

Mr. FENNO,

SO many falsehoods have been palmed upon the public, thro' the medium of newspapers, that contradictions are rarely necessary; but if so palpable a series of misstatements, and such unfounded assertions, as appear in your paper of Saturday last—in "the extract of a letter from a gentleman in Philadelphia, to his correspondent in New-York"—should pass unnoticed; it might too much encourage evil minded persons, under a hope of impunity, to proceed in such practices.

I ought, in justice to the citizens of Philadelphia to suggest, the improbability, that such a letter was written here, it is doubtless a fabrication in New-York; under the fictitious appearance of a letter from this city; a trick the anarchists at a distance from the seat of Government, have practised, with too much success; as the ignorant and uninformed may give more credit to assertions from persons, who are near the Government, and have opportunity of accurate knowledge of its movements.—No man in Philadelphia would dare to place "Heaven and the Madisonian party," together as having preserved peace to this country.

A declaration of this extent, the party themselves dare not make, and never will, unless emboldened, by such hints, to expect support from abroad.—The letter suggests that the same persons who opposed Madison's Commercial Regulations, and were in favor of the Excise, were also in favor of the Stamp Duty; too impudent for any body, but a distant anarchist, to assert; facts on record, will mark such insinuations with a proper epithet; Ames, Tracy, W. Smith &c. &c.—who were of the committee who reported that bill, are among the names who opposed it, and those gentlemen would not be very thankful to any person, for ranking them in the Madisonian party.—The committee of ways and means, thought it their duty, to report, a variety of modes by which a revenue could be raised, a Stamp duty, and Land Tax, were among the ways and means reported; and the Madisonians may with equal truth, be said to have prevented a Land Tax, as the Stamp duties; altho' the Land Tax was a favorite of that party.—I was a spectator in the gallery, when these things, were in agitation, before the House of Representatives in Congress; and I declare the language of that party, titled in the letter you published, Madisonians, was hostile; they reproached the friends of peace with tameness, they opposed negotiation with Great-Britain, as mean and degrading; they said, after Mr. Jay's appointment, we should not now have war with Great-Britain, and gave for a reason, that the Government of the United States was too timid, to face an invader of their rights:—and many such expressions, which were undoubtedly then uttered under a full confidence, that popularity was to be gained by them; but when it appears, the good sense of almost all the citizens of the United States approves the measures of the peaceable party, Demagogues are found, base enough, to assume all the credit to their own heroic gentry, who feared not war, but, in the extreme, feared all preparations for it.—It is not true, that the "Madisonian party composed a considerable majority of Congress." They were in the minority, in every vote, excepting two; the first proposition in Madison's Commercial Regulations, and in Clark's intercourse bill, as it was called; as to the first, it amounted to nothing; as the same, in the substance, had specifically been adopted by the House of Representatives, as part of a fund to build a Navy.—And as to the second, the party will probably claim an unrivalled credit.—But if they were the majority, why did not they prevent the Excise, which raised the insurrection? The writer states, the Madisonians as frightening Great-Britain into peace with the United States in the part of his letter which is to set up his friends as efficient preservers of peace, and at the close says, on comparing the measures, "which were the most pacific!" When it is felt to be hostile, his party was so, when it is felt to be peaceable, the same conduct, by a kind of hocus pocus, is said to be pacific: But without the spirit of prophecy, I can assure your letter writer, it will take some time, and many efforts, of all the anarchists in New-York, Boston and Vermont, united, to convince, even this party themselves, which he styles Madisonians, that they have been the peace makers of the United States:—and I believe still longer to make the enlightened citizens at large believe it. Well might this writer, with canting face and language,

say, What vile arts are made use of to delude people at elections?

A SPECTATOR.

Monday, 15th Dec. 1794.

For the Gazette of the United States.

Mr. FENNO,

The enclosed article was sent to Mr. Brown on the 8th inst.—after waiting three days a note was sent him, requesting to know whether he would publish it—on the evening of the twelfth, the public is informed in the Philadelphia Gazette, that the piece is rejected, as it abounds with personal abuse!—As I wish the public to have a better opportunity of forming a judgment than is afforded by either a joint or separate opinion in the Philadelphia Gazette, you will oblige me by inserting the piece in your paper.

Mr. Brown,

A PIECE signed *Russell* appeared in the Philadelphia Gazette not long ago, and so little was there in it, and so trite and common-place was that little, that I run my eye over it hastily as I usually do over the columns of newspaper trash, and in two or three days had entirely forgot the publication. But as it was brought up again by successive puffs in the same gazette, I was at length induced to re-examine the paper to find this pearl which I had overlooked or mistaken for a common pebble. I was truly surpris'd to find it was *Russell*.

As so much pains has been taken to force it into notice, let it be noticed. It is stated as of no importance what the forms of government may be, whether monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy; every thing depends upon, and the only points really consequential, is the judicious arrangement of the public funds or resources.

This is not common place truth, it is common place prejudice or absurdity. The writer has probably read as deep as Pope's well known couplet,

For modes of government let fools contend,
That which is best administered is best.

The poetry is very good, but the proposition is execrable for an American to propagate. Is it really indifferent whether the United States are governed under a monarchy, an aristocracy, or a club-government (all the abhorrence of freemen) or a republic?—Either of the first three forms, would convulse this country to its centre, and would blast all the hope that our present happy constitution has nearly realized.

So far is the proposition that this writer has advanced from being true, that the reverse may be affirmed as the more conformable with reason and experience. That our political liberty depends on the happy arrangement of our government, and that our civil liberties have flowed from our political. This at least will be allowed, that the forms of our constitutions have been tried and found as useful as they were thought to be. A retrospect of some facts will confirm this conclusion.—Would a simple democracy have secured America from a foreign war? or have suppressed insurrections in more instances than one? Would the attempts of paper money knaves and other schemes for violating right, have failed in some of the states, if it had not been for the steadiness and virtue of a second branch or senate?

Such trite sophomoric maxims, besides their fallacy, tend to damp the affection which republicans feel towards our happy constitution, and which they will value the more highly for contrasting it with the old confederation; with such a comparison before his eyes, how could *Russell* say, forms of government are of no importance?

But the most singular point, the only one of real consequence with *Russell*, is the judicious arrangement of the public funds or resources.

The nonsense of this dogma sets it beyond the reach of confutation. No other scribbler ever made the only business of a nation, to pay taxes. Injudicious taxes will probably yield little money and much complaint. The men at the head of affairs will have the less financial power and the more clamor.—Thus a government may weaken itself in this way much more than it will be able to oppress the people. The writer, however, is very uninformed of the operation of taxes when he makes their weight the cause of misery, and their lightness the cause of happiness. The old confederation called for almost no revenue; yet industry drooped and declined. Besides, high taxes become incorporated with price, and individuals

in a thriving nation are indemnified for what they pay. A taxed article rises in price, and others rise afterwards, in consequence; so that the usual balance between demand and supply is kept up. This writer, however, overlooks the real securities for the happiness of Americans. The sovereignty of the laws made by our own representatives, committed afterwards into the hands of the people thro' their juries, and explained by judges who are placed above all undue influence. These are securities which will protect man and his earnings, and which are of infinitely more value than the pounds, shillings and pence of this writer's arrangement of finance.

One would naturally have expected that sophisms so spun out and strung together by *Russell*, would have ended in some precise conclusion of his own;—what is it more or less than a quotation from the President's speech, respecting the sinking of the public debt? *Russell*'s preamble was probably made beforehand, to fit any subject which his study of the poets might inspire him to handle; and he has hurried its appearance before he had found any thing to tack it to.

The fallacies in this preamble, which indeed is the whole of the essay, are little worth exposing. But to some persons whose intellects may not be under as wise and judicious arrangement as the writer would have the finances, may be misled by them; and therefore this attempt is made by way of caution to such, not to adopt them without examination. After having examined them, few persons will need any further caution.

A REPUBLICAN.

For the Gazette of the United States.

Mr. FENNO,

In Saturday's paper I saw a long panegyric on the measures of what the writer calls the *Madisonians* or *Madisonian* party (but which for brevity's sake and as equally intelligible, I shall call the *Mads* or *Mad* party) and an attempt to prove that those measures, though only inchoate and unexecuted, will eventually procure us whatever satisfaction we may obtain from Great Britain. The writer at the same time asserts that the measures of the *Anti-Mads*, or sober party, were of a contrary tendency.

It is well known that the projects of the former failed and that the measures of the latter succeeded; if the negotiation terminates well, it is more probable that it will be owing to measures which actually took place, than to measures which were only in Embryo. The schemes of the one were impotent threats and inactivity; those of the other dignified moderation and active preparation: the former—vox et preterea nihil; the latter, a firm claim of justice and an active preparation for war. If justice is obtained which was the most likely to obtain it.—The writer tells us that the *Mads* composed a considerable majority of Congress; how did it happen then that all their projects fell through, and that all those of the anti-*mads*, or moderates took effect? He tells us that Great Britain was terrified by the commercial regulations and sequestrations: But both those were merely projects and neither of them ever sanctioned by a vote of either house. It is not very probable that Britain was much terrified by schemes which must have failed in their execution, which would either have ruined this country or been repealed this session.

The object of the commercial regulations was to make this country altogether dependant on France for manufactured supplies and to give France a monopoly of our commerce. When the opposers of that project represented its impolicy and shewed that France was in her present situation unable to furnish us, and her commerce was nearly ruined, the only reply was that these were the falsehoods of British misrepresentation.

But now authentic documents and undeniable evidence demonstrate the absurdity of the measure and the enlightened policy which resisted it.

Robert Lindet in his late report on the actual state of France, says, "manufactures and commerce present a gloomy spectacle; the factories and work-shops are deserted! Many farmers do not thresh their grain, or rot and dress their flax;—they keep their wool and spinning is neglected. Commerce at the present moment, presents to views, ruin and desolation.—The genius of destruction stalk'd through France, and at a blow levelled agriculture and commerce, what can we hope from such a general prostration of manufactures? Foreign nations send us their productions, we should send them ours in return, but we consume the whole." (See *Bache's* paper of the 13th Dec.) This is the country to which that patriotic party intended to confine the commerce of the United States! Oh, rare policy!—This same writer denies that the Democrats or Republicans (meaning the societies) were accountable for the insurrection, which he says is the consequence of the impolitic measures of the opposite party. But if the *mads*, as he told us, composed a considerable majority of Congress, how came they to suffer those impolitic measures to exist; why did they not repeal them?—Are they not therefore accountable for the mischiefs resulting from them? He says

that the measures of the *mads*, were pacific and that they will terrify the British into concessions; those of the opposite side hostile and unattended with any effect.—Strange that pacific measures should have such terrifying effects; and that hostile measures should be altogether inoperative? More strange still that system of pacification which professes the most cordial hatred to a nation and a disposition to ruin her manufactures and commerce.

CIVIS.

For the Virginia Chronicle,

Mr. PRINTER,

I happened lately to be present at a very respectable meeting of this Borough, when their sentiments were expressed with unanimity in a resolve to instruct their Representative to use his influence to repeal the law of this state which secures real estate from the payment of private debts.—The mind cannot hesitate to pronounce the Law impolitic, partial and repugnant to the first principles of the equal distribution of justice. But I could not suppress my admiration, that our Representative was to be INSTRUCTED to vote for the repeal of the law, and that by most of my respectable friends, these instructions were considered as binding on him, and that he was so far deprived of his free agency, that he was incapable of acting in opposition.—I am not desirous of subverting the favourite maxim, that the sovereign power resides in the people; but it is my anxious wish that it be rightly understood.—In the individuals composing a community is the sovereign right of fixing their own government on such principles as they please: but to fix on this government, organize it and give it the proper attributes of action and harmony, the whole society must convene in one general convention to discover, discuss and fix such rules and laws as shall contribute to the greatest good, as in Rome and Athens; or to send Delegates with necessary powers to act for them, which from the necessity of the thing, must be done in a country as extensive as ours.—Were the Suffragans of the State possessed of the necessary information of the abilities, principles and integrity of all the candidates in the state, a state election would be best: this would destroy, in a great measure, those local embarrasments and private attachments which so often disturb Legislation, but as this is impracticable, Representatives must be elected from districts. And here let me ask, Where is the necessity, and whence the right of any particular district binding their Representative on a question, which concerns the whole community.—The collective sense of a state, ought to be the basis of law: and when discussing the propriety of a general measure, a legislator is not to be biased, influenced and governed by the interest of a single district, or local attachment, but the collective interest of the whole state, he will not ask himself, What is the interest of my town or district? but what is best for the whole community? what will produce the greatest possible good to the greatest number of people.

That the people of any district should advise with their Representative is right, and the opinions of the people should, if possible be collected; for the general sense of the people is generally right, and by this collective information, a Representative is to govern his rule of action, and not by the private or selfish views of local attachments: for he is fixing rules of action on the grand floor of Legislation for the whole Commonwealth, which are not limited or confined to any particular district; and his opinions and sentiments should be commensurate with the extent of the law he is making. But positive instructions from districts prevent this—they are formed on an imperfect and partial view of facts, when their opinions and resolutions might be very different after having a fair statement of all the facts in a general assembly, where freedom of discussion and communion of sentiment besield the truth. People cannot tell at home how they would or ought to act in an assembly.

The suffrages of my fellow-men, which neither repose confidence in my integrity, nor afford the tribute of respect to my abilities, would neither be agreeable nor acceptable to me. Are instructions in all cases binding—the ideot if he is capable of giving his *Aye* and *Nay*, may answer all the purposes of the wisest legislator. What judgment, what wisdom can any man display, who is under the restraint of binding instructions? He acts as a mere machine, he must exclude the possibility of all conviction, and obstinately persist in what he may think to be error. The object embraced by the choice of Representatives, is, to collect the wisdom of the state, (for in a multitude of councilors there is safety) the Representatives are to unite in their counsels and consult for the public safety; but binding instructions prevent it—they totally destroy the good effect of public deliberations, and pervert the salutary measures resulting from united councils: Such are the opinions which I formed, and with diffidence I publish them, in opposition to the generally received opinion of my countrymen; but a strong persuasion of their

truth holds me, on this occasion, to express them.

MIRROR.

Nov. 27, 1794.

Foreign Intelligence.

FRANCE.

NATIONAL CONVENTION.

September 19.

From Paris Papers:

Garnier, of Saintes, denounced the disturbances, which took place in the palace of Equality, offering again the fees of a Palais-royal. There have been seen, he said, insolent beings, who outraged with impunity the patriots, particularly those they suspected to be Jacobins. Some of his colleagues went there, in order to enquire into the nature of the commotion; they found the proceedings to be counter-revolutionary, and in favour of royalty. The convention is too wise to be misled by the pretended watch-word of *Vive la Convention*. I demand, that the committee of general safety make a report on that subject.

Dubois Crance.—It is time, that the Convention pronounce and display the majesty of the people it represents. It is at least time, that this hall cease to be the centre of the fluctuations which some brigands, covered with crimes, the blood-suckers, who have plundered the republic, endeavour to perpetuate.—[Applauded.] Yes, there are certainly two distinct parties at Paris; one is composed of all those, who love liberty, and rally round the Convention; the other, of those depraved individuals, who have served Robespierre, abetted his tyranny, who have embred their hands in blood, who have drank the blood of their victims.—[Applauded]

You will find the constitutions in the ancient Revolutionary Committee.—They have in vain hid themselves behind a mask of patriotism, the convention will finish by pulling it off and unveil the turpitude of those hypocrites.—[Fresh applauses.] All France has returned you thanks for the firmness you displayed on the 27th July. All France exclaims, Let us unite, and we shall be saved; the whole nation declares in favor of justice, and abhors the reign of terror.

We have long combated with all the revolutionary energy, when it was required, to overthrow royalty, to exterminate the federalists, and to crush the factions. Ought we to be now, what we have been before? Yes, with respect to principles, but not in our actions.

Energy is required to conquer liberty, and wisdom to preserve it. We cannot hope to consolidate liberty, by spreading despair among the families, by raving like some men, who enjoyed the confidence of Robespierre and Couthon, and made more aristocrats in one day, than the revolution during five years political crisis.—[Applauded.]

They make a bustle about what has happened yesterday in the ci devant palais-royal.—Well; I know, there have been two parties at the theatres, one cried out, vive les Jacobins, and the other, vive la Convention! the hall resounded with shouts of applauses. [The assembly and all the spectators rose and cried out, vive la Convention!]

Citizens, don't suffer yourselves to be lulled into security. There are some men who say aloud, "We shall triumph ere long." Atrocious menaces are heard every where. Individuals who have received cards [of safety or civism] from the revolutionary committees, or fled their departments, in order to escape the punishment due to their crimes, are met with in every street of Paris. I have demanded liberty to speak on this eight days since. If the Convention allows me to mount the tribune, I shall present some ideas, which may contribute to throw light on the dangers, and point out the necessary measures, to keep the vessel of the revolution afloat, and to prevent its being swallowed by the storms, which the brigands are raising.

The Convention resolved, that Dubois Crance should be heard.

Dubois Crance, after having taken a slight retrospect of the different disturbances which opposed the happiness of twenty-six millions of Frenchmen, addressed the Mountain, which has not only done its duty, but also paid its tribute to humanity,—engaged his colleagues to forget animosities, and to watch the Camerons of the revolution, who change their colours according to circumstances, in order to effect with impunity the destruction of liberty; and drew the attention of the assembly on the situation of commerce and industry. He concluded, by proposing a decree for the maintenance of the re-