

THE Village of Sanguella, on the frontiers of Arragon, has been the victim of the greatest calamity ever experienced in that part of the world, owing to a violent storm. The prodigious quantity of rain that fell on the mountains of Sacca, occasioned so terrible an inundation, that out of four hundred houses, which composed the village, one only is remaining. Two thousand persons have been buried under the waters, which rose fourteen feet higher than they generally do. All the mills, the wells, a great quantity of cattle, all are ravaged and destroyed. Ten or twelve villages are reduced to the greatest misery, and the kingdom of Navarre is a deplorable object of compassion. This dreadful disaster happened the 24th of last month, and since that time the rains have never ceased. The 6th inst. there fell such a quantity at Pampeluna, that the streets of the town appeared like rivers; all of a sudden. The torrents have carried away two wooden manufactories, with an hundred bales of that valuable commodity. Upwards of twenty houses have been overthrown, and the second inundation was as terrible as the first: the vines, the olive trees, with various other things; men, and animals of every kind have been destroyed; in a word, every thing presents the image of total destruction. The smallest brook has caused incredible damage. We can have no news from any part of Upper Navarre nor of Arragon, on account of the impossibility of the couriers passing. I was at Cambu the day of the last horror. The rain did not cease for eight and twenty hours, the river Nive rose twelve feet above its banks, and overflowed all the plains. The Turkey wheat, the flax, the hay, and the cattle, that happened to be in its way, were swept off by the torrent. The bridge at Ustaris has been forced away, and left the inhabitants in the greatest distress.

From the VIRGINIA GAZETTE.

ON the eleventh day of this month Mr. Rumley's steam boat, with more than half her loading, (which was upwards of three ton) and a number of people on board, made a progress of four miles in an hour against the current of Potowmac river, by the force of steam, without any external application whatsoever, impelled by a machine that will cost more than twenty guineas for a ten ton boat, and that will not consume more than four bushels of coals or the equivalent of wood, in twelve hours. It is thought that if some pipes of the machine had not been ruptured by the freezing of water, which had been left in them a night or two before, and which ruptures were only secured by rags tied round them, that the boat's way would have been at the rate of seven or eight miles in an hour. As this invention is equally applicable to boats or ships of all dimensions, to smooth, shallow and rapid rivers, or the deepest and roughest seas, freightage of all kinds will be reduced to one third of its present expence.

Mr. Rumley has a machine (which I likewise have seen) by which he raises water for grist or saw mills watering meadows, or purposes of agriculture cheaper than races can be dug, or dams made, and the water, after performing its operation, to be returned again into its first reservoir. He has likewise made such improvements upon the structure of mills as to work grist mills with one third of the water now expended, and saw mills with one twentieth, and yet increase their powers without fearing the innumerable accidents attendant on the cumbersome parade of rounds, logs, and wheels, which he has totally laid aside, and equally simplifies and

cheapens the buildings; but I shall say no more, as Mr. Rumley is preparing to publish the principles upon which his boat acts, when the public's curiosity will be satisfied. I am, &c. &c. Winchester, Dec. 16th, 1787.

ON SLAVERY. (From PALEY'S Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy.)

DEFINE Slavery to be "an obligation to labour, for the benefit of the master, without the contract or consent of the servant." This obligation may arise, consistently with the law of nature, from three causes. 1. From crimes. 2. From captivity. 3. From debt.

In the first case, the continuance of the slavery, as of any other punishment, ought to be proportioned to the crime.

In the second and third cases, it ought to cease as soon as the demand of the injured nation or private creditor is satisfied.

The slave trade upon the coast of Africa is not excused by these principles. When slaves are in that country brought to market, no questions, I believe, are asked of the origin or justice of the vendor's title. It may be presumed, therefore, that this title is not always, if it be ever, founded in any of the causes above assigned.

But defect of right in the first purchase is the least crime with which this traffic is chargeable. The natives are excited to war and mutual depredation. For the sake of supplying their contracts, or furnishing the market with slaves. With this the wickedness begins; the slaves torn away from parents, wives, children, from their friends and companions, their fields and flocks, their home and country, are transported to the European settlements in America, with no other accommodation on ship-board than what is provided for brutes. This is the second stage of cruelty; from which the miserable exiles are delivered only to be placed, and that for life, in subjection to a dominion and system of laws, the most merciless and tyrannical that ever was tolerated upon the face of the earth; and from all that can be learned, by the accounts of the people upon the spot, the inordinate authority which the plantation laws confer upon the slaveholder, is exercised, by the English slaveholder especially, with vigour and brutality.

But necessity is pretended: The name under which all enormities are attended to be excused. And after all, what is necessity; it has never been proved that the land could not be cultivated there, as it is here, by hired servants. It is said, that it could not be cultivated with quite the same conveniency and cheapness, as by the labour of slaves; by which means a pound of sugar, which the planter now sells for six pence, could not be afforded under six pence halfpenny—and this is the necessity.

The great revolution which has taken place in the western world may probably conduce, and who knows but that it was designed, to accelerate the fall of this abominable tyranny; and now that this contest, and the passions which attend it, are no more, there may succeed, perhaps, a season for reflecting, whether a legislature, which had so long lent its assistance to the support of an institution replete with human misery, was fit to be trusted with an empire the most extensive that ever was obtained in any age or quarter of the world?

Slavery was a part of the civil constitution of most countries, when Christianity appeared; yet no passage is to be

found in the Christian Scriptures, by which it is condemned or prohibited. This is true; for Christianity, soliciting admission into all nations of the world, abstained, as behoved it, from intermeddling with the civil institutions of any. But does it follow, from the silence of Scripture concerning them, that all the civil institutions which then prevailed were right? or that the bad should be changed for better?

Besides this, the discharging of slaves from all obligation to obey their masters, which is the consequence of pronouncing slavery to be unlawful would have had no better effect than to let loose one half of mankind to the other. Slaves would have been tempted to embrace a religion which asserted their rights to freedom. Masters would have hardly been persuaded to consent to claims founded upon such authority. The most calamitous of all content, a bellum servile, might probably have ensued, to the reproach, if not the extinction of the Christian name.

The truth is, the emancipation of slaves should be gradual; and be carried on by provisions of law, and under the protection of civil government. Christianity can only act as an alternative. By the mild diffusion of its light and influence, the minds of men are insensibly prepared to perceive and correct the enormities which folly, or wickedness, or accident, have introduced into their establishment. In this way the Greek and Roman slavery, and since these the feudal tyranny, has declined before it. And trust, that, as the knowledge and authority of the same religion advances in the world, they will banish what remains of this odious institution.

NOTICE is hereby given to the following non-resident proprietors of land in the district of Easthampton, in the county of Hampshire, that their lands are assessed in a list and rate tax for the year 1788, and town tax for the year 1788, as follows, viz.

| Name | State tax | Parish tax | Town tax |
|---------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Samuel Mather, Esq. | 6 d. | 9 d. | 1 s. 4 d. |
| John Stoddard, Esq. | 4 d. | 9 d. | 3 s. 2 d. |
| Lieut. Gideon Clark | 4 s. 3 d. | 4 s. 0 d. | 4 s. 3 d. |

NOAH JAMES, Collector. Easthampton, Feb. 29, 1788.

NOTICE is hereby given to the following non-resident proprietors of land in the town of Hadley, in the county of Hampshire, that their lands are assessed in a list and rate tax for the year 1788, and town tax for the year 1788, as follows, viz.

| Name | State tax | Parish tax | Town tax |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Timothy Henderson | 1 s. 6 d. | 1 s. 0 d. | 1 s. 0 d. |
| Edwin John Field | 2 s. 6 d. | 1 s. 0 d. | 1 s. 0 d. |
| William Aeres | 2 s. 6 d. | 1 s. 0 d. | 1 s. 0 d. |
| Joseph Crafer | 3 s. 7 d. | 1 s. 0 d. | 1 s. 0 d. |

JOSEPH SMITH, Collector. Hadley, March 3, 1788.

Take Notice!

ALL persons indebted to CLARK and PINKS for News-Papers, are ONCE more requested to make immediate payment. As said PINKS determines to stop riding the 15th of March next, they earnestly desire all who are in arrears, to discharge the same by that time. All who neglect to pay, after that time, must expect trouble and cost, without further notice. Greenfield, February 25th 1788.

FOR SALE, at the Printing-Office in Northampton, STRONG'S and BICKERSTAFF'S ALMANACK, For the Year 1788.

LIKEWISE, The First, Second and Third Part of Webster's Institute.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1788.

NORTHAMPTON: PRINTED BY WILLIAM BUTLER, A FEW RODS EAST OF THE COURT-HOUSE.

PROCEEDINGS OF CONVENTION.

(Continued from our last.)

Wednesday, January 30, A. M.

The 9th Section still under debate. MR. DAWES said, he did not see that the right of trial by jury was taken away by the article.—The word Court does not, either by a popular or technical construction, exclude the use of a jury to try facts. When people in common language talk of a trial at the Court of Common Pleas, or the Supreme Judicial Court, do they not include all the branches and members of such Court, the jurors, as well as the judges?—They certainly do, whether they mention the jurors expressly or not. Our State legislatures have confirmed the word Court in the same way; for they have given appeals from a justice of peace to the Court of Common Pleas, and from thence to the Supreme Court, without saying any thing of the jury. But in cases which almost all time out of mind have been tried without jury, there the jurisdiction is given expressly to the justice of a particular court, as may be instanced by laws upon the absconding act, &c. called Gentlemen have compared the article under consideration, to that power which the British claimed, and which we resisted at the revolution—namely, the power of trying the Americans without a jury.—But surely there is no parallel in the cases: It was criminal cases in which they attempted to make this abuse of power, Mr. D. mentioned one example of this, which, though young, be well remembered, and that was the case with Nickerson, the pirate—who was tried without a jury, and whose judges were the Governours of Massachusetts, and of some neighbouring provinces, together with admiral Montague, and some gentlemen of distinction. Although this trial was without a jury, yet it was a trial upon the civil law, there was not so much clamour about it, as otherwise there might have been; but still it was disagreeable to the people, and was one ground of the then complaints. But the trial by jury was not attempted to be taken from civil causes.—It was an object of power, whether one subject's property was lessened, while another's was increased; nor can it now be an object with the federal legislature. What interest can they have in constituting a judicial, to proceed in civil causes without a trial by jury? In criminal causes by the proposed government, there must be a jury. It is asked, why is not the Constitution as explicit in securing the right of jury in civil, as in criminal cases? The answer is, because it was out of the power of the Convention: The federal States either too widely in their mode of trial, some States using a jury in causes wherein other States employ only their judges, that the Convention have very wisely left it to the federal legislature to make such regulation, as shall as far as possible, accommodate the whole. Thus our own State constitution authorizes the General Court to erect judicatories—but leaves the nature, number and extent of them, wholly to the discretion of the legislature. The bill of rights indeed secures the trial by jury in civil causes, except in cases where a contrary practice has obtained. Such a clause as this, some gentlemen with were inserted in the proposed Constitution, but such a clause would be absurd in that Constitution, as has been clearly stated by the honourable gentleman from Charlestown, (Mr. Gorham) because the "exception of all cases where a jury have not heretofore been used" would include almost all cases that could be mentioned when applied to all the States, for they have severally differed in the kind of causes where they have tried without jury.

In the conversation on THURSDAY, on the 5th article, which provides, that "no religious test shall ever be required, as a qualification to any office." Several gentlemen urged, that it was a departure from the principles of our forefathers, who came here for the preservation of their religion's and that as it would admit deists, atheists, &c. to the general government, and people being apt to imitate the examples of the Court, these principles will be disseminated, and of course a corruption of morals ensue. Gentlemen on the other side applauded the liberality of the clause—and represented in striking colours its impolicy and almost emptiness of the requisition of a test, as practised by Great Britain and elsewhere. In this conversation, the following is the substance of the observations of the Rev. Mr. Shute:—Mr. President—To object

to the latter part of the paragraph under consideration, which excludes a religious test, is, I am sensible, very popular; for the most of men some how, are rigidly tenacious of their own sentiments in religion, and disposed to impose them upon others, as the standards of truth. If in my sentiments, upon the point in view, I should differ from some in this honourable body, I only wish from them the exercise of that candour, with which true religion is adapted to inspire the honest and well disposed mind.

To establish a religious test as a qualification for offices in the proposed federal Constitution, it appears to me, Sir, would be attended with injurious consequences to some individuals, and with no advantage to the whole.

By the injurious consequences to individuals, I mean, that some, who in every other respect, are qualified to fill some important post in government, will be excluded by their not being able to stand the religious test—which I take to be a privation of part of their civil rights. Nor is there to me any conceivable advantage, Sir, that would result to the whole from such a test. Unprincipled and dishonest men will not hesitate to subscribe to any thing, that may open the way for their advancement, and put them in a situation the better to execute their base and iniquitous designs. Honest men alone, therefore, however well qualified to serve the public, would be excluded by it, and their country be deprived of the benefit of their abilities.

In this great and extensive empire, there is and will be a great variety of sentiments in religion among its inhabitants. Upon the plan of a religious test, the question I think must be who shall be excluded from national trusts? Whatever answer bigotry may suggest, the dictates of candour and equity, I conceive will be none.

Far from limiting my charity and confidence to men of my own denomination in religion, I suppose, and I believe, Sir, that there are worthy characters among men of every other denomination—among the Quakers—the Baptists—the Church of England—the Papists—and even among those who have no other guide, in the way to virtue and heaven, than the dictates of natural religion.

I must therefore think, Sir, that the proposed plan of government, in this particular, is wisely constructed: That as all have an equal claim to the blessings of the government under which they live, and which they support, so none should be excluded from them for being of any particular denomination in religion.

The presumption is, that the eyes of the people will be upon the faithful in the land, and from a regard to their own faith, will chuse for their rulers, men of known abilities, of known probity, of good moral characters. The apostle Peter tells us, that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him.—And I know of no reason, why men of such a character, in a community, of whatever denomination in religion, *ceteris paribus*, with other suitable qualifications should not be acceptable to the people, and why they may not be employed by them, with safety and advantage in the important offices of government. The exclusion of a religious test in the proposed Constitution, therefore, clearly appears to me, Sir, to be in favour of its adoption.

Col. Jones (Britton) thought, that the rulers ought to believe in God or Christ—and that however a test may be prohibited in England, yet he thought if our public men were to be of those who had a good standing in the church, it would be happy for the United States—and that a person could not be a good man without being a good Christian.

The conversation on the Constitution by paragraphs being ended.

Mr. Parsons moved that this Convention do dissent to and ratify this Constitution.

Mr. Neal rose and said, that as the Constitution at large was now under consideration, he would just remark, that the article which respected the Africans was the one which lay on his mind—and unless his objections to that were removed, it would be so much soever he fixed the other parts of the Constitution, be a sufficient reason for him to give his negative to it. Col. Jones said, that one of his principal objections, was the omission of a religious test. Rev. Mr. Payson. Mr. President. After

what has been observed relating to a religious test by gentlemen of known abilities, I did not expect it would again be mentioned, as an objection to the proposed Constitution, that such a test was not required as a qualification for office. Such were the abilities and integrity of the gentlemen who constructed the Constitution, as not to admit the presumption that they would have betrayed so much vanity as to attempt to erect bulwarks and barriers to the throne of God. Relying on the candour of this Convention, I shall take the liberty to express my sentiments on the nature of a religious test, and shall endeavour to do it in such propositions as will meet the approbation of every man.

The great object of religion in man being the heart or conscience, i. e. the reason God has given us, employed on our moral actions, in their most important consequence, as related to the tribunal of God, hence I infer, that God's love is the God of the conscience, and consequently, attempts to erect human tribunals for the consciences of men, are impious encroachments upon the prerogative of God.—Upon these principles had there been a religious test, as a qualification for office, it would, in my opinion, have been a great blemish to the instrument.

Gen. Heath. Mr. President. After a long and painful investigation of the federal Constitution, by paragraphs, this hon. Convention are drawing nigh to the ultimate question.—A question as momentous, as ever invited the attention of man. We are soon to decide on a system of government, designed, not for the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts only—but for the present people of the United States only;—but in addition to these, for all those States which may hereafter rise into existence within the jurisdiction of the United States—and for millions of people yet unborn.—A system of government not for a nation of slaves, but for a people as free, and as virtuous as any on earth.—Not for a conquered nation subdued to our will, but for a people who have fought, who have bled, and who have conquered; who under the smiles of Heaven, have established their independence and sovereignty, and have taken equal rank among the nations of the earth. In short, Sir, it is a system of government for ourselves, and for our children, for all that is near and dear to us in life, and on the decision of the question is suspended our political prosperity or infelicity, perhaps our existence as a nation.—What can be more solemn? What can be more interesting? Every thing depends on our union.

I know that some have supposed that although the union should be broken, particular States may retain their importance, but this cannot be the strongest nerve that, even the right arm, if separated from the body must wither; if the great union be broken, our country, as a nation perishes, it will be as impossible to save a particular State, as to preserve one of the fingers of a mortified hand.

By one of the paragraphs of the system is declared, that the ratification of the conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of the confederation, between the States for ratifying the same; but, Sir, how happy will it be if not only nine, but even all the States should ratify it.—It will be a happy circumstance, if only a small majority of this convention should ratify the federal system; but how much more happy if we could be unanimous.—It will be a happy circumstance if a majority of the people of this Commonwealth, should be in favour of the federal system; but how much more so, if they should be unanimous, and if there are any means whereby they may be united, every exertion should be made to effect it. I presume, Sir, that there is not a single gentleman within these walls, who does not wish for a federal government—for an efficient federal government; and that this government should be possessed of every power necessary to enable it to shed on the people the benign influences of a good government. But I have observed from the first, that many gentlemen appear opposed to the system, and this I apprehend arises from their objections to some particular parts of it. Is there not a way in which their minds may be relieved from embarrassment? I think there is—and if there is, no exertions should be spared, in endeavouring to do it.

If we should ratify the Constitution, and im-