

MR. FENNO,

It is by men's actions alone, that we can form any just opinion of the measure of their attachment to the welfare of their country: For if the declarations of some people among us were to be considered as the touchstone of their sincerity—it would go to prove, that many of the most active promoters of the present unhappy disturbances, are the uniform and steadfast supporters of the laws!

The strange infatuation which appears to govern the conduct of these persons, is of a nature similar to the mischievous delusion which influenced the little urchin, who about three years since amused himself with setting fire to the stables and out buildings of the inhabitants of Philadelphia. This artful incendiary, stimulated no doubt by that rage for change and innovation which characterises the incendiaries of the present day, was the first to announce the flames kindled with his own torch; and by his exertions to extinguish the fire, acquired the good opinion of his unsuspecting fellow-citizens! It would be a circumstance highly consolatory to the friends of humanity if the instigators or perpetrators of similar acts of depravity, could like the unhappy boy in question, plead their youth and inexperience in extenuation of their crimes.

Upon the acknowledged principle, that the decisions of a majority in all Republican governments ought to obtain, it would follow, that every attempt to defeat the operation of laws framed by that majority, is not only a denial of the principle itself, but treason against the will of the people. Any man therefore who disseminates the false and absurd doctrine of legal opposition or constitutional resistance to the mandates of the majority, is an incendiary and an Enemy to our present form of government. Laws may be repealed, but cannot be legally or constitutionally resisted. Of all the instances of this kind that have lately occurred, the petition of the snuff makers and sugar refiners of Philadelphia, challenges the pre-eminence.

These people were calm spectators of the inconveniences, to which the merchants of the United States have been subjected by a variety of laws imposing duties on every species of merchandize, snuff and refined sugar not excepted—Nay, they were totally deaf to the complaints of their brethren on the other side of the mountains, until the critical situation of their country, threatened by a foreign war and the consequent loss of its usual revenue, required that a small tax should be exacted from the consumers and not as they would wish us to believe, from the manufacturers of snuff and refined sugar. This, however, was the auspicious moment, chosen by these magnanimous patriots to evince their attachment to the common weal by incessantly laboring to render the law odious and unpopular, and finally to remove every doubt with respect to the purity of their intentions, they have formally solicited the patriotic Legislature of Pennsylvania to co-operate with them, in their opposition to the government of the Union. Perhaps the next memorial, may contain a proposition for arming in defence of the opposers of excise laws!!!

Among the other arguments (if they deserve to be called such) to which these ingenious gentlemen have reached, in order to shew, why the people of the United States, ought not to exercise the right of raising a revenue in such manner as to them may appear best, they adduce the address of the Congress of 1774 to the inhabitants of Canada—in which address among other things Congress adverts to the odious nature of British excise laws. Gracious Heaven! As if there was any analogy between a tax imposed by a Foreign Legislature, in which we had no voice, and a tax laid by representatives of our own chusing, and whose states are equally liable with those of their fellow Citizens to the operation of the law. In short, that the very reasons given by the Congress of 1774, and their successors for resisting foreign tyranny, should be considered as sufficient grounds for opposing laws constitutionally made and not subject to the abuses so justly complained of in England, argues either extreme ignorance or extreme wickedness in the persons who have thus endeavoured to pervert them to answer their own purposes.

The complaints of the people in the Western Counties of this state, on the subject of the excise law, are equally unfounded with those of the snuff-maker and sugar-refiners; and their attempt to resist it by force, during the present gloomy state of our political ho-

rision, will stamp a degree of infamy upon the authors of it, not easily to be effaced. The reasons assigned by Mr. White for the unjustifiable conduct of his constituents, are such no doubt, as have been resorted to by designing men, not only in the county of Washington, but throughout the United States, to delude and mislead their unwary fellow-citizens. The difficulty is not impossibility of framing laws, so as to operate equally throughout the Union is admitted by all parties;—but, it does not follow from thence that those who are the loudest in their complaints have the most reason on their side. It behoves Mr. White therefore to shew, that the excise law has had a more partial effect in Washington County, than in other parts of the Union—by proving, that the quantity and value of the whisky, has diminished in consequence of the law, and that the Distillers and not the traders to whom it is passed away in exchange for other goods, pays the duty.

I shall conclude this essay with observing that the awful situation of our country, calls loudly upon the real friends to a fixed order of things, to hold to the Government under which we live—a desire of change is natural to the human race—If ever there was a necessity however for resisting a change, it is at the present moment. The benefits to be derived from new systems are conjectural only—the evils that might possibly result from them are incalculable. Let us therefore leave it to time to determine, whether our situation is less envious than that of any other people. When we separated from G. Britain, the task of framing a Constitution was easy—it was the work of a band of brothers.—Since that period the United States have been inundated with emigrants from all parts of the world, strangers to our language, our manners and customs—many of them perhaps unfriendly to our equal laws. Let no man who possesses property—let no man who earns a comfortable maintenance for his family, flatter himself with escaping the general wreck consequent to a dissolution among ourselves—there are hundreds of daring adventurers already among us, ready to seize upon the fruits of our industry—their numbers will increase in proportion to our inability to resist. Those persons who please themselves with the hopes of gratifying their ambition in an event of this kind will find themselves miserably mistaken: For as it is probable, they intended to confine their plan of innovation to the removal of their rivals in power, they will be supplanted by men, who unshackled by the ties of consanguinity and friendship, have nothing but their own immediate interests to consult and are therefore not to be diverted from indulging in all those excesses common to lawless usurpers.

CIVIS.

From the Connecticut Gazette.

MR. GREEN,

By inserting the following extract from a sermon delivered by the Rev. Dr. Lathrop, on the 4th of July, you will convey some profitable truths to our fellow-citizens, and gratify many:—

“THE freedom of election is a matter of essential importance. Under such a happy constitution as ours, where the elective power is in the great body of the people, and the periods of election frequently return, direct bribery is not easily practised. There are other ways, however, in which the electors may be unduly biased. The combinations of influential men to recommend and support certain candidates, may be as dangerous as corruption itself. The few who combine may have a particular design to serve; and, in some instances, it is possible, they may study rather to deceive, than to inform the public mind.

“Personal slanders, and infamous exhibitions, are always to be disapproved, as inconsistent with the freedom of parliamentary debate, and the purity of national manners. You may hang or burn in effigy, or you may revile and proscribe in a Gazette, an unworthy character; and you may do the same to a worthy character. And so far as your thus influence an election, you may prevent the choice of a good man as well as a bad one. To determine whether a man is worthy of our suffrages, we must enquire, whether he is a man of ability and information, of virtue, stability and firmness; of pure republican principles; and whether his interest is united with that of his country. Such a man, whatever aspersions may be cast upon him by political partizans, is worthy of our confidence. Though in particular instances, he may favor measures, which we had not previously expected, we are not hastily to reprobate his conduct; but to take time for examination; considering, that he may possess means of information, which have not reached to us.”

### Foreign Intelligence.

LONDON, July 11.

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, July 10.

THE WAR.

Mr. Sheridan. I rejoice that the attendance of members having put the speaker in the chair, has enabled me to deliver a few parting words. I rejoice that ministers have now condescended to think that the House of Commons merits some attention, and to suppose it might be possible that some gentlemen might feel an inclination to make a few observations on the present situation of affairs previously to the prorogation of the Parliament. I rejoice also at the attendance of the members this day, because it has enabled a gentleman opposite me to make a motion, which will enable the public to avail themselves of the abilities of a right honorable gentleman (Mr. Wyndham) and of Mr. Burke whose secession is the object of the other motion. I have to say, that the right honorable gentleman has served the public many years, and though I have recently differed from him in material points, yet I should have been happy to have heard that he had vacated his seat for the purpose of taking possession of an office equally profitable with that of Mr. Wyndham. Another reason of my rejoicing is, that the attendance of members will enable the right hon. gentleman opposite to me, to make a motion, which I have heard is to be made, for the erection of a monument to the memory of Admiral Harvey, and Captain Hutt.

The proposition which it is my intention to submit to the consideration of the house, does not go on in the first instance to do that which I think to be most proper in the present situation of affairs, to advise his Majesty not to prorogue the Parliament. I shall first make some observations for the purpose of obtaining information; and the effect of these observations will determine whether I shall not move for an address to his Majesty to continue the sitting of Parliament. If we were at an earlier period of the session, and if the events which have lately taken place, had taken place in February, I believe there is no man who would not have thought that a motion for inquiring into the causes of those events was absolutely necessary. Six weeks only have elapsed since the object of the War was explicitly announced. Scarcely more than that period has passed away since an hon. gentleman avowed that the war had for its object the extermination of the government at Paris—that we ought to employ the last man, and the last guinea, for the purpose of destroying the French Republic. In the same short period of six weeks, do I say too much, when I assert, that events have happened which have proved that the object of the war is wholly impracticable and chimerical? Do I say too much when I affirm, that I have a right to ask, whether the object of the war is still the same? Have ministers ever held out one expectation which was not followed almost with immediate disappointment? Not one! We differed with the minister on the principles and object of the war, but we did not deny him a man or a guinea. Application was made for powers more extensive than had ever been granted before—they were given. The minister assured us, that he had the most sanguine hopes of success. He applied for a subsidy to the King of Prussia, to an amount almost unprecedented. He applied also for powers to enable him to embody Frenchmen for the purpose of being employed against Frenchmen, what has been the event of all these applications? Disgrace, defeat, disasters beyond what were experienced in any former war. Since then all these hopes and expectations have been disappointed, shall we not enquire the cause? Are the imbecility and incapacity of the ministers to exempt them from animadversions? Are they to practise delusions and deceit, and are we still to be silent? I should like to hear what excuse they can offer? Will they say, that they have been disappointed by the King of Prussia? if they do, it will not be asking too much to enquire whether that monarch has received his subsidy, and what troops he has furnished in consequence of it. On this subject, I should indeed think it scandalous if the House were to separate without requiring or receiving any information. I will not suppose that the minister will assert that the King of Prussia is assisting the alliance against France, by besieging Cracow, and by massacring the Poles. If he state in vindication

that he could not have expected that the King of Prussia would have been guilty of such conduct, I reply that he was warned of it. That we assured him, that the King of Prussia would do nothing but receive his subsidy. If they allege that they were disappointed by Austria, I shall still say, that such an excuse is wholly unworthy any man who wishes to have the character of a great Statesman. If they represent to us that the numbers of the French were so great, I answer in reply, that the Minister must have been aware of the French system of rising in a mass, and that he knew they would on any emergency arise, as he had himself said, “an armed nation.” I should be glad to know why, when these adverse events occurred in Flanders, the troops were suffered to hover on the coast of Hampshire, and were not employed in strengthening our force in Flanders? Upon military tactics, I do not mean to enter, because I do not understand them, but the general principle, that the object of the War has totally failed, is known to every person. It is known to every person, that the avowed end of the War is unattainable; that the Allies have been driven out of Flanders, and that they have been forced to act on the defensive on the frontiers of Holland.

On the sentiments which have been expressed by one Right Hon. Gentleman (Mr. Wyndham) who is now reposing in the cool shades of the Chiltern Hundreds for the purpose of qualifying himself for War Ministry; I shall say very little; if he were present, I should say much. But it is on account of some new political Alliances which have been formed, that I think the cause of the War should be explicitly declared now; though I should imagine, that as the times are so different, it would be absurd to proceed on the same individual principles;—yet, as I suspect that as the members of this new alliance in office are placed in important situations, a deeper and more stubborn principle for prosecuting the war has been adopted, and that these new appointments hoist the bloody flag to declare that the War is to be carried on till either the government of France is exterminated, or till England falls in the attempt. When I consider these insuperable bars which once prevented any communication with the Minister—when I recollect the solemn declaration, that a temporary dereliction of office, on the part of the Minister, was a sacrifice absolutely necessary to the insulted dignity of the House of Commons—when I remember that those declarations, though long made, were long adhered to, and even repeated in the last Session of Parliament,—when, I say, I consider these circumstances, and reflect a little on the unpopularity of former Coalitions—when I reflect on the disinterestedness of the characters in question, he must think that nothing but a paramount and imperious necessity has induced them to adopt their present mode of conduct—Have they acted in consequence of any admiration of the great talents of the Minister, and has this admiration swept away all their former opposition? Are we to believe on the other side, that the union is founded on the confessed imbecility of Ministers, who are to throw the management of the War into other hands? I cannot suppose that this is the case; for, however rational and well founded their opinion of the imbecility and incapacity of the Ministers may be, yet, I know, that the Minister possesses too good an opinion of his own abilities, either to acknowledge his own incapacity, or to give up the management of the War from a conviction of his own inability. The present mode of conduct therefore of these gentlemen, can only arise from an idea of the dangerous situation of the country—from a knowledge of the failure of every project adopted by the Minister—and from a conviction, that all petty considerations should give way, and that the case is so urgent, as to render the honor of the House of Commons a circumstance of no importance. Such must be the cause of their forgetfulness of all their former declarations—of all their former principles—of all their former pledges. If therefore I am right in the motives which I have supposed must influence their conduct, they ought at least to give the House of Commons credit for being willing to remain on their posts, in this period of extreme difficulty and danger. For these reasons I think, that we have a right to know, whether the cause of the War remains the same or not. I believe that, unless the wild project to which I have alluded, is given up, no person will support the War with vigour. On the subsidy granted to the King of Prussia, some explanation I assert is absolutely necessary. Explanation is also necessary on the subject of our difference with America. It is a known and incontrovertible fact, that

the present Administration is detested in every part of America. As however the Minister and his Colleagues have on a former occasion evinced such an ignorance of American affairs, it is not too much to suppose that they are also ignorant of this fact. America is divided into two parties, a moderate and a violent party. But whatever difference of opinion occurs between these two parties on political subjects, in this they are all agreed, that the conduct of the Administration of Great-Britain, for the last ten years, has been devoid of every principle of justice, and even of common sense. In this point of view, I have a right to assert that they may be ignorant of this fact, for when I read a paper some time ago, relative to Lord Dorchester's speech, the authenticity of it was generally denied, though Ministers might have supposed that Lord Dorchester might be guilty of as gross folly as themselves. In another place, to which, I cannot consistently with Parliamentary order, allude, the speech was treated in such a manner, that the Noble Lord who read it, was almost accused of reading it only for the purpose of sowing dissention between the two countries. I wish to know what authority was given to Lord Dorchester for making such a speech, and whether any steps have been taken by Government in consequence of it. If in answer, I am told, that the Negotiation with Mr. Jay (the American Minister) is in such a train that it would be dangerous to reveal any secrets, I shall certainly press the subject no further. But seeing, that after eleven years, the same miserable expedients of Annual Commercial bills continue to be adopted. Looking at Lord Dorchester's speech concerning that, even after Mr. Jay's departure hostilities may have been committed, and knowing that nothing can be done without the assistance of Parliament, I say that I have a right to receive some explanation from Ministers, and that I am furnished with sufficient grounds on which to move an Address to the King not to prorogue the Parliament. It is necessary also to recur to the situation and sentiments of our Allies.

We say that we cannot make Peace, not because we dislike a Republican form of government, but because we must have security for the future. Now, of all the insulting mockeries that ever tired the patience of men, this is the most insulting. We see that we are the dupes of all Europe, and that none of our Allies are to be depended upon, and yet we insist upon having from the French Government security for the future.

What has the meanest of our allies, the King of Sardinia done? Nothing but receive his money. What has Spain done? Has she co-operated with us in the Mediterranean? Has she kept 20 sail of the line in Cadiz harbor, as she was bound to keep? Or did she send out any force to intercept that great American fleet, of whose sailing she received such timely notice?—No. Is then the Spanish government to be depended upon? What have the Dutch done, who have been fitted a maritime power, and have not furnished one ship? Is the Empress of Russia to be depended upon? Has she furnished a man or a rouble? Has Austria brought half the number of men which she promised? Is the King of Prussia to be depended upon? Has he not only declined, but defrauded us? When we look to the state of our own nation, is the British government to be depended on? What was our conduct at Toulon? And how have we fulfilled our promises to the Royalists? Can there be any argument, then, more preposterous and absurd, than that we ought not to make peace, without having security for the future? Of all the powers in Europe, France is the only one that has proved she is to be depended upon, and yet we treat her as if she had no subordination, and as if her inhabitants were only an undisciplined rabble and mere banditti. She has not fulfilled her promises to her allies, because she has no allies; but she has been terribly punctual in all her threats: She said that the world, single handed, fight all the Despots of Europe, and she kept her word—she declared that she would drive us from Toulon, and she kept her word—she affirmed that she would chase the Prussians to the other side of the Rhine, and she kept her word—she asserted that she would beat the allies out of Flanders, and she kept her word.—The Minister thinks himself strengthened by the grand alliance. I think on the contrary, that the sentiments of the persons who compose this alliance, will be fatal to the country. I hope that, now that these gentlemen attach to themselves a degree of responsibility, they will re-consider their declarations. I trust that, when they know that their opinions may turn the fate of the war, they will revise those