

BY AUTHORITY.

CANAL LOTTERY.

OFFICE, 149 Chestnut-street, between Fourth & Fifth streets.

WARRANTED UNDRAWN Tickets for sale at the above Office, where is kept a correct CALCULUS of the real value of Tickets for public information—also, a faithful numerical Book, open for inspection, gratis. Prize Tickets in the above, New-Cattle, or Washington Hotel Lotteries, purchased or exchanged. N. B. A Share in the New-Theatre to be disposed of. November 23.

George Bringham,

COACH & HARNESS MAKER,

RESPECTFULLY informs his friends and the public, that he has removed from Arch-street, to No. 23 in north Fifth-street, adjoining the Episcopal Burial Ground, where he continues the business of

Coach making in all its Branches.

He makes all kinds of crane neck and perch Carriages, such as Coaches, Chariots, Phaetons, and Coaches; also, Chairs, Kittereens, Gigs, Sulkeys; and all kinds of Harness, with plated or brass mounting. He hath a good supply of the best materials, and a stock of the best seasoned wood.

Orders from any part of the United States will be duly attended to with the greatest punctuality and dispatch.

His long experience in business, his care in the execution of his work, and an unremitting attention to the desires of his employers, he flatters himself will prove sufficient recommendations.

He has several second-hand Carriages for sale, viz. a complete Coach, with a coachman's seat and Venetian blinds all round; a Phaeton; a Chair; and a Sulkey with a falling top.

All kinds of Carriages sold on Commission, and Carriages taken in to stand by the month or year. Apprentices wanted to the Business.

Philadelphia, November 21. t, t, & 3 m. 2awd.

TO THE PUBLIC.

MINIATURE PAINTING.

A Limner from Paris respectfully informs the public, that he paints Likenesses in Miniature, in such striking and pleasing a manner, as will, he hopes, satisfy those who may employ him. His Likenesses are warranted, his sittings short, and his terms easy. His Room is at No. 2, north Fifth-street.

November 11. \$19.

P. S. As he shortly intends returning to France, he invites such Ladies and Gentlemen as may be desirous of having their Portraits drawn, to take advantage of the present time.

Portraits.

ANY Ladies and Gentlemen, who are desirous of having their Likenesses taken, may have them done by applying to the Painter, at No. 112, corner of Union and Fourth streets, where they can be referred to specimens. October 29. eod

THE

Insurance Company of North-America

INFORM the PUBLIC, that they make Insurance against Fire, on Furniture, Merchandise, and Houses, at the rate of Two Shillings and Three-Pence for One Hundred Dollars for Hazards of the first class, and for Hazardous articles, at an advance proportioned to the risk. November 10. \$1m.

Tuition of the French Tongue,

IN AN IMPROVED MANNER.

P. L. PORTIER,

AFTER examining the French pronunciation, with regard to the letters made use of to express it, and the difficulties which necessarily occur in its being soon acquired by foreigners who apply themselves to the study of the French tongue; difficulties arising—1st. From the different ways in which the same sound is represented—2d. From the usual way of expressing different sounds—3d. And from the want of means fit to convey to the mind these sounds with simplicity and clearness.

Convinced that to remove these difficulties, or at least to lessen them, is an attempt worthy the attention of those who are desirous to learn the French language.

P. L. PORTIER, most respectfully offers his services to the enlightened public of this city, in order to teach the French tongue, especially the reading of it, by a method yet unpractised anywhere.

This method, simple in itself, is to convey to the mind, by means of particular characters, every kind of sounds, and words, without any regard to the letters used to compose them.

Each character will express one syllable, representing to the mind the only French sound proper for it; these characters are so easy to form, and so recollected, that the meanest conception may thoroughly understand them in less than a month.

As soon as the scholar is acquainted with these characters, he cannot be at a loss in the reading of any French words, because he will find in the table of characters, and observations thereon, the right way of pronouncing every proper word.

Another advantage deriving from this method, is to enable the learner to adapt these characters to his own tongue, which he may find very convenient, either to write private notes, or even correspond with any one having a knowledge of them.

The intention of the author is to keep an Evening School from 7 to 9, and to attend at the houses of those Ladies and Gentlemen who may be pleased to honour him with their commands. He will teach every day, Sundays excepted, one hour by lesson, during which, he will do his utmost to deserve their favours.

He may presume to assure his patrons, that the greatest punctuality shall be observed in his hours of attendance, and that neither care nor pains shall be wanting for their improvement in reading, writing and speaking the French language. Apply to No. 181, fourth Front Street, between Spruce and Pine-Streets. November 17. eod.

CAUTION.

THE LOT of ground 39 feet 3 inches front on Fifth-street, and 124 feet deep on Gaskill-street, took possession by Timothy Hurst, as Attorney for William Hurst, is subject to a ground rent, for ever, of twenty-four pounds ten shillings and seven-pence half-penny per annum—Also, to arrears of rent due first of January, 1796, ninety-eight pounds two shillings and six pence to the subscriber.

Philad. Nov. 21. Susannah Rodney.

To be Sold,

THAT handsome seat near Princeton, the property of the late Rev. Doctor John Witherspoon, known by the name of TUSCULUM. It consists of a neat well-lighted Bone House, two stories high, with four rooms on each floor, and a cellar under the whole. There are attached to it one hundred and fifty acres of Land, more or less, and chiefly inclosed with good and durable stone fences. Of these about eight acres are natural meadow, five acres artificial town with red clover, and from twenty to thirty acres woodland. On the premises there is a valuable orchard of young and thirty apple trees, a framed barn and stables, two corn houses, a grain loft, and carriage house quite new, a new stone milk house, and near it a well, and a constant spring of water. For terms apply to THOMAS V. JOHNSTON, Esq. of the Rev. G. MUEL S. SMITH, in Princeton; or to the subscriber at Tusculum.

Ann Witherspoon. 44w. Tusculum, Nov. 21.

STRICTURES on a publication, entitled "Features of Mr. Jay's Treaty, from a S. C. paper."

[CONCLUDED.]

"By the constitution, congress is endowed with the power of declaring war: Suppose," says he, "that this had been an offensive and defensive alliance, binding us to join Great-Britain in hostilities against France; could the President and Senate thus negotiate us into a war?" I will change the supposition, and then ask him the question: when Genet proposed a treaty in 1793, the *sine qua non* of which was our taking part in the war, (which was happily avoided by the President's refusal to convene the Senate for that purpose, and for which this writer has never forgiven him) suppose an alliance, offensive and defensive, with France, had been made, would not Citizen Genet and his American abettors have thus negotiated us into a war? By the constitution, congress is empowered to regulate commerce with the Indian tribes: he asks, "what right there is by treaty to regulate our commerce with the Indian tribes?" And then he asserts, that "whenever a treaty of peace and amity has heretofore been concluded with the Indians, it has been the constitutional practice of the President to call on congress to regulate the commerce with them." What does this prove? The cases where the President has recommended to congress to regulate the intercourse with the Indian tribes were only those in relation to tribes with whom there were no treaties, or those with whom there were only treaties of peace, or those with whom regulations of commerce and intercourse had not been stipulated by treaty: But I challenge any one to produce an instance where, after a precise stipulation by treaty on the subject of commerce, the President has called on congress to confirm that by law. On the other hand, all our treaties with the Indian tribes will furnish instances, overturning the whole of this writer's doctrine; some containing regulations of commerce or intercourse, others containing grants of money, either by payments in gross or annual payments, and others fixing territorial boundaries, none of which have ever been confirmed by congress, or have ever suggested the necessity of such confirmation. It was reserved for a treaty with England to call forth all the venom of faction against the constitutional powers of the President and Senate, and to excite to discoveries never dreamt of before. It will not be doubted by those who have traced the source of certain dogmas, that a treaty with France would have suffered all those constitutional questions to have reposed in peace. A mind the least discerning will not fail to carry all these objections to their proper account.

"Congress," he proceeds to remark, "have the exclusive right to define piracy." Had he examined the act of congress on the subject of crimes and punishments, he would have found therein a reference to piracy by treaty. Congress knew so well the extent of the treaty-making power, that they expressly recognize it, by referring to cases of piracy defined by treaty; and this was done without the idea of an objection. This, among other points, is at once a specimen of the writer's ignorance, and an evidence that he is not, nor has ever been, in the station which his herald has proclaimed.

"By the constitution," we are next told, "no tax or duty can be laid on articles exported from any state." The 12th article is again pressed into the service of this writer, tho' no part of the treaty, to prove that the constitution has been violated: he says, is it not wicked to suppose that by treaty the exportation of the articles themselves can be prohibited? Observe the fallacy of this argument: The constitution provides that no duty shall be laid on articles exported from any state, that is the produce of any state; therefore it is an infraction of the constitution to prohibit the exportation of the produce of the West-Indies in American bottoms. Now, there are three points which take this out of the constitution. 1. No tax or duty is laid, but the exportation is prohibited; 2. It is not of the produce of the United States, but of the West-Indies; 3. It is not a total prohibition of the export, but in American bottoms: To extend this clause of the constitution to all articles exported from the United States, would be preposterous; for then the whole system of drawbacks would be annihilated. Congress have always regulated the terms on which foreign articles may be re-exported from the United States; and may prohibit, when expedient, their re-exportation altogether. To argue, that because a tax or duty cannot be laid on the export of American produce, the total exportation of them cannot, under certain circumstances, be prohibited, would be to restrain congress from exercising the salutary power of laying embargoes, (a power which has been even delegated to the President alone) and of stopping in time of war, the export of certain commodities, which might be indispensably necessary for national safety, a power which has recently been exercised.

This portrait painter and delineator of features, who possesses to an eminent degree the talent of distortion, having exhausted his genius in the display of all the numerous cases of usurpation of power, as he calls it, by the President and Senate, adverts next to one case, which he terms an alienation of power. "An act of congress cannot, (and can a treaty? he asks) surrender the right of sequestrating the property (meaning the debts) of a hostile nation?" He ought first to have shown that such right existed. Is it not wonderful, and accountable for only by that perversion of ideas which seizes on those who make every thing bend to a favorite doctrine, that the same individual who cavils through many a long page at clear and admitted powers, should immediately after claim a power not only not expressed, but only to be deduced by a strained and inadmissible construction; that the stickler for a rigid adherence to, and strict construction of the powers derived from the constitution, should be the advocate (when it suits his purpose) of an usurpation of a right, which is not warranted by any part of that instrument, I mean the right of congress to sequester debts? I call on this writer, or any of his admirers or associates, to put his finger on that clause of the constitution which

assigns to congress the right of interfering directly in private contracts. I deny their power of doing, except by an organization of the federal courts, in which case their arrangements must be uniform, general, and applicable to all debts, domestic as well as foreign. And yet this writer laments pathetically that Mr. Dayton's proposition, which was for an interference in private contracts, in time of peace, and which was abandoned from a conviction of its unconstitutionality as well as impolicy, did not succeed! Perhaps it will be asked, why did not the treaty then guard against the exercise of an act, which is not lawful? The answer is obvious: it was to restrain congress by the injunctions of good faith and the fear of consequences, from an exercise of power, to which, without such restraint, they might be prompted in a moment of heat and resentment. A little knowledge of popular bodies will inform us, that there are periods, when they, like individuals, are more under the influence of passion than reason, and when constitutional barriers have as little efficacy as arguments, addressed to their judgment: on these occasions, should even the ties of treaties be broken, it is of public utility and for the national good, that there should be the check of other branches, who would have the injunctions of solemn stipulation, superadded to those of reason and honour.

There are some other features of this political Lavater which are subject to the same animadversions as the preceding; indeed the whole piece teems with the most barefaced misrepresentations of the treaty, or the most glaring misinterpretations of the constitution. Every part of it might with ease be refuted to the satisfaction of every intelligent and unprejudiced reader. But fatigued and disgusted with displaying thus minutely the monstrous absurdities of his doctrines, it will suffice to sum up the whole with this observation, that all which relates to fact is misrepresented, all which relates to the constitution is misconstrued. The whole reasoning on the constitution, which constitutes the essence of this precious production, concludes in this, "that no treaty whatever can be made."

If his reasoning proves any thing, it must result in that: for, he says, "Congress, by the constitution, have the exclusive right, 1. to regulate commerce with foreign nations and with the Indian tribes; 2. to take money out of the treasury; 3. to declare war; 4. to define piracy; 5. to make rules respecting territory; 6. to borrow money;" consequently the President and senate cannot bind the United States in respect to any of these objects: but in as much as no power but the President and senate can make treaties, by the constitution, it follows that no treaty whatever can be made in relation to any of those objects, and consequently no treaty at all; for it is impossible to suppose a case of a treaty which shall not embrace one or another of them. How will he extricate himself from this dilemma? If he says, "the treaty, when ratified by the President and senate, must afterwards be ratified by the house of representatives," then the treaty will not be made by the President and two thirds of the senate, agreeably to the constitution, but by the President and congress: if he says, that after the treaty is ratified by the President and senate, acts of congress must pass to carry it into effect, then the President and senate are divested of their constitutional authority; for their ratification would be inoperative, without the concurrence of the house of representatives; and there would be this further absurdity, that the senate would by a majority of votes revise what they had sanctioned by two-thirds.

Such are the inconsistencies into which those writers run, who, abandoning the plain dictates of common sense and the simple path of the constitution, entangle themselves in the labyrinths of chicanery and error: and yet, so great is the force of prejudice, so much are the understandings of sensible men frequently clouded by the mists of passion, that this distorting of truth is said to have his admirers! A superficial and cursory perusal of a lengthy piece, artfully adorned with the flowers of rhetoric and the beguilements of sophistry, may for a moment mislead even the well-informed; but they will, if unprejudiced, soon see the deception and search for something solid and substantial. They will turn to the constitution, where they will find, in plain and intelligible language, "that the President and the senate have the power to make treaties, and that such treaties are the supreme law of the land." They will then execrate the men who have prostituted their talents in thus endeavoring to impose on their understandings.

I shall terminate these strictures with one question: had the President and senate, in the year 1793, when applied to by citizen Genet, entered into an alliance offensive and defensive with France, by virtue of which the United States stipulated to declare war against England, to borrow money, to raise armies, to regulate piracy, and to regulate the commercial intercourse of the two countries, would the writer of the features or his partisans have uttered a syllable of doubt touching their constitutional right of making such a treaty?

V A T E L.

From the COLUMBIAN CENTINEL.

SPIRIT OF THE TIMES.

[From the publications in the Chronicle, said to be "proceedings of the town of Plymouth," the public might be led to believe that the inhabitants of that ancient town were disorganizing antifeederalists. To free them from an imputation so disgraceful, we are happy in being able to present the citizens of the United States, with the following PROTEST—which strongly evinces that the most respectable part of the citizens thereof, and those most largely embarked in navigation, are firm friends to the Federal Government, to good order, and the constituted authorities.]

Whereas at a meeting of the inhabitants of the town of Plymouth, on the 28th day of October inst. for the purpose of taking into serious consideration the treaty entered into by the President, and twenty Senators, and the government of Great Britain, it was hastily determined to dispense with

the legal qualifications of voters, in consequence of which determination, a large number of the inhabitants, immediately withdrew themselves, conceiving the meeting to be no longer a legal meeting of the town. Notwithstanding which, sundry persons remained, and calling themselves the town of Plymouth, proceeded to pass resolutions, reprobating in strong and indecent terms, the conduct of the Supreme Executive of the United States. We the subscribers inhabitants of the town of Plymouth, holding in just abhorrence such irregular proceedings, think it our duty, publicly to manifest our "marked and pointed disapprobation," of the same for the following reasons:

First. Because the treaty having received the sanction of the Constituted Authorities, (so far as depends on the decision of those authorities) has become in the language of the Constitution, "the supreme law of the land"—any attempts therefore to counteract its operation, is an open and avowed opposition to the general government, and highly alarming to the peace of the community, as the insurrection in the Western counties of Pennsylvania, probably originated in meetings conducted with equal temper and moderation.

Second. Because the persons assembled at this meeting were incompetent to decide, on the merits of so complex an instrument, as the treaty, very few of them ever having seen or read it, and every thing relative to the whole business, being previously prepared by the original movers of the meeting, who in all instances, have been hostile to the federal constitution and the administration of it, from its first establishment.

Third. Because such meetings, and the efforts made to convene them, by practising on the passions of the honest, though uninformed, are in the extreme dangerous in a republican government, having a direct tendency to introduce the empire of licentiousness, which is only a short prelude to the more permanent one of despotism.

Fourth. Because the strictures made on the treaty, in the aforesaid resolutions, are a mere repetition of certain inflammatory sentiments, which have been echoed and re-echoed to the public; and while they contain the most unbounded, indiscriminate censure on illustrious and amiable patriots, whose important, meritorious services rendered their country, ought to endear them to every friend of it, pay the highest eulogium to Stephens Thomson Mason, a Senator of the United States, for a notorious breach of official confidence.

Plymouth, Oct. 30th, 1795.

Signed by 72 CITIZENS.

For the FARMER'S WEEKLY MUSEUM.

"Issachar is a strong ass."

WILLING to carry any burdens through thick and thin; the dirtiest roads, the most formidable obstructions the "hill difficulty" or the "valley of humiliation" are all the same to "strong asses" of this world.

On my return from a visit to a brother parson, I stopped at an Inn for refreshment, and an African hostler held my stirrup for a weary limb to dismount. His hat was under his arm, his body bent to more than a curve, and his looks of cringing obsequiousness for a moment angered me, not at him, for I saw slave in the furrows of his cheek, but at the first gold coast navigators who thus dared to change humanity into a "strong ass"—Not slaves alone are thus meanly subservient, I observed, to myself. I know some in that predicament who are free—Is it possible? How free? Why they have the keys to their chamber—they go, like the winds, where they list—they are not in the custody of the officer—But avarice sends them on vile errands, and to fetch or carry gold, they "couch down" like Issachar the "strong ass."

I sometimes see a little mercenary attorney "couching down" at the bar, taxing his bill of cost and pointing to the careless client that he has forgotten "one shilling more for this writ." I hear him argue, not with ingenuity, not with eloquence, for then I should do him homage, but by rote; croaking sentences from the statute book, and hesitating law from his "puddled" memory. I hear him scold a trembling culprit, as a toothless old woman scolds a wayward child; a culprit for the first time whose only offence is cutting a twig from the wayside tree. But this arch-villain of public wrongs holds his dogs cased law in one hand, and rudely pushes from him "sweet mercy" with the other. His bray, his stupidity, his callousness are all derived from the house of "Issachar" and when I see him with his green bag moiling for the last dollar of the entangled client, verily I see as "strong" an "ass" as the patriarch did, when he gazed at the most sluggish of his children.

On some of those days, when I do not preach myself, I sit down in the body seat of the first meeting house that I find. Occasionally I am instructed by an ingenious sermon modelled by a "workman that needeth not to be ashamed," but when the clergyman is corpulent, red faced, and a heavy leaver upon the cushion, when he sounds divinity through his nose, when he copies the huge pages of Dr. Gill or Flavel, and reads them without emphasis, though I cannot discern long ears rising each side of his wig, I am confident that some "strong ass" has mistaken the pulpit for the stable.

When a Candidate for Congress, instead of studying the constitution at home, is constantly in a bar room with a mug in his hand counting the suffrages of the populace. When, for the sake of a vote, he bows the neck of his judgment at the beckon of a fool, and resigns his belt grounded opinions to slide easily into those of his neighbour. When, like absalom he stands at the city gate, taking every stranger familiarly by the hand, inquiring his grievances, and hinting that, "if I were a ruler in Israel how soon they would be redressed," the most careless elector may anticipate Virginia politics hotter than the sun, battles against the funding system, crude calumny against the President, zeal for French lanterns, and resolutions of democratic clubs enough to fill both panniers of "a strong ass."

Should I in a morning's walk or ride, stop for rest at some log house or cottage in my way, and see a leucy looking fellow, smelling strong of nauseous drugs, poking frequently into old saddle bags or phials, and feeling pulses which keep time with