A TOUCH on the TIMES.

COME listen and laugh at the times,
Since folly was never so ripe;
For every man laughs at those rhymes,
That gives his own folly a wipe.
We live in a kind of disguise:
We flatter, we lie, and protest;
While each of us artfully tries,
On others to fasten the jest.

The virgin, when first she is woo'd,
Returns every sigh with disdain:
And while by her lover pers'u'd,
Can laugh at his folly and pain:
But when from her innocence won,
And doom'd for her virtue to mourn:
When she finds herself lost and undone,
He laughs (though unjust) in his turn.

The fools, who at law do contend,
Can laugh at each other's distress;
And while the dire suit does depend,
Ne'er think how their substance grows less;
Till lamper'd by tedious expense,
Although to compound they are loth;
They'll find, when reduc'd to their sense,
The lawers fit laughing at both.

But while we perceive it the fashion,
For each fool to laugh at the other:
Let us strive, with a generous compassion,
To correct, not contemn one another.
We all have some follies to hide,
Which known, would dishonor the best:
And life, when 'tis thoroughly try'd,
Like friendship, will seem but a jest.

ENTERTAINING ANECDOTE.

A YOUNG preacher in France, who had a graceful countenance, a very harmonious voice, fine action, and every other requisite necessary to charm his hearers, and attract their attention, being got into his pulpit, his memory at once failed him, that he could not recollect a single sentence of his intended sermon. To come down from the pulpit would have been too disgraceful; and to stay there and say nothing would be doubly so had. He therefore resolved to put a good face upon the matter and employ both his voice and action, without pronouncing any but imperfect and inarticulate sounds; such as—for finally—be—if—that—therefore—my brethren—and such unconnected sentences, and with all made a terrible thumping upon his cushion. The preacher ever seemed more animated with fire: He bawled as loud as possible, renting exclamation, and beat with his feet and hands. All things trembled under him, and the roof of the church, which was very lofty and spacious, echoed loudly to his voice. The whole congregation observed a profound silence, every one thrust forward his head, and gave all possible attention, in order to hear what it was impossible to understand. The orse who stood by the pulpit said, "We are too near, there is no possibility of hearing." Such as were at a distance complained—that they being too far from the pulpit lost the finest doctrine in the world.

To conclude, our preacher amused his audience during three quarters of an hour, and left off with the applause of the whole congregation, who resolved to place themselves to more advantage the next time, and not lose the fruits of so admirable a sermon.

APHORISMS.

THE hottest water extinguishes fire, and the affected heat of a cold character, friendship.

He, who gives himself airs of importance, exhibits the credentials of impotence.

Who lies in wait for errors neither to mend them in persons, nor to justify his choice in things, is on a road where good hearts are seldom met.

All finery is a sign of littleness.

From the ALBANY GAZETTE.

Messrs. PRINTERS,

In giving the following a place in your paper you will greatly oblige a forlorn and returned captive, who subscribes herself your very humble servant.

POLLY SMITH.

I WAS unfortunately taken by the Mohawk Indians, eighteen or nineteen years ago; and being a child I have no knowledge of my parentage, or part of the country they belong to, except what I received from two young women (who had also been captured) and with whom I fortunately fell in company, the evening after I was taken. They informed me, that they were acquainted with my parents, and as we were kept together for five years, I became capable of retaining their information, which to the best of my present recollection was—that my name was Polly Cooly, my mother's maiden name Betsey Stanley; and that my brothers' names were Jacob, Gideon, and Calvin. I do not recollect that they informed me that I had any sisters, or the town, county or state I came from. The Christian names of these two young women were Betsey, and Hannah, but their maiden names I do not remember. After five years captivity they were inhumanly murdered, for Betsey's refusing to marry an Indian. After their death I still lived with the Indians about six years, when I was sold by my Indian father and mother to a German, at Detroit; I lived with him very nearly six years, in which time I married John Smith from New England, and had two children. In May last my husband and eldest child were unfortunately drowned. I have since been travelling, seeking, as yet in vain, for my parents and relations. I have some inclination of going to the Mohawk River, supposing I was taken from the counties of Albany, Montgomery, or Saratoga, but as the Indians would never give me any information on the subject, it is only supposition. I have therefore thought fit to publish these lines, hoping they will be copied into the different papers in this country, that if I have any relations living, they may from the above narrative get information thereof; & should any claim me as a child, sister, or relation, they can see or hear from me at Mr. Alexander Bryant's at Saratoga Springs, about thirty six miles north of Albany, in the county of Saratoga, where I shall remain until Spring, when, if not inquired for, I shall return to Niagara.

January 26, 1793.

ANECDOTES.

DR. GRAHAM being on his stage in a country town, in order to promote the sale of his medicines, told the country people, that he had come there for the good of the people, and not for want? Then speaking to his merry Andrew—Andrew, says he, do we come for want? No, faith, sir, says Andrew, we have enough of that at home, besides, continued he, my master has a very great estate, but that is neither here nor there.

THE celebrated Doctor P——, in the course of the Twelve-month generally makes an elegant dinner for the brethren of his cloth; and in common none of the learned professions either medical or legal are admitted to this select party. As no rule exists without an exception, the Doctor, upon a certain occasion, invited a gentleman of the bar. He was the only one present. At dinner, an apology was offered for the appearance of a character so foreign to the clerical. A would be wit remarked, that the matter was excusable, for when the sons of God assembled, the devil came also. True, retorts Mr. H——, and the same book relates, that a certain man fell among thieves.

ONE day, as Charles the XIIth of Sweeden was dictating some dispatches to his Secretary, to be sent to court, a bomb fell on the house, pierced the roof, and burst near the apartment in which he was: One half of the floor was shattered to pieces; but the King's chair, being partly surrounded by a thick wall, suffered no damage; & by an astonishing piece of fortune one of the splinters which flew about in the air, entered at the chair door, which happened to be open.

The report of the bomb, and the noise it occasioned in the house, which seemed ready to tumble, induced the secretary to drop his pen. "What is the reason," said the king, "that you do not continue writing?" The secretary could only say—"Ah fire! the bomb!" "Well," replied the monarch, "what has the bomb to do with the letter I am dictating to you?—Go on.

RAN away from the Subscriber, the 22d of January, an indented boy, named *Amos Bread*, about 18 years of age. Whoever will take up said boy and return him to me, shall have *five shillings* reward.

BENJAMIN A. EDWARDS.

Northampton, Feb. 23, 1793.

TAKE NOTICE.

I HEREBY forbid all persons cutting Wood on the Land belonging to the heirs of the late TIMOTHY DWIGHT, deceased, as they do it at their peril, without a written Certificate from one of the heirs:—In behalf of the heirs, and by order of the Executors,

MAURICE W. DWIGHT.

NORTHAMPTON, MARCH 4, 1793.

LOST on the 18th ult. between Capt. Warner's in Belchertown, and Landlord White's in Hadley, a Check'd WOOLLEN RUG, fringed. Whoever has found said Rug, and will leave it with the Printer, or return it to the owner, shall be handsomely rewarded by

WILLIAM COLLSON.

NORTHAMPTON, MARCH 4, 1793.

Locks and Canals.

THE Proprietors of Locks and Canals on Connecticut River, want to employ 22 CARPENTERS, and 75 LABOURERS, for six months, the ensuing season, to begin their operations about the 20th of April next.—All persons who wish to engage in a work of such public utility, may be assured of good wages in Cash, and are requested to call on either of the subscribers, who are authorized to make contracts for that purpose.

JONATHAN DWIGHT,
JOHN WILLIAMS,
BENJ. PRESCOTT, } *Directors.*

Northampton, Feb. 26, 1793.

CASH,

AND THE HIGHEST PRICE, GIVEN FOR

SALTS of LYE, by

WRIGHT & STODDARD.

Northampton, January 2, 1793.

THE Partnership of HUNT and RAY, is by mutual consent this day dissolved. All persons indebted are requested to make immediate payment, to

M. HUNT.

Sunderland, Feb. 20, 1793.

Twenty Dollars Reward.

ON the Twenty fifth day of December 1792, *Abraham Brown*, of Adams, and *William Davis*, of Windsor, both in the county of Berkshire accidentally met at the house of Mr. Sabin, Landlord in Williamstown, in that county, and being, as is supposed, both, warmed with spiritous liquors, challenged each other to fight, betted two dollars upon the occasion, and laid down the money. Davis's blood cooling, or more regular feelings returning, he declined the combat, and Brown took up the stakes. The next morning Davis, (now become sober and regular) left Mr. Sabin's house, to return home, and as Mr. Brown lived not far from the road he must travel, said he would call and see if Brown would give up the two dollars he had taken as above mentioned.

Davis was seen to go to Brown's this day, viz. the 26th of December last, and the family consider he was there, but has never been seen nor heard of since, tho' much inquiry has been made for him. A boy belonging to the family has reported, that Davis and his father went to the barn quarrelling, or differing, and Davis has never been seen or heard of since. It is certain that Brown, when inquired of by one and another since Davis's absence from his family, had entertained the apprehensions of his friends, and put them upon search for him, has said things variant and false relative to the two dollars, and on examination by some gentlemen in commission for the peace, not indeed, ordered an arrest, but called upon at his house by them in a friendly manner, appeared disconcerted and confounded.

A circumstance that strengthens suspition that Davis is dead, and did not die a natural death, or come to his end by accident, is this, the beast he rode is not to be found; and a son of Brown, soon after Davis and his father met at the barn, and it is said the next day, or the next day but one, set out a journey (and it is supposed to the state of Rhode-Island) and has not been seen returning homeward on foot. It is not known, indeed, where he has been or how he went, but as it is highly probable he rode, and one of his father's horses have been missing from home, these several circumstances and my connexion with Davis's family, together with motives of a more public nature, have all united their force to convince me that it is my duty to publish the following description of the beast he rode from home, and had at Brown's, and to offer a reward of TWENTY DOLLARS to any person who shall bring her home, or TEN DOLLARS to any one who shall give information where she is that I shall be able recover her.

It was a chesnut coloured Mare, with a white face in the face, trots and paces, will be twelve years old the next spring, supposed to be with foal, but not certainly known to be so, has a scar on one of her buttocks, and carries her head something low.

And I earnestly request the Printers of public newspapers, into whose hands this advertisement may come (as the wife or widow of Davis will not be able to reward them) from motives of humanity and a regard to public justice, to give it a place in their several papers.

BENJAMIN GALLUP.

Dalton, January 31, 1793.

Timber.

THE following list of white oak Timber is still wanting for the use of the Proprietors of Locks and Canals on Connecticut River, viz:

no. pieces.	length.	size squared.		no. pieces.	length.	size squared.	
24	30	8	by 9	2	40	10	by 10
7	10	8	9	2	30	8	10
40	35	8	9	20	35	10	12
2	30	18	24	8	35	24	14
2	30	18	18	2	50	14	14
2	25	12	18	40	16	8	9
6	16	12	18	40	20	8	9
80	20	6	12	4	20	18	18
4	30	12	18	12	20	12	14
4	20	12	12	4	30	12	14
2	10	12	12	20	30	10	12

Also 10,000 feet SLITWORK.

WHOEVER inclines to furnish the whole or any part of the above TIMBER, to be delivered at the board way near Gaylord's mill, in Southadley, or any where on the bank of Connecticut River, between the board way aforesaid, & the mouth of Deerfield River, on or before the first day of May next, are requested to call on the subscriber, who is authorized by the said proprietors to make contracts for the same.

B. PRESCOTT.

N. B. Cash will be paid on delivery of the Timber.

Northampton, Feb. 18, 1793.

All Persons indebted to the subscriber are hereby requested to settle the same with him, on or before the 10th day of April next, as he is about to remove from this place.

ROGER WING.

Williamsburgh, February 25, 1793.

ROBERT BRECK, & SON,

HAVE just received a good assortment of

IRON HOLLOW WARE,

necessary for family use, which they will sell low for Cash. Produce taken as usual.

They give SEVEN-PENCE ½ per pound for good

FLAX.

N. B. A quantity of 5 pail kettles, proper for making Sugar.

Northampton, February 5, 1793.

RAGS,

CASH GIVEN FOR CLEAN COTTON AND LINEN RAGS, AT THIS OFFICE.

Hampshire Gazette.

NORTHAMPTON, *(Massachusetts)* PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM BUTLER.

Vol. VII.] WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1793. [NUMB. 342

FRANCE.

NATIONAL CONVENTION.

WEDNESDAY *December 26.*

Trial of LOUIS Sixteenth.

THE sitting was opened at nine o'clock, and the galleries being crowded with people who sat in them all night.

Manuel moved, that they should be cleared, in order to ventilate the Hall; but those who had taken so much trouble to secure seats drowned his voice in a general clamour, and the Convention could only obtain silence by deciding that he should not be heard.

It was then proposed to call over the names of the members, but this also was dropped.

Louis left the Temple at nine; and the National Guard not being assembled time enough to line the streets through which he was to pass, or to form a body round his person, he was escorted by a small party of cavalry. The people not expecting that he would set out so early, were not assembled in the streets, and he arrived as it were *incognito*.

Before he came to the bar, a member observed that, in denying all knowledge of the key of the iron door which concealed the papers produced by Roland, he had probably denied the truth, as the key opened several of the cabinets in his apartments. He therefore proposed that this key should be again presented to him, which was ordered.

At ten, Louis appeared at the bar, with the same firm and collected air as on his examination. He was attended by his three Counsel, the Mayor of Paris, Generals Santerre and Berruyer, and some municipal officers.

The President said, "The National Convention has decreed that you shall be finally heard this day, to present your means of defence. Be seated."

Louis replied, "My Counsel is going to speak for me," pointed to M. Deseze, and sat down.

Deseze, in an able and eloquent speech, of which the following is an abstract, said,

"*Citizens, Representatives of the Nation,*

"The moment is at length arrived, when Louis, accused in the name of the French people, and surrounded by Counsel, granted him by humanity and the law, is about to enter on his defence! The silence which at present prevails, gives me reason to think that the day of justice has succeeded the days of prejudice. Unfortunate Kings are entitled to more pity and respect than the unfortunate in other ranks of life, and he who formerly occupied the most brilliant throne in the universe, must excite a still greater degree of interest.—You have ordered him to appear before you; he has obeyed with calmness and dignity, emboldened by his innocence, and supported by the testimony of his whole life. He has revealed to us even his thoughts. In discussing with our preparation, and without mature examination, charges which he did not foresee, and being obliged as one may say, to make an extempore defence, it was impossible for Louis not to declare to you his innocence. This I shall demonstrate. I shall produce proper proofs, and I sincerely wish that this hall could be instantly enlarged, that the multitude, who have received the most fatal impressions against Louis, might come hither to receive impressions of a contrary nature. Louis knows that Europe waits with anxiety for the sentence you are about to pass. He knows that it will be handed down to posterity; but he considers only his contemporaries—like him, we forget posterity, and look only to the present moment.

"Had I to address only Judges, I should be satisfied with telling them, that since the nation has abolished royalty, no farther sentence can be pronounced against Louis; but I address the people—I must examine the question under two points of view, that in which Louis was placed before he accepted the Constitution, and that in which he stood after he had accepted it.

"In examining this affair, I first find the decree which enacts that Louis shall be tried by the constitution.—Those who framed that decree undoubtedly said, that Louis could not shelter himself under his inviolability. What then have you done by that decree? You have constituted yourselves judges of that accusation which you yourselves made. You have decreed also that Louis shall be heard. If he ought then to be heard, he has a right to defend himself; the Judge must not circumscribe the means; the Convention will examine them according to their just value when produced. If Louis deceives himself, you must refute his errors.

"Nations are sovereign: They have a right to give themselves whatever form of Government they think proper. I shall not contest this principle, and it is not yet forgotten, that the efforts of one of the Counsel of Louis contributed to make it be inserted in the constitution. But the nation itself cannot exercise its sovereignty. It must therefore, delegate the exercise of it. In 1789, the nation chose a monarchical government—a monarchical government required inviolability in the chief; it was necessary he should command that respect which inforces the obedience required by the law. The nature of this inviolability has been fully discussed. It has been pretended, that it was a synallagmatic contract: But the delegation of the sovereignty was a contract as long as it was not revoked. It was a mandamus if you choose, but a mandatory could not submit to other conditions, or other punishments, than those mentioned in the mandamus.

"On opening the second chapter of royalty, I said, that the person of the King is inviolable—there is no exception, no modification whatever; but there are certain circumstances in which the chief might lose that character of inviolability. The first case is as follows:

"ARTICLE V. SECTION I. CHAP. 2. of the title. If the King has not taken the oath, or if after taking it, he retracts, he shall be considered as having abdicated the throne." "The nation here supposes on the King the duty of taking the oath. To retract this oath, is a crime against the nation. The nation guarded against this crime, and appointed a punishment for it. I express myself incorrectly—it was not a punishment—it was not a forfeiture; the word is not once mentioned; it is only a supposition that the King should be considered as having abdicated the throne. You see that the constitution establishes no tribunal, that it speaks not of a trial, and that it does not pronounce the word forfeiture.'

"The King however, without retracting his oath, might betray it—he might favor criminal and hostile enterprizes against the state. The constitution provided also against this case.

"ART. VI. If the King shall put himself at the head of an army, and direct its force against the nation, or if he does not oppose by a formal act such an enterprize which may be undertaken in his name, he shall be considered as having abdicated the throne."

"Weigh well, I beseech you, the nature of the crime, provided against by this article; none more criminal can exist. It supposes all the machinations, all the perfidies, all the scourges, all the horrors, and all the calamities of a bloody intestine war; and yet, What does the Constitution pronounce? A presumption of the King having abdicated the throne.

"ART. VII. If the King quit the Kingdom and does not return, after being invited to do so by the Legislative Body." What does the Constitution declare in this case? A presumption that he has abdicated the throne.

"ART. VIII. states, that after an express or legal abdication, the King shall be tried, like other citizens, for all crimes posterior to his abdication. It results, then, that the King had a particular existence absolutely different from that of other citizens: And whence arose this particular, this privileged existence, but from the law, which conferred upon him that character of inviolability, which he could not lose but by an express and legal abdication? It is after being guilty of the most attrocious crime a King can commit against the nation, that it supposes him to have entered the class of citizens. In short the law here is perfectly equal with regard to the legislative body and the King. The legislative body might also betray the nation. It might invade the national sovereignty. The nation had a right to establish a punishment for the deputies, and yet this has not been the case.

"Louis is accused—he is accused in the name of the nation—he is accused of various crimes. These crimes are either provided against by the constitutional act, and then the punishment there established is to be applied to them, or they are not provided against; and, in that case, there exists no punishment which can be applied to them.

"I will go still further; I say they have been provided for. The most atrocious of all, that of a criminal war against the nation, has been provided for. In whatever manner that article may be understood, the crimes are there—they are all there; but the law only declares, the presumption of the throne being abdicated. I am well aware, that as the nation have at present abolished royalty, the punishment cannot be applied: But could it change the condition of Louis? Had he not a right to say, I was the prisoner of the nation, why did you not bring me to trial? You have abolished royalty. I do not dispute your right: But what—because you have abolished royalty, do you wish to punish me; and because you know no law applicable to me, do you wish to create one for me—for me alone? You are doubtless invested with every power, but there is one which you have not—that of being unjust.

"It has been said, that Louis ought to be tried as an enemy. But is it not a very cruel enemy who could put himself at the head of an army against the nation? It has been said, that he was inviolable only in regard to every citizen individually. According to this principle, would not the Representatives of the people, be more inviolable only in regard to the people for whatever they might have done, said, or written during a session? I shall here quote to you the following passage from Rousseau: 'When I fix neither the law which prosecutes, nor the law which condemns, I will not refer to the general will; for the general will cannot pronounce as the general will either against any man, or any fact.'

"But if you take from Louis the right of being inviolable, you cannot take from him the right of being tried as a citizen; and in the latter case I would ask you, Where are those protecting forms, where are those juries, which are as it were bottages for the lives and honor of citizens? I would ask you, Where is that proportion of suffrages which the law has so wisely established? Where is that silent ballot which includes in the same urn the conscience, and the opinion of the judge? I speak to you with the openess of a son of freedom. I wish to find among you judges, and I see only accusers.—You who pass sentence on Louis, and you have been his accusers.—You wish to pass sentence upon Louis, and you have already expressed your sentiments on his case. You wish to pass sentence upon Louis, and your opinions are well known all over Europe.

"I now proceed to the act of accusation. You go back to the month of June 1789. I shall go back to the same period: But how could you accuse Louis of having then attempted to destroy the Assembly? Do you forget that it was he who convoked it? Do you forget that for above a century and an half, Princes, more jealous of their authority than he, constantly refused such a convocation? Do you forget that had it not been for Louis, and the numberless sacrifices to which he consented, you would not be here deliberating on the interests of the state? He is accused of having surrounded Paris with troops; but I can say, these troops were destined only to protect Paris from those who wished to disturb the public tranquility. I had occasion to see the orders given to them when I undertook the defence of the commandant, whom the nation without any hesitation acquitted.

"I shall not here take notice of the memoir in which Talon is mentioned as acting a part in a plan formed for a counter revolution, nor of the papers subjoined to that memoir. Had I to defend a person of ordinary rank, I would observe, that a citizen cannot be condemned from papers procured by attacking his habitation, unless they had been previously sealed up and an inventory taken of them.

"The habitation of Louis was attacked, and his drawers were broke open. None of them were sealed up, no inventories were taken, and papers which might have been opposed to others may have been concealed. The letters of a deceased person are quoted: But can the letters of a person deceased be adduced as proofs? These letters it is said, mention money distributed; but even supposing that this fact, which they do not clear up, were true; and supposing it true, that greater or smaller sums had been extorted from the beneficence and sensibility of Louis; Do you know with what unhappy facility Kings may be surprised and deceived? The plan of a letter to La Fayette and Mirabeau is mentioned; but this letter was never sent. Mirabeau and La Fayette were at that time the two most popular characters; they both loved the constitution, and nothing was meant in the letter but the good of the state. Louis is accused also of having written a letter to Bouille; in regard to this, he has no occasion to justify himself; the National Assembly had before voted thanks to Bouille for his good conduct.

"You accuse him for the assemblage on the 28th of February; but popular rumours had attracted at that time a number of violent persons around the palace, & Louis ordered them to lay aside their arms. You accuse him with the massacres in the Champ de Mars; But do you forget that this unhappy Prince was then suspended from his powers, and watched as a prisoner? The nation has decreed that it shall be a republick; but this was not the form of government which is wished for then. Did not the Legislative Assembly declare against a republic in the month of July last? Had Louis is betrayed the interests of the nation at that period, or had he abused its confidence, you ought to have pitied him—you ought to have bewailed the fate of Kings—but he ought not to have been tried; I have not yet pronounced the word which would have made that chain of accusations fall. I have not said, that since all these facts, Louis accepted the constitution—the constitution was the contract of alliance between the people and the King; there was no longer any doubt; the past was forgotten. Let us now examine what Louis has done since his acceptation; the act of accusation comprehends facts for which Louis was not bound to answer personally, and facts for which he was personally responsible. By the constitution, the King was not responsible for what might be done by his agents. On the contrary, it made his ministers responsible. At present one has no right to accuse the King and his Ministers for the same acts. Louis is accused of having left the national Assembly ignorant of the Convention of Pilnitz.

"But this Convention was a secret treaty between the Emperor and the King of Prussia. There was no reason of state that could make it a rule for Ministers to communicate to an Assembly whose deliberations were publick, an act which was not publick. You have accused Louis of retarding, for a month, the transmission of the decree relative to Avignon. That, citizens, was one of the charges against the Minister Delessart, who had declared, that his defence, which he was preparing in his prison, would leave no doubt of his innocence. And can you, after his death, pre-