

Ricketts's Amphitheatre.

For the Benefit of Mr. SULLY.

THIS PRESENT EVENING, the 5th of April, Will be exhibited,

A variety of New Entertainments. HORSEMANSHIP.

The Sailor's Frolic on Horseback, By Mr. Ricketts, in which he will introduce a Horn-pipe, ride blindfold in a Sack, And change to a Sailor's Doxy.

Various FEATS by Mr. F. Ricketts. COMIC FEATS in the character of Mr. Merryman, by Mr. Sully.

The Horsemanship to conclude with the COMIC SCENE of The Taylor riding to Brentford. On the HUNTER & ROAD HORSE, by Mr. Ricketts.

Ground and Lofty Tumbling, In which will be displayed a variety of Manly Feats, By Messrs. Sully,

F. Ricketts, Langley, and Reano, Master Sully. Clown to the tumbling—Mr. Spinacuta.

The tumbling to conclude with Mr. Sully's throwing a Row of Flippaps across the area of the Circus, with

Fireworks tied to his Feet!

In the course of the Evening, for this night only, Mrs. SULLY will perform

A Concerto on the Grand Piano Forte. She will introduce a favorite Scots Air, with variations.

To which will be added, (for this night only) a NEW PANTOMIME, called

Harlequin's Olio; or, MIRTHS MEDLEY.

Harlequin, Mr. Sully. Genius, Master Sully. Pantaloon, Sig. Reano. Clown, Mr. Spinacuta. Lover, Mr. Macdonald. Dwarf, Master Schnyder. Columbine, Mrs. Spinacuta. Magician, Witches, Millers, Servants, &c. by the rest of the Company.

In the course of the Pantomime will be displayed the following TRICKS and MACHINERY.

The Dwarf outwitted; or, Harlequin turn'd market-woman.

The Magic Band Box; or, Harlequin's aid-de-camp. The Necromantic Hat, or, Clown's Flight in a Balloon. The Transforming Chair; or the Lover defeated. A grand change from the Sea to the Grotto of Mirth and Good-Fellowship.

The Scenery painted by Messrs. Schnyder & Hallam.

The entertainments of the Evening to conclude with Goldsmith's Epilogue, By Mr. Sully, (in the character of Harlequin) who will, for that night only, take a flying Leap into

The Crater of Mount Vesuvius. At the moment of Eruption.—The Fireworks by Monsieur Ambrose, In Arch-street.

Tickets to be had of Mr. Sully at Mr. Wadman's corner of Race & Front-streets, and at the usual places.

The Doors in future to be opened at SIX and the Entertainment to begin at SEVEN o'clock.

* * Boxes, one dollar—Pit, half a dollar.

CONCERT

OF VOCAL & INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC.

R. TAYLOR,

RESPECTFULLY informs his Friends, and the Public, his benefit Concert will be on Thursday, the 21st of the present month, April, at Mr. O'ELLER'S Hotel. A Band of the most eminent Instrumental Performers will be engaged.

The Vocal Part by Miss HUNTLEY, and R. TAYLOR. Particulars will be made known in due time. April 4. t,th&a*.

For LIVERPOOL,

THE SHIP S U S S E X,

Philip Atkins, master.

BURTHEN 246 tons, to sail with all convenient speed. For freight or passage apply to

Samuel & Miers Fisher, No. 27, Dock-street.

Who have Imported per said Ship,

A general assortment of Queens Ware in Crates; Short Pipes in boxes, three groce each, An assortment of Stone Jugs,

Together with an assortment of

D R Y G O O D S,

suited to the Season—as usual. 4th Mo. 5th, 1796. 3aw4w

Just Landing,

From on board the Ship SEA FLOWER, Captain Ben. Swift, from GUADALOUPE,

A quantity of SUGARS,

FOR SALE, BY

F. Coppinger,

5th April. \$ No. 221, fourth Front-street.

FOR SALE,

Or will take FREIGHT for Newport, or Providence,

THE SLOOP Y O A N N A,

NOW lying at Chebucto-street wharf. For terms apply to JOHN PROUD, the master on board, or to

Samuel Coates,

No. 82, fourth Front-street.

Who hath for SALE, imported in said Vessel,

A quantity of CIDER; SOAP; and CANDLES; TIMOTHY SEED.

4th Mo. 5th, 1796. * 61.

To the Public.

AT MR. O'ELLER'S HOTEL.

A French Miniature Painter respectfully offers his services to the Public, and hopes that the moderation of his terms, the very short time of his sittings, and the rate of his abilities, will induce his visitors to become his patrons. Feb. 29. \$

From the Western Telegraph.

THE important subject of the British Treaty is now before the House of Representatives of the United States: and the Treaties with Spain, Algiers, and the Indians, which offer to us peace with all the world, will perhaps soon occupy their attention. On these subjects, opinions may vary with interests; and the interests of this Western Country are peculiarly involved in the success of the British, the Spanish, and the Indian Treaties. It must have occurred to almost every person, that the failure of the British Treaty will of course occasion the failure of the Indian Treaty; but perhaps it has not occurred to every person, that it will also occasion the failure of the Spanish Treaty, and destroy all the bright prospects which these Treaties have opened to the Western Country.—It may be asked, how can the British Treaty fail, since, being ratified by the King of Britain, and the President of the United States, it has become a law binding on both parties, like any other mutual agreement, signed, sealed and delivered? This question is natural, perhaps just; but it is one thing to ratify, and another thing to execute an agreement; and many suspect that the House of Representatives of the United States may have the inclination, and some assert that they have the power to render the whole Treaty of none effect, notwithstanding its ratification. How can they do this? It will be recollected, that the constitution provides, that no money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law. The British Treaty requires money to pay the expenses of Commissioners, who are to settle the boundary lines and adjust the claims on both sides for spoiliations and detained debts. If the House of Representatives refuse their consent, no appropriation of money can be made for this purpose. If no appropriation be made, no commissioners will be appointed. If no commissioners be appointed, the lines will not be settled, nor the claims adjusted, nor the posts surrendered; and we shall be precisely in the situation in which we were before the Treaty: and I fear, in a worse situation, for I should have very little hope of obtaining another Treaty, and see war only as our resource. If the House of Representatives have and exercise this power of rendering void, Treaties ratified by our constitutional organs, they are more sanguine than I, who expect that foreign nations will readily listen to proposals for another Treaty. The example of the British parliament is cited. I hope the cases are not similar. The British parliament, like the senate of Augustus, is too often supposed to be the parliament of the minister.—It is well known, that the minister, either by his eloquence, his patronage, or his money, can always command a majority in parliament. When he cannot do this, he cannot be minister. Any foreign nation may therefore be assured, that a Treaty approved by the minister, will be approved by the parliament; and their votes on a measure adopted by him, are like the votes of a dean and chapter on a *conge d'elire*, or leave given by the king to elect a bishop; leave to elect him whom the king names. I am not now to enter on any defence of the British Treaty. It has been successfully defended. And to attentive, intelligent, and candid readers of the arguments on both sides, the opposers of the Treaty will have little victory to boast of: to any other readers all argument is vain. I will, however observe, that as it respects the Western Country, to me it appears without a fault; that the principal objections to it are drawn from those articles of it, which relate to maritime affairs, and are but temporary; and that one of those articles is not confirmed, but referred to a further negotiation, which, if we reject not what has been already given, may improve it. Self-defence is the duty of every nation.—The grandeur of Britain stands only by her commerce and navigation; and if she was to share generally with other nations those sources of her power, she would shrink to her natural littleness. She has given us more than she has given to any other nation; perhaps more than, if this fail, she will ever give to us by another treaty. I believe, what we have received will be advantageous to us; and when two persons negotiate about their several interests, each must take only what the other is willing to allow. And I believe, that the present treaty would have been thankfully received by us, if Britain had not been at war with France. If, in comparing our mutual claims, we calculate from the complaints of the sea coast, of spoiliations, or of the frontier, of Indian ravages; Britain has far more in her hands than we; and it is her interest more than ours, that the treaty should not be executed. The detention of the posts exposes the Western country to a continual Indian war, deprives us of the peltry and fur trade, and obstructs the sale of our lands, and the extending of our settlements. The surrender of the posts can hardly be purchased too dear by the Western people, and I despair of our ever purchasing it so cheap as by the present treaty. The time named for their surrender approaches; but if this session of Congress closes without providing for the execution of this treaty on our part, it will not be executed on theirs, and the posts will not be surrendered. Thus the British Treaty will fall.

But how will the Spanish treaty fall with it?—Legislators do not act from wanton, corrupt or partial motives; but from principle, and with an even hand to all. If the House of Representatives refuse to provide for the execution of the British treaty, they must do it, I presume, on the ground that the President and Senate-house have exceeded their powers. Nothing that I can see but this, or some necessity, can justify their refusal. Necessity is not pretended; and it so happens, that those points in the British treaty, in which the President and Senate are said to have exceeded their authority, exist also in the Spanish treaty. It also, like the British treaty, settles boundaries, interferes in titles to lands, and in the regulation of trade, prescribes contraband articles, defines piracy, appoints commissioners to adjust claims, &c. If, on these principles, the House of Representatives refuse to provide for the execution of the British treaty, they must also refuse to provide for the execution of the Spanish treaty; for they must act from

principle, and must determine, not on their opinion, whether the President and Senate have acted well or ill within their authority, but on their opinion whether they have exceeded their authority. If they could refuse to provide for the execution of a Treaty, not because it is unconstitutional, but because it is unjust or improper, there would be no test to try the propriety of their opinion, and they would be left at liberty to annul every treaty, render the President and Senate, in making treaties, mere puppets to be wire-drawn and moved at their pleasure; and overturn this part of the constitution. It is by the constitution, therefore, not their opinions, that the British treaty must be tried. If the House of Representatives refuse to provide for the execution of the British treaty, they must refuse on constitutional principles. The same principles which are objected to the British treaty, lie also against the Spanish treaty; and if they annul one, they must annul both. Nay more, on similar principles, the House of Representatives must also refuse to provide for the execution of the Indian treaty, and the Algerine treaty. Nor is there a treaty ever made by the President and Senate with any nation, which on the same principles might not be annulled. A proof, that the objections to the British treaty have their birth, not so much in principle as in the passions of the times.

See then the point to which the rejection of the British Treaty brings us; all treaties with every nation annulled, the posts detained, another Indian war, destruction of our frontiers, increase of our debts, obstruction of the Mississippi, the loss of all those objects to which this country looks forward for prosperity. But if the British treaty be, the Spanish treaty will, of course, be carried into execution by us; then the posts will be surrendered, peace and trade with the Indians will be secured; Orleans will be a free port; the navigation of the Mississippi will be free to us. We may build ships on the Monongahela, and sail thence to the West-Indies or to Europe. A vessel of seventy tons has sailed round the world. Our produce and our lands will fall as high here as in Conococheague. Nor do I see any thing that will then be wanting to our prosperity, but industry and virtue.

It may be said, that we can take the posts, and can take New Orleans. I believe we can; but that would produce a war with Britain and with Spain, and be a far more irrational and expensive way of obtaining them, than the present treaties. Besides, a war with Britain and Spain would take away the best markets for our produce in the West Indies, or prevent us from reaching them. When our ships have got out of the Mississippi, or any other port, they would be taken on the high seas. I have even been told, that Spain, by sinking a few vessels in the mouth of the Mississippi, could entirely destroy its navigation; so that it is only in a friendly way, that the navigation of that river could be useful to us.

But it may be said, that the British treaty is bad, and we ought to give no sanction to it. This is begging the question. It does not appear from the arguments on it. I lay little stress on the voice of town meetings: they are not adapted for a full discussion of any subject, much less of this.—Neither is their voice a just estimate of the voice of the people: it is rather the voice of party and passion, than of reason and judgment. The parts of it called bad, affect not us: we ought not to judge for others; but suffer those whom it affects to judge for themselves. We ought to think and speak, as it affects us. Every part of the Union will do the same. And the representatives of the whole will then hear the voice of the whole, and judge for the whole.

It may be said, that we ought to trust our representatives, and let them act for us. Perhaps we might safely do so, if such clamour had not been raised elsewhere against the treaty, and our silence, in this critical state of the treaty, could not be considered, as approving that clamour. We thought it our duty, when the acts of government were injurious to us, to express our objections; it is equally our duty, when the acts of government are advantageous to us, and while they are yet unfinished, to express our approbation. The treaties are not so important to others as to us; and who will require their execution, if we do not? will the inhabitants of the sea coast call for the surrender of the posts or the navigation of the Mississippi, and fall in their value, and that our produce may supplant theirs in foreign markets? We know it is not their interest, but it is beyond conception ours. It is therefore our duty, to strengthen the hands of our representatives, by expressing our desires and our interests, and to stir them up, to provide for the execution of the treaty, and thus secure the advantages which it offers to us.

It must therefore appear to our fellow citizens of the United States, that, as it is yet in suspense, whether the British and the Spanish treaties will be executed or not, the conduct of the grand juries of Allegheny and Westmoreland counties (which has been followed with such unanimity by other citizens of these counties) in signing and recommending a petition to the house of representatives, for the complete execution of those treaties, is the result of duty, and pursuit of the true interests of this country, and that this petition ought to be signed by every man who regards either duty or interest.

From the Western Telegraph.

MR. FENNO, I send you a Washington paper, containing some observations on A Speech, read by Dr. Leib, in the House of Representatives of this State, during their late Session. Yours, C.

The extract published in your last Telegraph may have its merit; but just sentiment, good reasoning, or that kind of knowledge which is acquired by observation and experience, must not be looked for in it. It seems the work of a young politician, entirely undisciplined, and should be received with the extreme diffidence.

It is the fault of young and warm minds to be unsuspecting, and to imagine the world governed by virtue. Poets have fancied a golden age, and visionaries have predicted a millenium: if fate had

cast our lot in such times, we might indeed dispense with treaties.

“What have to do with treaties,” says this new statesman, “three thousand miles distant from Europe, polluting every thing necessary for man, no enemy contiguous, and competent to repel every attack?” I confess if we could be content to stay at home, and make other nations content to keep three thousand miles off from us, I should be of his opinion, that treaties were useless. But if either we will go to other nations, or if other nations will come to us, I do think a treaty, regulating the terms of our intercourse, is not amiss. We have at present some very unwelcome intruders, even within our territory; and if he would without a treaty persuade them to keep three thousand miles off, we should have some proof of his reasoning powers, and the truth of his opinions. Surely the same arguments of mutual convenience, which would persuade us to make no treaties, will persuade the British and Spanish garrisons to surrender the posts, and persuade the Indians to keep the peace and be of good behaviour. Did not the walls of Jericho fall down at the sound of rams horns? but until he can do so much as this for us, since those people are here and will be troublesome, let us make one treaty to keep them quiet and get them away; and then if we can do without them, let us make no more. For my part, when a man is willing to listen to reason, and settle differences by a contract or an arbitration, I like this way better than the heroic way of knocking him down.

“Are treaties of alliance necessary to us.” I know of none that we have but that with France, in the year 1778. I do not know that any others are necessary to us, nor that now. I believe, at the time it was made, it was of some use to us; and unless we can bind other nations to their good behaviour, I do not know but the time may come when perhaps some other may be necessary to us. I cannot calculate events; and, till the age of reason arrives (on which all his calculations seem founded) I am disposed to take all the security I can against the vices of nations.

“But which ever way he turns his eyes, treaties present a ghastly spectacle. They always bind the weak, but they have no cord strong enough for the powerful.” If the weak cannot bind the strong by a treaty, I do not know what other cord the weak can use. He would surely not advise them to use force. And it will not hurt his own system of moral obligation, if a positive obligation be superadded to it. The natural duty to respect the life of another, is not weakened by the command *thou shalt not kill*, or the statute against murder.

“To commercial treaties his objections are not so strong; but he asserts, that commerce ought to be free as air, and left like fluids to seek its own level.” This, like many other things, would be very desirable, if it could be accomplished. But like the precept, “to give your coat to him who takes your cloak—and to turn your left cheek to him who strikes your right,” this doctrine, excellent as it is, will not do for a literally practical application, till we get to the age of reason. Whenever this politician can make nations and men rationally pursue their true interests, I will agree, not only that there shall be no treaties, but also that there shall be no laws, and that every man do what seems good in his own eyes. But it is unfortunate for his conclusions, that he makes his premises, and does not find them. He supposes a state of things, and then reasons from it as real. He draws men as they ought to be, not as they are.

“What commercial treaties has the Emperor of China?” Our politician might as well have asked what commercial treaties has the Emperor of the Eskimaux Indians, the Hottentots, or the Lapplanders? And I may ask, what is that to us, unless we be in the same situation? When men either want nothing, or have nothing to give, they need no commerce; and when they have a commerce in which none can rival them, they may make their own terms, without asking the consent of any others. China contains about two hundred millions of inhabitants, and there are born in it every year a number equal to about one third of the whole number of inhabitants in the United States. It abounds in arts and manufactures, and its soil is cultivated to the utmost possible extent, and so incompetent are all their exertions to procure from the fruits of the earth and the fishes of the sea a bare subsistence, that they are sometimes obliged, and the law permits them to expose their infants to perish. If he had asked, why do not the people of the United States do so too? I should have thought the question just as pertinent, and the argument arising from it just as conclusive. The use of commercial treaties, I had thought generally acknowledged. The want of one with Britain has been a constant theme of complaint, since 1783. And so strongly were we impressed with the injury of her refusing it to us, that, just before Mr. Jay was sent to make the present treaty, the House of Representatives of the United States was about to make a law to punish Britain for not making such a treaty with us; and desisted only in consequence of his mission. Britain saw all this before her, and I dare say gave us the best terms she safely could, in order to keep us quiet.

“The right of originating money bills,” says this writer, “is, by the constitution vested exclusively in the house of Representatives.” I do not know that. I do not recollect, that the constitution speaks of money bills; nor do I know what he means by money bills. He seems to me to mean appropriation bills; and the constitution does not vest in the house of representatives the exclusive right of originating these. The constitution provides that “all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the house of representatives,” that is, the house of representative shall first point out the manner and objects of taxation; but it is not very logical to conclude from this, that the Senate cannot first point out, to what purposes the taxes shall be applied.

I cannot tell for what end the extract was published here at this time. I wish true opinions to prevail, and for this purpose only have I made these few remarks on it. The extract shows a good heart, and some fancy, but a false judgment, and very weak reasoning.