

**NEW THEATRE.**

**TOMORROW EVENING, February 26,**  
Will be presented,  
**A TRAGEDY, called**  
**JANE SHORE.**  
Duke of Gloster, Mr. Green,  
Lord Hastings, Mr. Wignell,  
Cateby, Mr. Harwood,  
Sir Richard Ratcliffe, Mr. Warrell,  
Belmour, Mr. Beete,  
Dumont, Mr. Whitlock,  
Earl of Derby, Mr. Francis,  
Alicia, Mrs. Morris,  
Jane Shore, Mrs. Whitlock.

To which will be added, for the first time,  
**A Grotesque Pantomime Entertainment, (partly new and partly compiled) called**

**The Witches of the Rock;**  
Or, **HARLEQUIN EVERY WHERE.**  
With a new Overture, Incantation, Airs, and Choruses, composed by Mr. Reinagle.

The Pantomime compiled by Mr. Milbourne, and under the direction of Messrs. Francis and Milbourne.

Harlequin, Mr. Francis,  
1st Witch, Mr. Darley,  
2d Witch, Mrs. Warrell,  
Attendant Witches, Messrs. J. Darley, Robbins, Mitchell, Miss Willems, &c.  
Pantaloons, Mr. Warrell,  
Lawyer, Mr. Darley, jun.  
Drunken Valet, Mr. Milbourne,  
Surveyor, Mr. Beete,  
Piero, Sig. Joseph DeFor,  
Miser, Mr. Morgan,  
Pompey, Mr. Warrell, jun.  
Tinker, Mr. Mitchell,  
Bricklayer, Master Warrell,  
Milliners, Miss Willems, Miss Rowson,  
Fruit Woman, Mrs. Rowson,  
Columbine, Miss Milbourne,  
Old Lady, Miss Salomon.

With new Scenery, Machinery, and Decorations.—Interpersed with a variety of mechanical changes, magical transitions, and whimsical metamorphoses.  
To conclude with a **DISPLAY of**

**The Great Falls of Niagara.**  
The Scenery designed and executed by Mr. Milbourne.

**Ricketts's New Amphitheatre,**  
CHESNUT-STREET.

**THIS PRESENT EVENING,**  
Thursday, 25th February,  
There will be presented, a general Grand Display of the most capital

**Equestrian & Stage Performances,**  
And, in addition to the former Scenery, the **BEAUTIFUL PAINTING**

By Mr. Joseph Perouani, painter and architect from Italy, which gave such extraordinary satisfaction last evening, at the celebration of

**THE PRESIDENT'S BIRTH-NIGHT,**  
Representing the Temple of *Minerva*, with the Statue of that Goddess of Wisdom, in the attitude of contemplating a bust of the President of the United States of America, placed on an handsome pedestal, and surrounded by Fifteen Figures, emblematic of the Fifteen States, holding Festoons of Flowers.

The President's Statue is crowned by other Figures, representing Immortality and Liberty, ready to celebrate the Birth Day of this virtuous hero, whilst an Eagle appears, flying swiftly down, with the label in his bill,  
**E PLURIBUS UNUM.**

The top of the Temple and the Architrave are ornamented with emblematical Paintings descriptive of **THE VICTORIES gained under the command of Washington,**

Who yesterday commenced his 64th year, which is recorded by History, sitting by the pedestal that supports the bust.

The Arms of each State are painted over each Box, and the arms of the U. S. opposite the Stage.

**COMMERCE AND AGRICULTURE** appear on the front of the Stage.

And several Shields for Coats of Arms of the new States; together with other Emblems of the Indian Treaties.

Besides, a variety of other Paintings & Figures, that compose

**A Suite of Scenery extremely interesting.**  
The whole House will be illuminated with variegated lamps, and the great Granddole is ornamented with Festoons of Flowers.

The Evening's Amusement to conclude with **RICKETTS'S NEW PANTOMIME,** called,

**The Triumph of Virtue;**  
OR, **HARLEQUIN IN PHILADELPHIA**

**FOR SALE,**  
A NEAT two story frame building, situate in Fifth-street, continued in Southwark, which Lets at 30l. per annum, subject to a ground rent of 110s.

An elegant Brown Gelding, 14 1-2 hands high, goes well in a chair or under the saddle.—An handsome riding Chair and Coach, with harness complete.

Three tracts of Land, situate contiguous to each other, containing about 773 acres, in Northumberland county, near the town of Northumberland. Sundry tracts of Land in Bedford county, being about 2,200 acres, part near the waters of Conynemaux, and adjoining Lands of Daniel Tyfon. Also, one other tract in Westmoreland county, adjoining lands of William Sitgreaves, on Clearfield creek. For terms apply to

**SAMUEL R. FRANKLIN,**  
No. 81, S. Water-street, or  
No. 72, S. Second-street.

Philadelphia, Feb. 25, 1796.

Political Book-Store, No. 8, South Front-street.

**THIS DAY IS PUBLISHED,**  
By **THOMAS BRADFORD,**  
**A PROSPECT**

FROM THE  
**CONGRESS GALLERY,**  
During the Session beginning the 7th December, 1795.

**CONTAINING**  
The President's Speech, the addresses of both Houses, some of the debates in the Senate, and all the principal debates in the House of Representatives, each debate being brought under one head, and so digested and simplified as to give the reader the completest view of the proceedings with the least possible fatigue.

With Occasional Remarks,  
By **PETER PORCUPINE.**

Just Published,  
A Poetical Paraphrase on our Saviour's Sermon on the Mount, by Charles Crawford Esq. Harper's address to his Constituents, The Guillotine, Marten's Law of Nations.

Hunter, on the blood, 1st vol.  
Feb. 25.

**HOUSE OF COMMONS,**

November 25.

[Continued.]

Mr. Fox began a speech of the most energetic eloquence, of which a faint sketch can only be given, with warm commendations of the former speaker. He said, that highly as he always admired the talents of the hon. gentleman, he was the more pleased with the display of them on the present occasion, as there was not a principle laid down in the speech to which any man might not assent, and yet oppose the present bill. The ingenuity of the hon. gentleman had indeed made no inconsiderable impression upon the house, though his arguments seemed not so much to bear on the point in discussion as on the general policy of legislation. He felt the difficulty of replying to a speech of this nature in its utmost extent. He was not in the least disposed, nor did he believe any sober politician would be inclined to controvert the principles laid down by the honourable gentleman in the beginning of his speech. About the degree of constraint which government was to impose, alone, could any dispute arise; that government was in its application a system of restraint upon human action, was incontrovertible. It was important, however, to consider well the quantity and the quality of restraint which circumstances required, and to prove clearly the necessity upon which an increase of restraint was to be founded.

The hon. gentleman had complained that it was the temper of the times to take every general principle as meant to apply universally, and to fasten upon the person who employs it, all the absurd consequences which might arise from such an application. Of this disposition he was convinced no man had better reason to complain than himself. The hon. gentleman had accused gentlemen on this side of the house of wishing to produce this dilemma, either that the people of this country were animated by an universal spirit of loyalty, or that they were inflamed with a spirit of disaffection. He had never said that the people of this country were so completely harmonious in their political sentiments or opinions, or that no discontent prevailed. But it had been often stated on this side of the house, and he would call upon the hon. gentleman to answer, whether he believed the spirit of dissatisfaction was greater or less now, than it was previous to the war? He had never stated, because he had never believed, that the state of public affairs was wholly without danger. If it was allowed to be greater, to what cause was the increase to be attributed? He was surely enabled to presume, that it was occasioned by the discontents; excited by a war impolitic and unjust, by the measures of a corrupt incapable administration, and to the complicated miseries arising from the decay of commerce and the pressure of famine, into which the country had been plunged. The war then had produced an effect, directly the reverse of that stated by ministers themselves as the chief reason of triumphing in its success. If, on the other hand, the grounds of apprehension were less, why were the sacrifices required for public security to be increased? He asked pardon of the house, for the repetition in which he indulged, but when the same arguments are employed, and the same objections offered to gentlemen on this side of the house, he could not forbear repeating his material question.

With regard to the point of danger, of which the hon. gentleman was so anxious to have a specific declaration of his sentiments, he had always stated that some discontent existed, which might not be unworthy of attention, but which would never justify the legislative remedies proposed. The hon. gentleman had assented to treat as a paradox, the observation of his hon. friend (Mr. Lambton) that the danger of an attack was often created by the injudicious mode of defence. If it was one, however, it was one of those which frequent experience proves to be true. Many political evils were rendered desperate by the absurd methods pursued to remedy, or to remove them. Was the hon. gentleman so much more of a whig than himself, as to impute the whole evils of the civil wars to Charles I. to which the nation owed its liberties, in consequence of the conduct of that ill-fated monarch? The hon. gentleman believed all these calamities were to be ascribed to the illegality of ship-money, or of various other acts of that prince, but he would ask, whether there were not a body of persons, previously inimical to the constitution, and that the attack upon the monarchy was rendered formidable, and even tragical in the event, by the rigorous measures which rendered the breach irreparable.

The hon. gentleman had also mentioned the case of the Americans, when that unfortunate dispute first was agitated, and when he heard sermons of pamphlets read to prove that there was a settled design formed, to shake off the connection of this country; he had never been so unqualified a supporter of America, as to assert that no such designs were entertained. He was convinced however that there were very few who had conceived the project of separating from the mother country. By injudicious attempts to remedy the evils then complained of, was realized the catastrophe which it was intended to prevent. The hon. gentleman had not recurred to that fallacy so often answered, of which gentlemen on this side were accused, that they ascribed the discontent to the measures of his majesty's ministers. The hon. gentleman asked, did not these discontents exist, before the war, to which much of the discontents was imputed, had been commenced? Here again he would recal the two examples he had already employed. In the time of Charles I. there might exist causes of dissatisfaction. Nevertheless the conduct and the extravagant pretences of that prince, and the impolicy of his ministers carried them to that height which proved so fatal to themselves. A similar observation, said Mr. Fox, is applicable to what happened in America. I do not know what are the sentiments of the learned gentleman on that subject, but I put it to him whether he would consider it an argument of any weight against that injudicious conduct of parliament which occasioned the separation of America from the British empire, because a letter could be produced, written by some distinguished man in Boston in 1764, in which he expressed his wish for a separation? But he says, that much of the present danger arises from a body of men concentrating all the ill humours and discontents of the country, and applying them to their own purpose, to create dissatisfaction to the government. Can the hon. gentleman, however, maintain that this is a danger which arises only from a particular conjuncture in the times, and which has no reference to the character of the government? On the contrary, has it not its chief source in their misconduct? Is it not from mal-administration that it derives its strength and confidence? Ill humours are more apt to exist in bad than in good governments. They will always be found to prevail in the greatest degree under the worst, such as I contend the present to be; I need not say that I mean the administration, not the constitution. Equally false is the argument, that we by the line of conduct which we adopt, give strength to the enemies of the constitution, and afford additional grounds for those strong measures, which government are forced to adopt, in order to repel the danger arising from their machinations. The words of a celebrated writer, on an occasion, to which I have already alluded, are extremely applicable to the present instance. Mr. Fox here quoted the words of Mr. Burke, recommending lenient and conciliatory measures with respect to America: "I would divide," says he, "not Charleston from South Carolina, not Boston from New-York, but those who are adverse to taxation from those who wish a separation."—In the present instance continued Mr. Fox, I would adopt some policy: I would divide those who merely complain of grievances, and wish for the reform of abuses, from those who are unfriendly to the constitution. I would not repress the few who may be desirous of overthrowing the constitution, nor risk the adoption of measures which may engender a spirit of general disgust. I should rather endeavor to conciliate animity, to redress grievances, to reform abuses, to unite all under the banner of the constitution; but by no means to widen the breach, to drive every thing to extremes, and inflame discontent to despair.

ed his wish for a separation? But he says, that much of the present danger arises from a body of men concentrating all the ill humours and discontents of the country, and applying them to their own purpose, to create dissatisfaction to the government. Can the hon. gentleman, however, maintain that this is a danger which arises only from a particular conjuncture in the times, and which has no reference to the character of the government? On the contrary, has it not its chief source in their misconduct? Is it not from mal-administration that it derives its strength and confidence? Ill humours are more apt to exist in bad than in good governments. They will always be found to prevail in the greatest degree under the worst, such as I contend the present to be; I need not say that I mean the administration, not the constitution. Equally false is the argument, that we by the line of conduct which we adopt, give strength to the enemies of the constitution, and afford additional grounds for those strong measures, which government are forced to adopt, in order to repel the danger arising from their machinations. The words of a celebrated writer, on an occasion, to which I have already alluded, are extremely applicable to the present instance. Mr. Fox here quoted the words of Mr. Burke, recommending lenient and conciliatory measures with respect to America: "I would divide," says he, "not Charleston from South Carolina, not Boston from New-York, but those who are adverse to taxation from those who wish a separation."—In the present instance continued Mr. Fox, I would adopt some policy: I would divide those who merely complain of grievances, and wish for the reform of abuses, from those who are unfriendly to the constitution. I would not repress the few who may be desirous of overthrowing the constitution, nor risk the adoption of measures which may engender a spirit of general disgust. I should rather endeavor to conciliate animity, to redress grievances, to reform abuses, to unite all under the banner of the constitution; but by no means to widen the breach, to drive every thing to extremes, and inflame discontent to despair.

**CHARLESTON, [S. C.] February 4.**

Yesterday arrived the schooner *Aurax*, Campbell; *Gonaves*, 9 days; schooner *Peggy*, Atkins, Penobscot, 14 days; brig *Aurora*, Wardell, Bolton, 30 days, schooner *Savannah Packet*, Rogers, Savannah, 1 day, sloop *Fancy*, Morrison, Savannah, 1 day; ship *Randolph*, Greenough, Portsmouth, (N. H.) 28 days; sloop *Polly*, Finch, Gonaves, 12 days; brig *June*, Moore, Portsmouth, (N. H.) 26 days.

The snow *Henricus*, in 52 days from Nevis, has a pilot on board; she spoke, the day before yesterday, a large ship from Bremen, bound for this port. The ship *Tammany*, in 14 days from New-York, was at anchor below the fort last evening.

February 5.

Yesterday arrived the ship *Tammany*, Ward, New-York, 15 days; schooner *Betty*, Waterman, Philadelphia, 5 days; schooner *Avarice*, Bonnel, Aux Cayes, 25 days; snow *Sally*, Lindley, Cape-Francois, 20 days; schooner *Sally*, Leach, Salem, 9 days; brig *Deadman*, How, New-York, 7 days; schooner *Philadelphia*, Butler, Philadelphia, 7 days; sloop *Mary*, Savage, 18 days.

At his plantation, Horse-Shoe, Philip Smith, Esq. aged 68 years (wanting a few days). This venerable and most worthy man closed his mortal career in such a manner as bespoke him the real and undissimulated Christian.

Sunday evening last, Mrs. Elizabeth Holmes, the amiable consort of Isaac Holmes, Esq. Collector of the Customs for the port of Charleston.

Last evening, Mr. Philip Hart, a member of the Hebrew Congregation, aged 71 years.

**NEW-YORK, February 23.**

The multiplication of people in this state exceeds all former calculations. They city and county of New-York, in 1784, contained but 23,000 inhabitants—the present number is 50,000. The multiplication of people in the whole state fall very little short of the same ratio.

On the same principles, this city will contain.

In 1805	100,000
1816	200,000
1826	400,000

That is, in 30 years, at the present rate of progression, New-York will contain more inhabitants than any city in Europe, except London, Paris and Constantinople. In 70 years the number will equal that of either of those cities.

This idea is not visionary. The two circumstances that make great towns, are commerce and manufactures, and this city is to rise on commerce. The tract of country, which is now actually supplied from New-York, equals in extent and fertility, that part of Great Britain, which lies to the southward of the Tweed. Perhaps half a century is not sufficient to give this country the same state of high cultivation as that of England. But this may be expected in less than a century. The same state of improvement and population in the country, will require a correspondent population of the commercial cities. If therefore, the growth of our country should not be checked by wars or other unusual calamities, we may expect New-York in about 70 years to equal the cities of London and Westminster, and Harlem will be in the suburbs of the city. The territory trading to this city will then contain about 7 or 8 millions of people.

Similar calculations may be made, with respect to many other parts of our country.

The spirit of extending inland navigation, is one most favorable to population.

I will venture to predict that in one century from this day, there will be scarcely a village in the United States, at the distance of 30 miles from boatable water.

The legislature of Rhode-Island has taken steps to open an inland navigation from Providence river to Worcester county in Massachusetts. The state of Connecticut is penetrated by rivers that will some time or other admit boats from Norwich thro' Windham to the borders of Massachusetts; and by the Hoosateenack, a navigation may perhaps be opened from Stratford and Derby, to Stockbridge in Massachusetts.

The whole interior of this state, New-Jersey and Pennsylvania, will be intersected with navigable water; and men now living may see boats at our wharves from Quebec on one side and the Lake of the woods on the other.

An aggregate statement of the sums which will be requisite for the payment of interest, and certain reimbursements of the public debt, from the year 1795 to the year 1824, inclusive.

	dols.	cents.
In 1795	4,338,972	97
1796	4,424,902	47
1797	4,485,502	47
1798	4,601,302	47
1799	4,138,062	47
1800	4,272,192	47
1801	5,603,592	81
1802	6,509,562	81
1803	7,240,084	81
1804	6,060,254	81
1805	6,439,064	81
1806	6,244,437	81
1807	5,620,803	81
1808	4,874,171	81
1809	4,862,151	81
1810	4,607,631	81
1811	607,631	81
1812	4,607,631	81
1813	4,607,631	81
1814	4,607,631	11
1815	4,607,631	81
1816	4,607,631	81
1817	4,607,631	81
1818	4,148,608	79
1819	2,286,106	56
1820	2,286,106	56
1821	2,286,106	56
1822	2,286,106	56
1823	2,286,106	56
1824	2,063,7	90

Note.—The amount of principal of which the different species of the public debt is composed, is as follows. Foreign 12,200,000; 6 per cents, 29,310,856; deferred 14,561,934; 4 1/2 per cents, 19,569,909; 6 1/2 per cents, 1,848,900; 4-1/2 per cents, 176,000; unfunded estimated at 1,382,837; 37 domestic loans 6,200,000.—Total debt of the United States, 85,250,638 dollars 27 cents.

On the principles of the foregoing statement, the foreign debt, now funded here, will be extinguished in the year 1810. The 6 per cent stock now bearing interest will be all extinguished in the year 1819; and the whole debt, in 1824.

**CONGRESS**

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**  
Tuesday, February 23.

(CONCLUDED.)

By general consent the committee went back to the discussion of the first section.

A motion was made to strike out the first section in order to try the principle, whether the lots should be absolutely vested in the United States, or whether they should be mortgaged as a fund on the credit of which the money should be borrowed.

Mr. Hillhouse proposed a substitute for the first section, which contained the first principle, viz. that of vesting the power absolute in the United States so far as respects one half of the lots, which he proposed should be at the disposal of the United States, to reimburse the loan of one half the sum proposed to be borrowed, viz. 250,000.

The first section was passed over, and a motion made to strike out of the second section the words "on the credit of the said lots."

Mr. Smith (N. H.) said the motion was immaterial to the object as he conceived the lots were by the bill, in its present form, perfectly at the disposal of the United States. He disliked the idea of associating or blending this business in any manner whatever with the fiscal concerns of the United States. He wished to keep the whole business independent and distinct.

Mr. Brent consented to this amendment. He at the same time alluded to the observations which had been offered from different parts of the House, some of which he remarked, had a tendency to shake the general confidence of the people in the faith of the Government relative to a final establishment of the seat of government on the Patowmack—that they went to a sacrifice of the public property by counteracting the principles of economy, and eventually lessening the value of that property in such manner as would render the present funds entirely inadequate to the completion of the public buildings. This being the case, he submitted whether it would not be a stain on the faith of the government, to refuse that aid, which if now afforded will enable the commissioners to complete the public edifices at the time appointed by law for removing the seat of Government.

Mr. Sedgwick said that the idea of the gentleman last up, was not correct in supposing that the faith of the government was pledged to guarantee this loan, or to advance one shilling for the purposes to which he had alluded. Mr. Sedgwick recurred to the law for establishing the permanent seat of government, and to what was repeatedly declared on that occasion, the United States was to be exonerated from all expense.

But though this was the actual situation of things yet for the purposes of union, accommodation and mutual good will, he was heartily willing to sanction the loan for half a million of dollars—but as he was desirous that as little eventual loss as possible should be incurred by the United States on this principle, though he would vote for the guarantee of the loan, he could not consent to striking out the words in the second section.

Mr. Marryat said that he hoped the amendment would be agreed to—it would tend to conciliate the different parts of the House. Recurring to the great object of the law, he observed that if at the time contemplated for removing the seat of government, the United States shall be accommodated with a City and public buildings suitable and offices, it will be a great and important point gained. He did not suppose that a great object was not in view, in passing the act, he supposed a great end was in view, and he hoped that end would be realized. He believed that history afforded no example of a government's being accommodated in the manner that this would be, without expense. Such