Gazette of the United States.

PUBLISHED WEDNESDAYS AND SATURDAYS BY *JOHN FENNO*, No. 69, *MARKET-STREET*, BETWEEN *SECOND* AND *THIRD STREETS*, PHILADELPHIA.

[No. 62, of Vol. II.] WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1790. [Whole No. 166.]

[*THE Observations of* General du Portail *on the importance of the* Union *of these States, discover an intimate acquaintance with the principles of human nature, and those incidents which affect, and on which the happiness and freedom of a country sometimes depend—considering the period at which they were wrote, they evince the sagacity and penetration of the author, and a very superior understanding; in this view they will arrest the serious attention of every friend to our country.* —— C.]

THE following extract is rendered highly interesting at this moment, when a disposition unfavorable to *an efficient general government* has been recently manifested. The paper from which it is selected, was written, during the late war, by General DU PORTAIL, a French officer in the service of the United States. Had this country remained under the old confederation, it is plain that his conjectures and apprehensions would have been *long since deplorably realised*; and altho a larger portion of energy, than was at that time contemplated by any among us, has been since infused, *by the people themselves*, into the National Constitution, an unhappy example has been lately exhibited of those "*efforts to render the authority of Congress nugatory and its decrees ineffectual*," which he predicted.

"THE happiness and tranquility of the United States of America (says this judicious Frenchman) we may say their very existence, seems to depend *entirely* on their union. *If that ceases, we perceive no longer what they may become*, there is no longer any thing to be said about them—there is no longer any plan whatever to be formed.

"We must then in every speculation which concerns them, suppose *the Union*, and every projected establishment ought to have in view these two things—first *to maintain and consolidate the Union*; secondly, to draw from it all possible advantages.

"Some say that by putting many means in the hands of Congress, by giving that body much authority, it will be tempted, to enterprise against the liberties of the particular states; and to support this opinion they go rummaging among the histories of individuals and bodies who have attained to the subversion of the government and to the possession of absolute power. But if they would examine the thing with attention, they would soon see, that these pretended examples are not real ones, because the cases are not similar. For my own part, far from believing it possible that Congress should usurp too much power, I believe it easy to demonstrate with the highest evidence, that whatever power the confederation may at first give Congress, (provided the formation of Congress be the same) that body can never preserve during a length of time, that portion which will be necessary for the general good of the United States. As this is not the place to discuss that matter, I will only offer in support of my opinion, a single reason; which, however, I believe will appear sufficient to every man who knows the human heart and the motives which actuate it.

"I say that (like what happens to individuals) each state, altho sensible of the advantage of the Union, of the necessity of a general government, and therefore of parting with a portion of their independence to enjoy the rest in tranquillity, will *as soon as that Union is formed, that general government established*, be *jealous* of it, *try to elude its authority, and look upon every act of that just authority, as an attack on its liberty*. It will even be to the ambitious of every state, a sure means of making their court to their fellow-citizens, and gaining popularity to teach them to chicane the demand of the general government, and to throw as much as they can upon the other states, of that portion of the common burthens which they ought to bear.

"*There will then be an effort continued and perpetual of all the states to render the authority of Congress nugatory, and to render its decrees ineffectual.* Now I ask what means has Congress to defend itself against this incessant attack? If the members who compose it were for life, established in the place where they reside, it might be supposed that there would grow among them a *Spirit of Corps* which would oppose that of each state, and hold it in check. But this is not the case, the members of Congress are only such, transiently, they are strangers to their place of residence, surrounded with people jealous of them, which therefore they cannot seduce. It must also be observed, that each of them is after all, only *the Delegate of a state*, that he is only sent to execute its order and follow its views, a departure from which would soon occasion his recall; that he has, besides his fortune, his family, the ultimate object of his ambition, all his greatest interests in his state, and far from apprehending that he will not be conducted by these interests, it is to be feared that he will not be able sufficiently to strip himself of them, it is to be feared that each member of Congress will never be effectually more than the *Delegate*, the *Man* of such or such a state, and never *the Man of the United States*, as nevertheless ought to be the case for the general good.

"A body composed in such a manner, can then never have the force and energy which would be necessary to preserve the authority which should be given to it; and it must be expected to see it diminish every day, till the inconveniences which result from it become considerable, and the states thus recalled to sound principles by experience, shall restore things to order, an operation which must be performed from time to time, so long as the Union shall last.

"There may then be given to Congress, without danger, more power even than the general good of the United States might exact, because the power might be naturally soon reduced; but at least there must be given to it as much as is absolutely necessary to maintain the Union, and to make each state profit equally of its advantages."

EXPORTS from the District of *Bermuda-Hundred*, from 1st July to 30th Sept. 1790.

Species of Merchandize imported.	To Ireland.	To England.	To Scotland.	To Holland.	To Spain.	Total Quantity.	Total Value
Corn, Indian		2400 lb.			6781 bus	6781 bus.	Dolls. Cts.
Ginseng,		23 tons				2400 lbs.	
Iron, Pig,		1200 lb.				23 tons.	
Indigo,		200 lb.				1200 lbs.	
Root, Snake,						200 lbs.	
Skins, Deer	2714 lb.					2714 lbs.	
Tobacco, Hhd. Staves,	475 hhs.	1516 hhs.	749 hhs.	233 hhs.		2073 hhs.	
Barrel Ditto,	2300	3149 2	10100	4900		48792	
Pipe Ditto,	4500	2144 2	87004			31646	
Hhd. Heading,		46				46	
Handspikes,		2600				2669	
Anchor Stocks,	3 doz.	431-6 doz.	2 doz.	2 doz.		501-6 doz.	
TIMBER. Cars,		8				8	
		16				16	
Total value,							156,951 11

Nett amount of every species of Merchandise entered in the District within the same period, £. 126,598 5 0 *Sterl.* equal to 561,785 43 *Dollars, Cents.*

REMARKS ON THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

IT is frequent to hear the word *quantity* used for *number*, and *increase* for *multiply*. Thus people say great *quantities* of *shingles*; and *cattle* or *horses* are *increased*. These phrases are inaccurate. *Quantity* and *increase* refer to a thing in *bulk*; *number* and *multiply*, to *separate individuals*. A single tree, or horse *increases* by growth; but when individuals are added, they are said to *multiply*. We say with propriety *quantities* of grain, of salt, of timber, because we speak of articles in bulk, not separable into individual things: but we should say, *numbers* of *shingles*, of *staves*, &c. where the articles are usually separable. The Irish frequently mistake in using these words. They say, great *quantities* of *men*; and I have often heard them use the phrase, a *great deal of gentlemen*.

There are two modern innovations made in our language, which demand particular notice, because they are found in good authors. One is the omission of the sign of the possessive case in such expressions, as, "I could not write, on account *of the ship sailing suddenly*." It ought to be, on account of the *ship's sailing*. Modern writers, particularly the Scotch, are remarkable for this omission; and our Newspapers are full of such errors. The phrase is not English nor sense; for the *s* and apostrophe are just as necessary to mark the case, as in any other example where two nouns meet. Writers seem not to know that in our language, we have a peculiar sort of words called *participial nouns*, which answer the purpose both of a participle and a noun in the same phrase. Thus, I heard of a *man's possessing a large estate*: In this phrase, *possessing* is a noun, as it respects the construction with *man*; but a participle as it respects the subsequent word *estate*, which it governs. This is a phrase or idiom of our language, as well established as any other; and when a pronoun is used, we never see it mistaken. Thus, we always see it written, "we heard of *his* possessing an estate," tho, "we heard of *he* possessing an estate," would be just as good English, as "we heard of a *man* possessing it." That these remarks are well founded, will appear from the following examples.

"For the possibility of *B's dying* before A."
BLACKS. 2. 170.

"The plaintiff cannot take advantage of the *plea's amounting* to the general issue." STRANGE's Rep. Vol. 1 5.

"They would be glad to purchase the advantage of the *Bishop's being* in such a post.
Lord CLARENDON's Letter to Sir WM. TEMPLE. Works 467.

This is good English, and the modern omission of *s* is a gross error.

The other innovation is the change of such phrases as "agreeable to notice, the motion was made;" "previous to this, I received a letter;" into, *agreeably to notice, previously to this*. One would think the awkwardness of sound in the latter phrases would have prevented the use of them; but this will not be sufficient to restrain men, who are unwilling to take the rules of our language as they find them, and disposed to make rules of their own. The truth is, it is a rule of our tongue, as well established as any principle in it, though grammarians have not generally discovered it, that *adjectives, pronouns, and relatives may agree with or refer to whole sentences, or members of sentences*. This is not only *an idiom*, but one of the *most frequent*, in the language. Thus, the word *that*, sometimes called a conjunction, is always a *relative*, or *adjective*. Thus, when we say *that man went, that* refers to a single name, *man*; but in this phrase, "I heard that he went," *that* refers to the affirmation in the words *he went*, and agrees with it as a member of the sentence. This is more obvious by changing the order of the words, "he went, I heard *that*;" ask the question, what did I hear? *he went, that* is what I heard. These remarks hold with respect to *that* in all other situations. In the same manner, are used *agreeable, previous, prior, antecedent, according*, &c. "He wrote, agreeable to promise" or "according to promise." What was agreeable to promise? the affirmation in the words, *he wrote*, or the *act of writing*. The adjective in this case refers to the *members of a sentence*, a complete detached affirmation, or fact stated; and the change of the word into an adverb, *agreeably to promise*, or *accordingly to promise*, turns the phrase into nonsense.

ROME, July 30.

THE conduct of the people of Avignon to obtain their liberty, very seriously affects our court. Disgusted with the inutility of negociation to bring back the people to obedience, it has at length determined to solicit the intervention of different powers. The brief which is as follows his holiness has dispatched to his Nuncio at Paris.

"The maxims of independence, and an unrestrained liberty, propagated by the enemies of religion, sovereignty, and public tranquility have induced the inhabitants of the town of Avignon to commit the most enormous outrages, and to despise themselves by the most execrable perfidy. This people, which has lived so many ages under the mild and happy dominion of the Holy See, has been imprudently led away by the bold and artful practices of some designing persons, who amidst tumults and anarchy, have at length produced an open rebellion."

"To prevent all cause of complaint, the Holy See has in vain displayed its benevolence towards those subjects, of whose disaffection it complains, by occasionally furnishing them, from its own sources, with plenty of grain; by lightening their expences; by facilitating the administration of justice, and by inviting them paternally to make known the defects and abuses which might have crept into their legislation, in order to their being reformed.

"All these cases, all these effects of condescension of a generous Pontiff, far from exciting any gratitude, have only served to render these unhappy men more rebellious, and more insolent. Every day has produced new crimes and new excesses.

"After having overturned from the foundation, the ancient system of the municipality and the tribunals, seduced the militia, usurped the rights of the throne and the altar, insulted the Holy Father and the ministers, published writings injurious to the supreme power, and violated even with contempt every thing sacred and profane, they have at length attained the aim of their infamous designs, by imbruing their hands on the 12th and 13th of June last, in the blood of their fellow-citizens, by forcing M. Gassoui, Vice Legate, to leave the city and territory of Avignon by pulling down the arms of the reigning pontiff, their only sovereign, and tumultuously substituting for them those of his most Christian Majesty, whose known equity, religion and respect for the Holy See, fully convinces that court, that, far from favoring so criminal a procedure, he would not suffer it to pass with impunity.

"Such, in a few words is the account of the insurrection of the revolters of Avignon, of which the cardinal secretary of state, by order of the Holy Father, has the honor to inform you, to the end, that you would be pleased to communicate the same to the court where you reside: and it is in the full persuasion that it will take a part suitable to the importance of an event, which is the common cause of all sovereigns, and to the particular friendship which it has ever professed towards the sacred person of his holiness."