directory as determined upon proceeding to every extremity for the purpose of carrying their points in America. As it is unquestionable, that the ruin of our commerce and a war with Britain are involved in these points, I cannot suppose that the government of the United States will submit; and I must therefore recur to an idea which I have heretofore suggested—that is, the importance of a cool, moderate and candid statement to the world of the real situation of our differences with France. The notes of Adet, and most especially the speech of Barras to Mr. Monroe, when he delivered his letters of recall, flat pretensions of superiority on the part of France, and of dependence on that of the United States, which must be refuted and resisted. Instead of which, it is painful to say it, Mr. Monroe himself in his speech gives them countenance and encouragement, by talking of generous assistance, which never was given, and which their own official documents have long since disproved.

The papers published by the British government concerning the negotiation of Lord Malmesbury, serve in a great measure to shew the immediate system of France. The dissolution of the German Empire is avowed as one of the objects. This plan which was checked by the disasters of their armies on the Rhine, the last autumn, appears by the capture of Mantua, to be resumed with new vigor. Italy seems to be secured to them beyond the reach of accident; the fate of the neutral states in that quarter, is as miserable as that of those which are parties in the war. Florence, Venice, and Genoa, by turns are required to supply money and provisions, no less than if they were in a state of complete hostility; and no sort of acquiescence or submission can remove the danger that is continually threatened, of revolutionizing the governments, and turning them into new, one and indivisible republics, allied and tributary to France.

A very large detachment from the Austrian army on the Rhine has marched into Italy, as likewise have considerable parts of the French armies; another struggle is to take place in that quarter which in all probability will terminate like the former. The Austrian forces like those of all the allied powers thro' this war, are apparently a formidable body; but a body rotten at the heart. Treachery pervades all their camps, or a languid indifference pallies every exertion. Yet it does not appear probable that the Emperor will yet make peace; because upon every success the French troops obtain their government swells its political system and by the time when Austria will be ready to sacrifice the Netherlands, he will be required to consent also to the establishment of a republic formed upon his Italian dominions.

The troops which had been embarked for the expedition against Ireland, are coming to join the armies upon the Rhine, where it is now said the French are to take again their offensive position. I hear no more at present of the intention to send them again to sea. The Directory some days ago requested the Legislative Assembly to place thirty three millions of livres at the disposal of the minister of marine. I see they did allow him only twelve millions and a half; a sum large enough to squander or throw away, but not competent for much else.

My letters from France intimate great expectations, of an improvement in the Legisla-

five Assembly, and a more favorable prospect for peace after the new elections, which are to be completed about the 20th of next month. I have not for my own part, the least idea, that they will produce any material alteration. They are still debating the continuation here. It will probably take them a month or six weeks longer. A plot of insurrection in Friesland has been suppressed, by killing and wounding about a dozen of the rioters.

CONGRESS. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THURSDAY, MAY 24. (MR. GALLATIN'S SPEECH CONTINUED.) But a question has been indirectly made by gentlemen, whether it is proper to offer to place France on the same footing with other nations; this question had indeed been already so well answered, that there was little left for him to add; and it might be resolved into the question, what is the law of nations? Because if there is a precise law of nations, that belongs to all, and must be mutual; this has been discussed in the merits of the armed neutrality, which whether it contained truly or not the fixed law of nations was accepted as that permanent law by America in the midst of her Revolution, when it was above all other seasons the least her interest so to recognize it, and which, if there was a doubt, she would have been justified in acting upon to her own salvation and benefit; in like manner the Treaty of 1778 was concluded; but the gentleman from S. Carolina (W. Smith) had insisted and the Secretary of State in his letter to Mr. Pinckney had endeavored to argue, that it was not meant to be permanent;—their arguments had been already so pointedly refuted by a gentleman from N. York (Mr. Livingston) that he had to add only one conclusive fact; the gentleman had asserted that the armed neutrality had ceased to operate upon the termination of the war; now if it should be found that one power had entered into that coalition and recognized the principles thereof as a permanent law, the gentleman's conclusions fell at once to the ground; the gentleman had argued that the convention of armed neutrality was not to be permanent, and the Secretary of State had supported or rather broached the same opinion—what does that document itself declare—"These stipulations shall be further 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."—To this article he would only add this plain fact, which he found recorded in the history of the armed neutrality, which had been quoted by gentlemen, that in the year after the conclusion of the war, Portugal had formally acceded to that convention; its provisions concern shipping, and we see a maritime power acceding to it in the tranquil moments of peace, and agreeing to it as the permanent law of nations; and it is upon our accession to the principle while we were ourselves at war, and when its acceptance was in opposition to our interest but conformable to our love of justice, and upon our subsequent recognition of it as well in the case of our Treaty with France as with others, that we are now bound to put France upon an equal footing with those to whom we have since relinquished the principle. He did not know any treaties of other nations in which the same principle had not been recognized, unless it was in an instance mentioned of Russia having combined with England to do it away for the temporary end of starving France into a surrender—or as was the fashionable expression, of blotting her out of the map of Europe; Denmark and Sweden indeed had in some measure given way to the necessity of the times by declaring that they would abide by none but generally received laws, and in this they no doubt acted with a prudence that could not be blamed; and it was right under a pressure as urgent that the United States had pursued a corresponding conduct; and if right in these powers it could not be said to be wrong only in the case of France, who being willing to maintain it, cannot find the other powers ready or able to render the support mutual and general; but it had been said that America was not bound by her Treaty with France, not to make this relinquishment to Britain; as a foreign nation unquestionably had a right to treat as she pleased, and no other nation had a right to interfere in the acts of her sovereignty; but was it right to acknowledge it in opposition to the law of nations, and to grant it without an equivalent from the only nation that had before denied that law; it should have been the sine qua non in our negotiation with Britain, not of war, but a sine qua non of negotiation; it would have been our interest & our duty not to abandon the principle, even tho' our strength did not allow us to support the execution, and we should have left past depredations to have been amicably compensated, but asserted strenuously our security for the future—this is a real effectual, and not such a fictitious security as we have now obtained; the mischiefs of an abandonment of the principle, is to us of immense magnitude.

On the contraband article, the gentleman from S. Carolina had found Vattel, who was every thing in all other cases, completely void of authority, although Great Britain agrees with Vattel; but how is France to be contented for her maintenance of the doctrine against Britain; the only way to obviate the difficulty is by placing her on the same footing as France in this respect, and specially stipulating that the principle is not abandoned, but granted for a period co-existent to each of the powers; this will be a lesser evil, but there is little to be derived from either party, and when two powers are at war, when we are not able to enter into extensive hostility, we had better incur a disadvantage where there is no dishonour, than insist upon objects of subordinate value, which may be in more auspicious times retrieved.

It had been said, we should not offer France an ultimatum; he had not heard one reason to shew the bad consequences of such a step; he was for giving an ultimatum, and for this very plain reason, because every thing that could be known on this subject by either party was already perfectly understood, but more particularly because Mr. Pinckney informs us, the people of France entertain an opinion that we are divided;—which though true in some cases, would put us on such ground as to shew that on the true national points we were united to a man. Those who oppose it on the ground of concession, would do well first to shew that what we ought and are certainly willing to allow, can be so considered. If this amendment should be rejected, or at least the spirit of it should not be adopted, can it be expected that gentlemen who formerly opposed and disapproved of the measures of administration, will sacrifice their opinions, as has been insinuated they should; can it be expected that after the clamour which has been raised with the obvious intention to overawe us; after the Executive has been put up as a kind of shield to stand between us and the truth, and to protect their arguments and irritating measures from animadversion; that we should not rather be the more alarmed for ourselves, and more fixed to such measures as we are convinced are just; he had always spoken freely, and he would continue so to do, always preferring due respect for others. [To be continued.] MONDAY, JUNE 5. The Journals of the Proceedings of Saturday having been read. Mr. NICHOLAS supposed there was an omission, as no mention was made of the resolutions which had been bro't forward by the gentleman from South Carolina, after the doors had been closed, and which it had been determined were net of a nature to require secrecy. Mr. W. SMITH said the vote which had been taken only related to a part of what he had brought forward. Mr. NICHOLAS said he understood that the letter which he had produced was a private letter, and therefore it was not necessary to notice it. Mr. GALLATIN observed that no distinction had been made. If the letter could be considered as part of the communication, it was also included in the vote, as it was simply that the communication did not require secrecy. Mr. MACON thought the resolutions stood upon the same ground as that upon which a motion is offered to the House, upon which no decision was made, which was never recorded until it was taken up. Mr. THATCHER concurred in opinion. Mr. NICHOLAS was full of opinion an entry ought to have been made in the Journals and moved to amend them. The question was put, and there appeared 41 votes in favour of it, and 41 against it, the Speaker decided it in the negative. The House then resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the state of the Union, Mr. Dent in the Chair, and the speech of the President at the opening of the session having been read. Mr. W. SMITH said he wished to lay upon the table a number of resolutions, which it appeared, if it should not be found advisable to carry the whole of them into effect, were at least worthy of discussion. He did not, however, at present pledge himself to support the whole: they were as follow: See yesterday's Gazette. The resolutions having been read from the chair, Mr. W. SMITH moved the first of them. Mr. MACON wished the gentleman from South Carolina to inform the committee whether he meant to repair all the fortifications, which had heretofore been contemplated—Perhaps some might be necessary, but he thought, considering the present state of our finances, few of them ought to be attended to. Much of the money already expended on this subject had been thrown away. He particularly mentioned New-York. Mr. W. SMITH thought the gentleman had been long enough a member of that house to know, that when they were about to settle the principle of a thing, that it was not usual to go into details. If the resolution was agreed to, a committee would be appointed, who would report such fortifications as it appeared to them necessary to be attended to, with an estimate of the expense, upon which the house would determine; or a sum of money might be voted, and leave it to the President to employ it as appeared to him best; but this was not the question, but merely whether a farther sum of money should be voted for this object. Mr. THATCHER thought they were not ripe for this subject, as they did not know what was the state of the different fortifications. He thought as there were a number of propositions, in some degree connected, that it was desirable that they should be printed; he therefore moved that the committee might rise to give time for this to be done. Mr. GILLES wished the gentleman would reverse his propositions, and let the one for raising money come first. He did not know whether they were prepared to meet this expense. He did not mean to oppose the present motion; he supposed it would pass. But he thought they were about to be too precipitate in their measures. At a time when all Europe seemed to be tired of the war, and about to make peace, we seemed to be disposed to rush into it. He did not believe that much good would be done by this system of fortification. He did not think the United States were more secure now, than before they had a single work of the kind. We have, said he an extensive sea coast, and it was not to be expected that an enemy would choose to come to precisely the place where a fortification stands. It was his opinion that the interests of the country would be served, by letting this matter lie over till the next session.

CONGRESS. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THURSDAY, MAY 24. (MR. GALLATIN'S SPEECH CONTINUED.)

CONGRESS. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THURSDAY, MAY 24. (MR. GALLATIN'S SPEECH CONTINUED.)

CONGRESS. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THURSDAY, MAY 24. (MR. GALLATIN'S SPEECH CONTINUED.)

CONGRESS. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THURSDAY, MAY 24. (MR. GALLATIN'S SPEECH CONTINUED.)