

Gazette of the United States.

[No. LXXXIV.]

SATURDAY JANUARY 30, 1790.

[Published on Wednesday and Saturday.]

THE TABLET.

No. LXXXIV.

(Continued from the last Number.)

“Every situation in life has pleasures and pains peculiar to itself; but the most unfailing fountain of happiness is open alike to all men.”

THE happiest man I ever knew was a person who every day of his life formed delusive expectations, and never once succeeded in a plan he undertook. To miscarry in a most material point of business made slight impressions on him, because his anticipations were always awake, and his mind was more habituated to indulge new prospects, than to repine at past misfortunes. His neighbors viewed him with a mixture of ridicule and pity. Such bitter disappointments, they supposed must make him unhappy, and such unreasonable hopes could not but expose him to derision. In short his misfortunes produced complaint from every body but himself, and he was miserable in every estimation but his own. From this run of remarks I would infer that we are too apt to exaggerate imaginary evils, and to suppose people more unhappy in many respects, than they really are.

It is a question that deserves enquiry, whether we generally anticipate more pleasure from any object than it affords when we possess it? The common opinion of mankind is, that the imagination overates approaching scenes of gratification. We should not too hastily adopt such an opinion. The reverse more usually happens, and we derive more happiness from gratifying our wishes than was expected. People form their ideas on this subject, by examining their feelings when the enjoyment is over; and comparing the sensations of satiety with the impulses of hope, they give the preference to the latter. But the fact is, the enjoyments of the scene itself was more delightful than either.

We should make a distinction between the pleasures of sense and those of the imagination. The gratification of natural appetites never affords less delight than we anticipate. A man pinched with hunger or cold, does not exaggerate, in his imagination, the pleasure he derives in being relieved from his distress. A traveller, performing a journey in rough, tempestuous weather, consoles himself with the prospect of meeting at night with a commodious inn, where he will find a warm room and comfortable refreshment. He mitigates no doubt the tedious hours of the day, in looking forward to the pleasing scenes of the evening; but I appeal to his fellow traveller, whether his spirits are not more brisk, when he is enjoying those comforts, than while he was anticipating them.

Artificial sources of pleasure, however may often prove delusive. Men who flatter themselves that a superb house, elegant gardens, a carriage and livery servants will add essentially to their happiness, are under the influence of a mistake. Their anticipations are too lively, and the object when they attain it, will not yield the delight that was imagined. There is no reason in nature, why a person should feel any exquisite satisfaction in riding in a chariot to church; and gratifications of this kind soon lose their relish.

Providence has so managed the causes that contribute to happiness, that all classes of people may attain a proportion. To relieve the wants and gratify the desires which nature has formed, afford more genuine and universal satisfaction than can well be created by the allurements of caprice and fancy. The appearance of the sun, when it has been, several days, hidden in the clouds, has afforded more real delight to the human race, than all the elegance and splendor that artifice can devise. Refreshing showers after the earth has long been parched with drought has yielded more pleasing sensations, than can be enjoyed by all the gratifications that wealth can purchase or power command.

Mankind should not indulge a temper of complaint. Happiness is dealt out in more equal portions, and depends more on causes within our reach, than is commonly supposed. It cannot be material, whether imaginary objects of pleasure are greatest in anticipation or in possession. Whatever delight they afford is so much clear gain. We should make the most of our situation, and not repine because it is not different.

FOR THE GAZETTE OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE REPUBLICAN.

No.—11.

EVERY society of men must be restrained by some coercive regulations; and every form of government must be founded on certain general maxims. According to the celebrated *Montes-*

quieu, Fear is the spring of action in a Despotism; Honour in a Monarchy, and Virtue in a Republic. This is a plausible theory; but like many others, though beautiful on paper, it is utterly fallacious in practice. Human nature is so selfish and corrupt, that the legislator who depends on virtue alone for the support of a Republican system, builds upon a foundation of sand. More permanent and operative principles are necessary. The common participation of all denominations of citizens in the honours, emoluments and burthens of society; as equal a distribution of property, as the abilities and exertions of individuals will permit; and above all a general diffusion of knowledge among the body of the people, are main pillars in the edifice of a lasting republic. A people well instructed in their rights, are necessarily furnished with the means of preserving them. Their liberties cannot be taken from them, without the absurd supposition of their own consent, which would be a kind of political suicide. Mankind have been too long governed or rather enslaved by means of their hopes, their fears and other passions. But we have reason to be thankful that experience has effected a happy change of measures. In this enlightened age and country the laws begin, as they ought, to be addressed to the sober reason of the subjects. To fit them for such a rational government, every useful branch of knowledge should be encouraged by our federal and state legislatures. The President's recommendation of this subject, in his late official speech to Congress, is worthy of that great friend to the rights of mankind. He urges a legislative patronage of education with his usual candour and discernment. His reasons appear to be altogether satisfactory; and I trust will meet with the concurrence of both houses of Congress, as well as the hearty approbation of the public. As the President did not think proper to descend to particulars, they are left to the good sense of the senators and representatives. To encourage literature, without interfering so far as to controul and shackle it, would be an undertaking becoming our national rulers. With deference I would suggest the propriety of founding a federal professorship of *history, government and jurisprudence* in each of the universities of the United States. The professors might be appointed either by the President of the United States, or by the trustees of the respective universities, as should be judged most proper. Their lectures might explain the general rights and liberties of men; the history of ancient and modern times, especially of our own country, and more particularly the grand American revolution, including the rise and progress of the various political establishments in the several states and the general confederacy. As the pupils annually retire from the universities, mix with the mass of citizens, and many of them engage in the instruction of subordinate schools or other useful employments, they will carry their knowledge with them into life, and diffuse it far and wide among all ranks of people. And thus the whole community will receive a salutary influence from such institutions. Surely the salaries which would be necessary to engage competent professors, would be money expended to the advantage of the public.

EXTRACT,

From Governor Hancock's speech to the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts. January 19, 1790.

IT would be very extraordinary if we, as a Nation, should remain exempted from those foreign or domestic troubles, with which other nations are frequently visited. Notwithstanding a general Government is well established by the free consent of the people, we are to continue to support our own government, with unabating anxiety for its welfare and prosperity: Indeed, the general Government of the United States is founded in an assemblage of Republican Governments; and it depends essentially on these, not only for its dignity and energy, but for its very existence in the form it now possesses; therefore, whatever is done to support the Commonwealth, has a tendency to advance the interest and honor of all the States. Hence we are called upon in an especial manner, to maintain an equal and regular system of revenue and taxation, to support the faith, and to perform the engagements of our Republic; to arm and cause our Militia to be disciplined according to the mode which shall be provided by Congress; and to see that they are officered with men, who are capable of making the greatest progress in the art military, and who delight in the freedom and happiness of their country. A well regulated and disciplined Militia, is at all times a good objection to the introduction of that bane of all free governments—a standing Army.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 27, 1790.

THE order of the day for the consideration of the bill for giving effect to the laws of the United States in the state of North-Carolina, was taken up, and the bill passed to be enacted.

The bill for the remission or mitigation of fines, forfeitures and penalties in certain cases, was read the second time. Ordered, that it be referred to a committee of the whole house, to be taken into consideration on Wednesday next, and that 100 copies be printed.

In committee of the whole, on the bill to provide the means of intercourse between the United States and foreign nations; the motion before the committee yesterday, for striking out of Mr. Lee's proposed amendment, the words, “by and with the advice and consent of the senate,” was again read.

Mr. Jackson objected to the principle of the bill, as tending to establish arbitrary power—as divesting the senate of their prerogative—as relinquishing the controul of the House over the Treasury of the United States. Besides, he contended that it is the duty of the House to fix the salaries, and this he conceived the legislature fully competent to. The disposal of the public money is a trust committed to us, nor can we constitutionally divest ourselves of it.

Mr. Boudinot was opposed to the amendment, and in favor of striking out the words, and contended that the bill went to make all those provisions as fully as the nature of the case would permit, which gentlemen appeared so earnestly to contend for.

The bill empowers the President to draw out of the public treasury a specified sum, it has also determined a point beyond which the salaries shall not extend; all the power proposed to be vested in the President, is to reduce the salaries, and to dispose of the appropriation to the best advantage. This cannot be considered an extraordinary or unconstitutional trust; it is agreeable to the uniform usage of the House in making appropriations where any trust is reposed. It is easy to foresee insuperable difficulties in associating the senate with the President in this business.

Mr. Scott asked whether the question was of a legislative or executive nature—for his part he thought it of a legislative nature; and therefore granting any power to appropriate the public money for purposes where the house could not ascertain the quantum necessary, was acting contrary to the constitution. It was improper he said that either the President or senate, or both, should expend money for any services, the amount of which could not be fixed by law. He was therefore wholly opposed to the principle of the bill, and moved that the committee should rise, for the purpose of introducing a motion in the house to re-commit it.

Mr. Sedgwick observed that if a discretionary power cannot be lodged with any person to determine what sums shall be paid for particular services, it is difficult to conceive how the public business can be carried on. He was sure he said, there was nothing in the Constitution against the delegation of such a power—and in fact constant experience was directly opposed to the position.

Mr. Smith (S. C.) pursuing the idea of Mr. Sedgwick adverted to the circumstance of voting 20,000 dollars the last session for the Indian business—it is true the compensations of the Commissioners was fixed—but their allowance, absorbed but a small proportion of the sum committed in trust to the President and Senate of the United States.

Mr. Lawrance opposed the motion for the committee's rising—he wished the committee to come to a decision of the question, whether the Senate should be associated with the President in this business or not—he adverted to the constant practice of the House in respect to the heads of departments, who from the necessity of the case are constantly trusted with appropriations which it is true they may not exceed, but without particularly specifying the sums they shall pay for certain services.—He wished the gentleman would withdraw his motion.

Mr. Boudinot was likewise opposed to the rising of the committee, and enlarged upon the ideas suggested by Mr. Lawrance, and Mr. Smith.

Mr. Scott defended his motion,—he said that services performed in the public offices are known and open to examination; but that might not be the case with the present business; that as the bill stands it militates against the constitution; that consideration would influence him not to withdraw his motion for the rising of the committee.