were felt or affected. The alarm ſpread faſter than the publication of the treaty. There were more critics than readers. Beſides, as the ſubject was examined, thoſe fears have ſubſided.

The movements of paſſion are quicker than thoſe of the underſtanding. We are to ſearch for the cauſes of firſt impreſſions, not in the articles of this obnoxious and miſrepreſented inſtrument, but in the ſtate of the public feeling.

The fervor of the revolution war had not entirely cooled, nor its controverſies ceaſed, before the ſenſibilities of our citizens were quickened with a tenfold vivacity by a new and extraordinary ſubject of irritation. One of the two great nations of Europe underwent a change which has attracted all our wonder, and intereſted all our ſympathies.—Whatever they did, the zeal of many went with them, and often went to exceſs. Theſe impreſſions met with much to inflame, and nothing to reſtrain them. In our newſpapers, in our feaſts, and ſome of our elections, enthuſiaſm was admitted a merit, a teſt of patriotiſm, and that made it contagious.

In the opinion of party, we could not love or hate enough. I dare to ſay, in ſpite of all the obloquy it may provoke, we were extravagant in both. It is my right to avow that paſſions ſo impetuous, enthuſiaſm ſo wild, could not ſubſiſt without diſturbing the ſober exerciſe of reaſon, without putting at riſk the peace and precious intereſts of our country. They were hazarded. I will not exhauſt the little breath I have left to ſay, how much, nor by whom, or by what means they were reſcued from the ſacrifice. Shall I be called upon to offer my proofs? they are here, they are every where. No one has forgotten the proceedings of 1794.* No one has forgotton the captures of our veſſels, and the imminent danger of war. The nation thirſted not merely for reparation but vengeance. Suffering ſuch wrongs and agitated by ſuch ſentiments, was it in the power of any words of compact, or could any parchment with its ſeals prevail at once to tranquiliſe the people? It was impoſſible. Treaties in England are ſeldom popular, and leaſt of all when the ſtipulations of amity ſucceed to the bitterneſs of hatred. Even the beſt treaty, though nothing be refuſed, will choak reſentment, but not ſatisfy it. Every treaty is as ſure to diſappoint extravagant expectations as to diſarm extravagant paſſions. Of the latter, hatred is one that takes no bribes. They who are animated by the ſpirit of revenge, will not be quieted by the poſſibility of profit.

Why do they complain that the Weſt Indies are not laid open? Why do they lament that any reſtriction is ſtipulated on the commerce of the Eaſt-Indies? Why do they pretend that if they reject this, and inſiſt upon more, more will be accompliſhed; Let us be explicit—more would not ſatisfy.—If all was granted, would not a treaty of *amity* with Britain ſtill be obnoxious? Have we not this inſtant heard it urged againſt our Envoy, that he was not ardent enough in his hatred of Great Britain? A treaty of amity is condemned becauſe it was not made by a foe, and in the ſpirit of one.—The ſame gentleman at the inſtant repeats a very prevailing objection, that no treaty ſhould be made with the enemy of France. *No treaty*, exclaim others, *ſhould be made with a monarch or a deſpot. There will be no naval ſecurity while thoſe ſea robbers domineer on the ocean. Their den muſt be deſtroyed. That nation muſt be extirpated.*

I like this, ſir, becauſe it is ſincerity. With feelings ſuch as theſe, we do not pant for treaties.—Such paſſions ſeek nothing, and will be content with nothing but the deſtruction of their object.—If a treaty left king George his iſland, it would not anſwer—not if he ſtipulated to pay rent for it. It has been ſaid the world ought to rejoice if Britain was ſunk in the ſea—if where there are now men and wealth and laws and liberty, there was no more than a ſand bank for the ſea monſters to fatten on; a ſpace for the ſtorms of the ocean to mingle in conflict.

I object nothing to the good ſenſe or humanity of all this. I yield the point that this is a proof that the age of reaſon is in progreſs. Let it be philanthropy, let it be patriotiſm, if you will, but it is no indication that any Treaty would be approved. The difficulty is not to overcome the objections to the terms; it is to reſtrain the repugnance to any ſtipulations of amity with the party.

Having alluded to the rival of Great Britain, I am not unwilling to explain myſelf. I affect no concealment, and I have practiſed none. While thoſe two great nations agitate all Europe with their quarrels, they will both equally deſire, and with any chance of ſucceſs, equally endeavour to create an influence in America. Each will exert all its arts to range our ſtrength on its own ſide. How is this to be effected? Our government is a democratical republic. It will not be diſpoſed to purſue a ſyſtem of politics, in ſubſervience to either France or England, in *oppoſition* to the general wiſhes of the citizens: and, if Congreſs ſhould adopt ſuch meaſures, they would not be purſued long, nor with much ſucceſs. From the nature of our Government, *popularity* is the inſtrument of foreign influence. Without it, all is labor and diſappointment. With that mighty auxiliary, foreign intrigue finds agents, not only volunteers, but competitors for employment, and any thing like reluctance is underſtood to be a crime. Has Britain this means of influence? Certainly not. If her gold could buy adherents, their becoming ſuch would deprive them of all political power and importance. They would not wield popularity as a weapon, but would fall under it. Britain has no influence, and for the reaſons juſt given, can have none. She has enough—and God forbid ſhe ever ſhould have more. France, poſſeſſed of popular enthuſiaſm, of party attachments, has had, and ſtill has, *too much influence* on our politics—*any* foreign influence is too much and ought to be deſtroyed. I deteſt the man and diſdain the ſpirit, that can bend to a mean ſubſerviency to the views of any nation. It is enough to be Americans. That character comprehends our duties, and ought to engroſs our attachments.

But I would not be miſunderſtood. I would not break the alliance with France—I would not have the connection between the two countries even a cold one. It ſhould be cordial and ſincere, but I would baniſh that influence, which by acting on the paſſions of the citizens, may acquire a power over the government.

It is no bad proof of the merit of the Treaty that, under all theſe unfavorable circumſtances, it ſhould be ſo well approved. In ſpite of firſt impreſſions, in ſpite of miſrepreſentation and party clamor, enquiry has multiplied its advocates—and at laſt the public ſentiment appears to me clearly preponderating to its ſide.

On the moſt careful review of the ſeveral branches of the Treaty—thoſe which reſpect political arrangements, the ſpoliations on our trade, and the regulation of commerce, there is little to be apprehended. The evil, aggravated as it is by party, is little in degree, and ſhort in duration—two years from the end of the European war. I aſk, and I would aſk the queſtion ſignificantly, what are the inducements to reject the Treaty? What great object is to be gained, and fairly gained by it? If, however, as to the merits of the Treaty, candor ſhould ſuſpend its approbation, what is there to hold patriotiſm a moment in balance as to the violation of it? Nothing—I repeat confidently nothing. There is nothing before us in that event but confuſion and diſhonor.

But before I attempt to develope thoſe conſequences, I muſt put myſelf at eaſe by ſome explanation.

Nothing is worſe received among men than the confutation of their opinions—and, of theſe, none are more dear or more vulnerable than their political opinions. To ſay that a propoſition leads to ſhame and ruin, is almoſt equivalent to a charge that the ſupporters of it intend to produce them. I throw myſelf upon the magnanimity and candor of thoſe who hear me. I cannot do juſtice to my ſubject without expoſing as forcibly as I can all the evils in proſpect. I readily admit that in every ſcience, and moſt of all in politics, error ſprings from other ſources than the want of ſenſe or integrity. I deſpiſe indiſcriminate profeſſions of candor and reſpect. There are individuals oppoſed to me of whom I am not bound to ſay any thing. But of many, perhaps of a majority of the oppoſers of the appropriations, it gives me pleaſure to declare they poſſeſs my confidence and regard. There are among them individuals for whom I entertain a cordial affection.

The conſequences of refuſing to make proviſion for the Treaty are not all to be foreſeen. By rejecting, vaſt intereſts are committed to the ſport of the winds. Chance becomes the arbiter of events, and it is forbidden to human foreſight to count their number, or meaſure their extent. Before we reſolve to leap into this abyſs, ſo dark and ſo profound, it becomes us to pauſe and reflect upon ſuch of the dangers as are obvious and inevitable. If this aſſembly ſhould be wrought into a temper to defy theſe conſequences, it is vain, it is deceptive to pretend that we can eſcape them. It is worſe than weakneſs to ſay, that as to public faith our vote has already ſettled the queſtion. Another tribunal than our own is already erected. The public opinion, not merely of our own country, but of the enlightened world, will pronounce a judgment that we cannot reſiſt, that we dare not even affect to deſpiſe.

Well may I urge it to men who know the worth of character, that it is no trivial calamity to have it conteſted. Refuſing to do what the Treaty ſtipulates ſhall be done, opens the controverſy. Even if we ſhould ſtand juſtified at laſt, a character that is vindicated is ſomething worſe than it ſtood before, unqueſtioned and unqueſtionable. Like the plaintiff in an action of ſlander, we recover a reputation diſfigured by invective, and even tarniſhed by too much handling. In the combat for the honour of the nation, it may receive ſome wounds which, though they ſhould heal, will leave ſcars. I need not ſay, for ſurely the feelings of every boſom have anticipated, that we cannot guard this ſenſe of national honour, this everliving fire which alone keeps patriotiſm warm in the heart, with a ſenſibility too vigilant and jealous.

If, by executing the Treaty, there is no poſſibility of diſhonour, and if, by rejecting, there is ſome foundation for doubt and for reproach, it is not for me to meaſure, it is for your own feelings to eſtimate, the vaſt diſtance that divides the one ſide of the alternative from the other.

If therefore we ſhould enter on the examination of the queſtion of duty and obligation with ſome feelings of prepoſſeſſion, I do nor heſitate to ſay, they are ſuch as we ought to have—it is an after enquiry to determine whether they are ſuch as ought finally to be reſiſted.

The reſolution (Mr. Blount's) is leſs explicit than the Conſtitution. Its patrons ſhould have made it more ſo, if poſſible, if they had any doubts or meant the public ſhould entertain none. Is it the ſenſe of that vote, as ſome have inſinuated, that we claim a right for any cauſe or no cauſe at all, but our own ſovereign will and pleaſure, to refuſe to execute, and thereby to annul the ſtipulations of a Treaty? That we have nothing to regard but the expediency or inexpediency of the meaſure, being abſolutely free from all obligation by compact to give it our ſanction? A doctrine monſtrous, ſo ſhameful, is refuted by being avowed. There are no words [illegible] that would not convey [illegible] reproach. It would [illegible] the tenth century to believe [illegible] of a Papal council to [illegible] impoſſible. No leſs impoſſible that we ſhould deſire to aſſert the ſcandalous privilege of being free after we have pledged our honour.

It is doing injuſtice to the reſolution of the houſe (which I diſlike on many occaſions) to ſtrain the interpretation of it to this extravagance. The Treaty making power is declared by it to be veſted excluſively in the Preſident and Senate. Will any man in his ſenſes affirm, that it can be a Treaty before it has any binding force or obligation? If it has no binding force upon us, it has none upon Great Britain. Let candor anſwer, is Great Britain free from any obligation to deliver the Poſts in June, and are we willing to ſignify to her that we think ſo. Is it with that nation, a queſtion of mere expediency or inexpediency to do it, and that too, even after we have done all that depends upon us to give the Treaty effect? No ſober man believes this. No one who would not join in condemning the faithleſs proceedings of that nation, if ſuch a doctrine ſhould be avowed, and carried into practice—and why complain, if Great Britain is not bound? There can be no breach of faith where none is plighted. I ſhall be told that ſhe is bound. Surely it follows that if ſhe is bound to performance, our nation is under a ſimilar obligation—if both parties be not obliged, neither is obliged, it is no compact, no Treaty.—This is a dictate of law and common ſenſe, and every jury in the country has ſanctioned it on oath.

It cannot be a Treaty and yet no Treaty, a bargain and yet no promiſe—if it is a promiſe, I am not to read a lecture to ſhew why an honeſt man will keep his promiſe.

The reaſon of the thing, and the words of the reſolution of the houſe, imply, that the United States engage their good faith in a Treaty. We diſclaim, ſay the majority, the Treaty making power, we of courſe diſclaim (they ought to ſay) every doctrine that would put a negative upon the doings of that power. It is the prerogative of folly alone to maintain both ſides of a propoſition.

Will any man affirm, the American nation is engaged by good faith to the Britiſh nation: but that engagement is nothing to this houſe? Such a man is not to be reaſoned with. Such a doctrine is a coat of mail that would turn the edge of all the weapons of argument, if they were ſharper than a ſword. Will it be imagined the King of Great Britain and the Preſident are mutually bound by the Treaty, but the two nations are free?

It is one thing for this houſe to ſtand in a poſition that preſents an opportunity to break the faith of America, and another to eſtabliſh a priuciple that will juſtify the deed.

[To be concluded in our next.]

Philadelphia,

TUESDAY EVENING, May 24, 1796.

NEW THEATRE.

To-morrow—THE ROAD TO RUIN. Godfinch, Mr. CHALMERS. With THE CRITIC. Puff, Mr. Chalmers On Friday, The Suſpicious Huſband, with Entertainments, For the Benefit of Mr. Morris.

Mr. Green's Night [illegible] on Monday.

Poſt-Office, Philadelphia, 20th May, '96.

The Mail for Middleton, Delaware, Warwick Georgetown, Croſs Roads and Cheſter Town, will in future be cloſed on Tueſday, Thurſday, and Saturday evening at ſunſet, and the Mail for Centerville, Eaſton, Vienna, Saliſbury, Princeſs Ann, and Snowhill, will be cloſed on Saturday evening at the ſame time time.

BY THIS DAY'S MAIL.

NEW-YORK, May 23.

ARRIVED.

		days.
Ship Atlantic, Joſe	Cork	61
Patty, Whitney	Jamaica	24
Lydia, Banker	Hiſpaniola	19
Barque Letitia, Bunker	St. Croix	18
Brig Flora, Williams,	B. of Honduras	24
Schr. Julia, Jenkins	Hiſpaniola	17

Capt. M. Joſe, of the Atlantic, arrived here on Friday evening from Cork, ſpoke the following veſſels:

April 8, ſpoke the ſhip Thomas, Capt. David Alder of Portland, in lat. 43, 35, N. bound to Liverpool, but laſt from St. Euſtatia, where ſhe put in through diſtreſs, having ſprung a leak—out from thence 30 days—reckoned himſelf in long. 20, 30—all well.

[illegible] ſpoke a ſchooner from Dominica, out 20 days—reckoned himſelf in lat. 42, 30, weſt—all well.

May 2, ſpoke the brig Eliza, Capt. James Yeardſley, from Philadelphia bound to Hambro, out 6 days—all well.

May 12, ſpoke the ſchooner Sukey, of Newbury in lat. 41, 52, N. bound to Newbury from St. Thomas, out 16 days, all well.

Left at Cork 20th March, the ſhip America, Capt. Johnſon Stinſon from Boſton for Belfaſt, all well; and the ſhip Harriot, for Boſton, to ſail beginning of April.

The ſon of the celebrated Sheridan is about making his entrance into political life. He is ſaid to be a candidate for a ſeat in parliament, at the next general election which is near at hand.

A jury has been ſtruck againſt Mr. Reeves, the great political actor in London, for a libel on the houſe of commons; introduced in a late pamphlet, aſcribed to him. His trial was to commence on the 19th of this month. Mr. Reeves wrote as he thought, on the miniſterial ſide; but, he, moſt evidently degraded the dignity of the houſe, as to the independence of its members, much more than the moſt managing miniſter could wiſh to have at leaſt, avowed.

—

A magiſtrate of London has lately written a treatiſe on the police of that city, which gives a general view of the prominent cauſes of the increaſe of crimes in the metropolis (which will apply more or leſs to all large towns) the pointing out deficiencies in the laws, and bad regulations of the police. In ſtating the number of people, made wretched by immoral and vicious habits, he aſſerts it, as a fact well eſtabliſhed, "that above twenty thouſand individuals riſe every morning in that great city, without knowing how, or by what means, they are to be ſupported during the paſſing day, or where they are to lodge the ſucceeding night." And, deſcribing the ill effects of the great increaſe of public houſes, he ſays, "in the city of London, there are at preſent 5204 licenced public houſes, and it is calculated that the beer and ſpirits, which are conſumed in theſe receptacles of idleneſs and profligacy, by the laboring people alone, do not amount to leſs than three millions ſterling a year."

WORCESTER, (Maſs.) May 18.

Northfield, May 7, 1796.

This morning, intelligence arrived in town, that a majority of the Houſe of Repreſentatives in Congreſs, had voted to make proviſion for carrying into effect the Britiſh treaty. The feelings of the inhabitants on this occaſion, were expreſſed by the ringing of bells, and other demonſtrations of joy. At three o'clock, a large party of the inhabitants collected, and dined together at Houghton's Inn.—After dinner, the following toaſts were drank.

1. Waſhington! The Savior of America. May he ſtand ſecure amid the ſtorms of faction; and long live to bleſs his country! Three cheers.

2. The Vice Preſident and Senate. May the wiſdom of their councils prove the ſhield of America!

3. The majority of the houſe of Repreſentatives, who voted to carry into effect the treaty with Great Britain. May the laurel of their country's approbation, never wither on their brow! Three cheers.

4. John Jay! our late Envoy at the Court of Great Britain, and the friend of his country.

5. The United States of America. May her national importance never be tarniſhed by inteſtine feuds!

6. The Commonwealth of Maſſachuſetts. May ſhe never be a younger ſiſter in ſupporting her country's rights!

7. The Fair, may their virtues be cheriſhed in the arms of affection.

8. All mankind. May peace and harmony pervade the univerſe. Three cheers.

At ſix the company retired. It is but juſt to obſerve, that true federaliſm brightened the countenance of each individual, and peace and harmony were the order of the day.

PORT OF PHILADELPHIA.

ARRIVED.

		days
Brig Elizabeth, Howell,	Bay Honduras	25
Rambler, Bratell,	Jeremie	24
Schr. Mille, Edwards,	Hiſpaniola	23

CLEARED.

Ship Aſia, Yard,	Calcutta
Fabius, Corran,	Havanna

Capt. M'Dougall, from St. Vincents, informs, that previous to his ſailing, intelligence was received of the capture of one of the ſtrongeſt forts on St. Lucia, by the Britiſh; whoſe force on the occaſion, was ſix ſail of the line, and 6000 men—The loſs on both ſides was eſtimated at 500 men.

No. 133, South Second Street.

DISEASES of the EYES.

J. E. HARRISON,

Accoucheur, M. D. and Member of the London Medical Society, &c.

INFORMS his Fellow Citizens, that he has ſtudied Phyſic under the moſt eminent Britiſh Profeſſors, and has been upwards of ſeven years a conſtant Pupil at St. George's and St. Bartholomew's Hoſpitals, under John Hunter, Pott, Bromfield, and William Sharp. He performs all the Operations for Relief of Diſeaſed Eyes, particularly Extracting the Chryſtaline Humour, called COUCHING; and he has reſtored to ſight two out of five, who were blind. raw 3t*

May 24, 1796.

Paper Hangings Manufactory

No. 70.

In Cheſnut-ſtreet, between Second & Third-ſtreets.

W. POYNTELL,

HAS prepared for Spring Sales a very extenſive collection, ſuitable for every part of a Houſe, amongſt which are many new and elegant Patterns.

In addition to the extenſive Stock of his own Manufacture, he has for ſale TWELVE THOUSAND PIECES of FRENCH PAPERS, together with Borders, Landſcapes, and Chineſe Pieces for ornamenting Breaſt Works and Chimney Boards—A great variety of Pannel Papers, and every other article attached to Ornamental Papering.

Orders for any quantity executed at a ſhort notice, and a liberal credit given to wholeſale dealers, and for exportation. May 24. tt&s

To-morrow will be Landed, at —— Wharf, from on board the Brig Elizabeth,

Mahogany in Logs and Planks,

35 *Tons Logwood.*

For Sale by

Philips, Cramond, & Co.

May 24 3t

LISBON SALT.

The cargo of the Brig Bon Eſperance, for Sale, by PRACHES & Co.

Who has alſo for Sale,

48 Hogſheads Prime St. Croix SUGAR.

May 24. d1w.

---

* Soon after France declared war againſt England, citizen Genet (whoſe civiſm had aſſiſted the revolution that had juſt been effected at Geneva) was diſpatched to the United States for the purpoſe, as appears by his inſtructions, of engaging them to take part in the war, and in caſe the Government, from motives of prudence, and a deſire to remain in peace, could not be enliſted, the people were to be ſtirred up, and by a revolutionary proceſs, plunged into a conteſt which has done more injury to the morals and happineſs of nations than all the wars of the laſt century.

Citizen Genet, perceiving that the ſucceſs of his miſſion could only be expected from a revolutionary movement of the people, commenced his operations at the place of his landing, and by his own agency and that of his partizans, every popular paſſion was inflamed, and every convenient means employed through all the ſtates, to produce diſtruſt and confuſion among our citizens, and a diſorganization of our government. It muſt be in the recollection of all, that during the diſgraceful conteſt between this foreign agent and our Executive, the public opinion for a time hung doubtful and undecided—to the honor of our country, virtue and good ſenſe ultimately triumphed over this incendiary.

The revolutionary labours of the citizen Genet were performed in the ſpring and ſummer of 1793, his inſtructions were probably early known in England; and the ſpirit and hoſtility towards that country which during this ſeaſon appeared throughout the United States, together with the numerous equipments in our ports, of privateers under French commiſſions, muſt naturally have produced an opinion in the Britiſh Cabinet, that the United States would ultimately engage in the war on the ſide of France. The orders of the 6th of November, and the ſpeech of Lord Dorcheſter to the Indians, are more ſatisfactorily accounted for by ſuppoſing the exiſtence of this opinion in England, than by the extravagant ſuppoſition that has ſo often been made, that they meditated war againſt the United States, becauſe our citizens were free and our government a republic.