

placing those advantages on permanent ground; a decree, however of the National Assembly, subjecting vessels laden with provisions to be carried into their ports, and making enemy goods lawful prizes in the vessel of a friend, contrary to treaty, though revoked at one time, as to the United States has since extended to their vessels. As has been recently stated to me, the provisions on this subject will be immediately given in charge to our minister there, and the result shall be communicated to the legislature.

It is with extreme concern I have to inform you that the proceedings of the person you have unfortunately appointed their minister plenipotentiary here, has breathed nothing of the friendly spirit of the nation which sent him; their tendency on the contrary has been to involve us in a war abroad, & discord and anarchy at home. So far as his acts or those of his agents have threatened our immediate commitment in the war, or flagrant insult to the authority of the laws, their effect has been counteracted by the ordinary cognizance of the law, and by an exertion of the power was considered to me. Where their danger was not imminent, they have been borne with from sentiments of regard to his nation, from a sense of their friendship towards us. From a conviction that they would not suffer us to remain long exposed to the action of a person, who has so little respect of our mutual dispositions, and I will add, from a reliance of the firmness of our peace and order. In the mean time I have respected and pursued the stipulations of our treaties, according to what I judged their true sense, and have withheld no effort of friendship, which their Ministers have called for from us, and which justice to others forbade us to refuse. I have gone forward; rather than to employ force for the restriction of certain vessels which I deemed the United States bound to receive. I thought it more advisable to satisfy the parties by avowing it to be my opinion, that if restriction were not made, it would be incumbent on the United States to make compensation. The papers now communicated will more particularly apprise you of these transactions.

The vexatious and spoliation understood to have been committed on our vessels and commerce, by the contractors and officers of some of the belligerent powers, appeared to require attention, the proofs of which however not having been brought forward, the description of citizens sequestered to have suffered were notified, that on furnishing them to the executive, due measure would be taken to obtain redress of the said, and more effectual provision against the future. Should such documents be furnished, proper representations will be made thereon, with a just reliance on a redress proportioned to the exigency of the case.

The British Government having undertaken to refrain generally our commerce in ports and other provisions, to their own ports, and those of their friends, the instructions now communicated were immediately forwarded to our minister at that court. In the mean time some discussions on the subject took place between him and I, they expect to leave the result of his special instructions in time to make it known to the legislature during their present session.

Very early after the arrival of a British Minister here, mutual explanations on the execution of the treaty of peace were entered into with that minister, these are now laid before you for your information.

On the subjects of mutual interests between this country and Spain, negotiations and conferences are now depending—the public good requiring that the present state of these should be made known to the legislature in confidence only, they shall be the subject of a separate and subsequent communication.

G. WASHINGTON.

PHILADELPHIA, December 9.

TO THE PUBLIC.
AGREEABLY to the promise that was published on the 6th inst. I shall now proceed to declare the facts, relative to Mr. Genet's conversation with me, in the case of the *Little Democrat*.

I feel, indeed, the indecency of disclosing what may appear, in some respects, to be an official, and in others, a private communication; but the anxiety, which the public mind has experienced on the subject, & the misrepresentations, which have prevailed, and the example, which is derived from the conduct of all the other persons who have been involved in the disclosure, will, I think, be deemed a sufficient justification of the liberty, that I thought necessary to take.

I sat in the evening of Saturday, the 2d day of July last, I was informed

that the *Little Democrat* (whose wares equipments, in opposition to the declared neutrality of the port, had before attracted the attention of government) would fall in the coast. At the ensuing morning, I was accordingly, communicated the information to the governor, I received instructions to prepare for calling out a party of the militia, to prevent all egress, the departure of the vessel; but, on my suggesting, that the necessity of pursuing hostile measures, might, probably, be precluded, by an application to the director of the French Minister, I was directed to wait upon that gentleman, with an overture for an amicable arrangement, before the party should be summoned to parade.

It was about 11 o'clock at night, when I arrived at Mr. Genet's house. Mr. Paff-chall withdrew from the room into which I was introduced, soon after I entered it; but Mr. Borno-ville and Mr. Dupont remained there during the whole of my visit.

I apologized for my unbecomingly an intrusion; and lamented that my errand was not an agreeable one. I stated the nature, extent, and obligation of the instructions, which the governor had received from the President, for the purpose of preserving the neutrality of the United States, within the jurisdiction of Pennsylvania; and I described the circumstances, that rendered the *Little Democrat* an object of those instructions; as well as the recent intelligence of her intention to leave the port; which the governor was bound to prevent. I mentioned, however, that the governor was desirous to avoid the use of any compulsory measures on the coast; and, therefore, as the allegation which had been made, that the vessel belonged to the Republic of France, and not to individuals, might produce an exception from the general rule, in her favor, he would cheerfully rely on the minister's engagements, that she should not depart, till there was an opportunity of consulting the President (who was then, I believe, on his way from Mount Vernon to the city of Philadelphia) upon the merits of this particular case.

This representation was feebly delivered, when Mr. Genet exclaimed with great vehemence, "that the proceeding was very extraordinary, improper and unjust." He then, in his own opinion, acquiesced in the views of the officers instructed in the forerunner of the *Grange*, &c.) had not merited this return; which he said, however, should regulate his conduct in future. He expressed surprize, that the first information which was given of the matter, should be accompanied with a threat. He complained in strong terms, and with many angry epithets, of the ill treatment which he had received from some of the officers of the government, which he contrasted with the cordial attachment that was expressed by the people at large, for his country; that he described the conduct of those officers as principles inimical to the cause of France and liberty. He expressed apprehensions, that owing to their influence, even the President had, in that respect, been misled. He observed, with a considerable emphasis, that the President was not the sovereign of the country; for he could not legislate on general subjects; nor could he declare war, or make peace; that Congress, the depository of those powers, was the only constituted body, that could on the part of the United States, give a constitutional interpretation or possibly in the terms of the treaty; that it was therefore, the duty of the President, (a duty of which he had frequently preface a performance) to have convened Congress, before he ventured to decide, by the proclamation of neutrality, upon the general relation between America and the belligerent powers; or to exhibit, by his instructions to the state governors, the enjoyment of the particular rights, which France claimed under the express stipulations of the Treaty. He urged, amidst the powers which he has no doubt in his possession to command his country; that the privilege to arm and equip their vessels, was deemed by them indispensable, founded upon the plain meaning of the 22d article of the treaty of commerce; that he could not therefore, enter into any arrangement which might appear as a waiver of that privilege. He insisted that the President's constitution was neither just nor obligatory; notwithstanding the existing cases, which would warrant an exception of America, his regard for the people of America would induce him to remain here, amidst the latest and distressing difficulties, in order to be present at the daily session in his official character for the public officers, all the meetings of Congress. He spoke of publishing his correspondence with the officers of government, together with general narrative of his proceedings; and he said, that Congress agreed in the opinions, and supported the measures, of the President, in relation

to the Republic of France, he would certainly then withdraw, confiding of having discharged his duty, and leave the dispute to be finally adjusted by the two nations themselves."

As I could not obtain an opportunity, to see Mr. Genet's statement to the immediate object of my visit; but he persistently refused to enter into any engagement, for insinuating the departure of the *Little Democrat*; and added, in a manner, which I thought intemperate, that "he hoped no attempt to seize her would be made; for, as she belonged to the republic, the most due honor of her flag, & would certainly repel force by force."

Such was Mr. Genet's conversation with me; and it will be allowed, that although I am responsible for the fidelity of the recital, I am not responsible for any inference, which has been, or may be, drawn, from the facts that it contains.

My report to the Governor, on the same night, and to Mr. Jefferson, on the succeeding morning, corresponded, as precisely as I can repeat it, with the account which I have now given, and I well remember, that Mr. Jefferson's relation of this discourse, published in his subsequent interview with Mr. Genet, on the same occasion, so nearly corresponded with my report, that the similarity became a matter of remark with the Governor and Mr. Jefferson, as well as with me.

But it will be expected, perhaps, that I should give a more direct reply to the specific charge, which states, that I had reported to the Governor, and communicated to Mr. Jefferson, "that Mr. Genet had declared, that he would appeal from the President to the People."

Upon this point, I said, that the Governor thinks, that I made use of the word appeal, towards the close of my report, in that manner—"that, if, after the business was laid before Congress, Mr. Genet did not receive satisfaction, on behalf of his nation, he would publish his appeal, withdraw, and leave the government themselves to settle the dispute." The word appeal, appears, however, in my opinion, to be more applicable to those facts which represent, that Mr. Genet, controverting the justice and force of the President's decisions on the treaty, &c. declared a determination to address Congress on the subject; but, in either place, if it is not confined necessarily to an appeal, that I heard of from Mr. Genet, "that he would appeal from the President to the People," I am content to admit the expression as mine.

But I am, likewise, apprized, that soon after the translation; when, however, the report was circulating, that Mr. Genet had used the expression in question; when it was reported to have been used by him in his conversation with Mr. Jefferson; and when Mr. Jefferson thought it proper to remove impressions by that circumstance in the report; he stated, in an official memorandum, that Mr. Genet's declaration of an intention to appeal from the President to the People, was not reported to him, but to me. Whether Mr. Jefferson employed the language of his own inference from my recital, on the occasion; or adopted the language of the current rumor; I will not attempt to discuss; but, in the former early stage of the business, I had already formed the means of explanation; like Mr. Jefferson, should then have said, what I said the moment I heard the suggestion, applied to me; what I have since taken every proper opportunity of saying; and what I now most solemnly say;—that Mr. Genet never did, in his conversation with me, declare, that he would appeal from the President to the People; or that he would make any other appeal, which conveyed to my mind, the idea of exciting insurrection and tumult.

Upon the whole, as my communications to the Governor and Mr. Jefferson, were of an official and confidential nature, I think, that I have cause to complain; and the candor of others will induce them to lament, that I was not personally consulted (which common courtesy, as well as common candor, might be required) before Mr. Genet's conversation with Mr. Knox, who had daily opportunities of seeing me under lock and key, and who, I believe, was the first to propagate the report, connected with my name; or, at least, before Mr. Jay and Mr. King, undertook to vouch for its authenticity. The most attentive hearer, may sometimes misconceive the ideas of the person who addresses him: And I am now aware of my just purpose, which could require that the sentiment which has been circulated; should be immutably fixed; or that the form of words, in which it is clothed, should be irrevocably prescribed.

A. J. DALLAS,
Philadelphia, 7th December, 1793.

ARCHANGEL, (Russia) July 1.

This city, for often damaged by fires, has again met with a dreadful one, which broke out on Saturday the 26th June, and lasted from 9 o'clock in the evening until 8 o'clock the next morning. It has burnt

to ashes 88 numbered houses, among which are all those lately built of brick, and the buildings of the different tribunals: The cathedral church and other churches, and the shops in the market-place, to the number of above 300, besides a great number of magazines, stables, out-houses, private barns, &c. In general, they reckon the buildings destroyed of every description, at about 3000. The loss is immense; & the moderate estimation falls at three millions roubles, and without the pecuniary assistance of government, it will be impossible for the citizens, without their goods or refuge, to subsist. Two thirds of the city is consumed, and many persons have lost their lives amidst the general conflagration.

PARIS, Sept. 22.

In consequence of a report made by Citizen CAMBON, the Convention decreed, that all deposits made by the Emigrants in the hands of all the Public Notaries, or agents whatever—all the funds seized and deposited in the office of the public review, are belonging to the said emigrants, should be sent to the National Treasury—The sums that have been deposited in assignats bearing the King's Effigy, before the 25th of July, which annihilated them shall be taken into the Treasury in Republican Assignats; and those that have been deposited in hard specie, shall be brought into the National Treasury in the same specie: This decree was unanimously accepted, and will bring an immense quantity of specie into the coffers of the Nation, and frustrate the last hopes of the Emigrants. "This decree is to be in full force immediately after its acceptance."

A letter was read from the Commissioners of the French Republic, in the Eastern Pyrenees, giving an account of an affair between the Republican Army, and the Spanish troops, on the 14th of September. After the taking of Puycerd, by General DAGOBERT, the Spaniards returned in great force to dislodge the French troops, from that important place; the French who were informed of their intention charged them with fixed bayonets, put them to flight after a great slaughter and took from them all their artillery, baggage and ammunition.

On the 13th, another letter was read from the Commissioners, the purport of which was, that on the 17th, the Army of the Eastern Pyrenees, attacked and took possession of the Spanish camp, strongly fortified, and defended by 12,000 men; the Republican Army marched in three columns, and carried all before them; the Spaniards fled with great precipitation, they abandoned 26 pieces of cannon, a great number of colours, a thousand tents, all their ammunition, cattle and provisions; they left 500 dead on the spot, and 300 taken prisoners. They had in their camp a very rich deal in silver, composed of candlesticks, vessels, and some faints, which have been sent to the mint at Perpignan. The great Chaplain, who was Captain, and several other Priests, we have sent prisoners to Montpellier.

The Spanish General DON SOLANO, is killed, and several other officers.

The Commissioners CASAGUS and FARRER, are slightly wounded; the loss of the French, amounts to 125 killed, 200 wounded.

Samuel Lyman, & Co.

HAVE for Sale at their Store near the Ferry in Hartford, W. L. & N. E. Rum, by the bbl. or bbl. East-India Sugar, by the bbl. or bbl. Holland Gin, by the Pipe or Caf. Sherry and Best Lisbon Wine in Car. Casks, and excellent.

Best London Porter, by the groce or doz. Loafed and Liver Oil, by the cwt. Best Brown Sugar, by the bbl. cwt. or less. East-India Sugar, of an excellent quality, by the bag or less.

Best French Cognac, by the cwt. or less. Best Green Coffee, by the bbl. cwt. or doz. Pepper by the Bag, or cwt. or doz. Allspice by the Bag, or doz. Hyson and Bohea Tea, by the chest, doz. or single lb.

Excellent Cotton, by the Bale or lds. by 6 or 9 and 8 Window Glass. Chocolate by the Box.

Raffin in Jars.

Best Liverpool and Turk's Island Salt.

Jersey Iron—Nail Ropes—10 & 8d nails. Sheet Iron—Pipes by the load.

Sealed and Smoked Tobacco.

Best English Mustard—Capens.

Cod Fish—Dutch Quill—OIL Steel, and excellent.

And many other articles which will be exchanged for cash or most kinds of produce, upon as good terms as they are to be had at any Store in the city. Constant attendance and every favor gratefully acknowledged, by

SAMUEL LYMAN, and Co.
Hartford, Dec. 6, 1793.

For the HAMPSHIRE GAZETTE.
WRITTEN under the Signature of "AMICUS," comes forward in a his paper with a proposition in favour of the rising generation; which, as it must be shown from the pure source of benevolence, deserves the consideration of the public. I have, as one of those who are directly benefited by the proposition, showed upon it some small degree of attention. At the first reading, all the finer sensations were brought into brisk and lively exercise; a certain calm which, in the happy moment that gave birth to the proposition, must have spread itself over the senses of the author, by a sympathy power diffused for benefit, induced his ready and firm frame. The topics of discussion here enumerated in my sketch, are not danced perpetually before my eyes—"Philology, mathematics, geography, history, and every thing that shall be useful in the promotion of industry, trade and the mechanic arts—the nature, and origin of government, the empire of Great Britain, and the republic of France" were perfectly at my control—I was flouting in my buffoon, and upon my toes ends had nearly exclaimed in the language of the madman—"Attention to the world's Kingdoms and Empires be the right word!" But alas! I was before the night when I saw the light of the sun. I was then a young man, and my eye rolling with mighty thought, disclosed the charm, brought back to me my common sense, and the language of truth—Yes, Noah Webster's third part was a floating monument of my shame. I was smitten with a conviction that even this book contained more than I could make the subject of useful and entertaining discussion among my friends. If so, said I, what can this AMICUS mean? Does he think of the arts, sciences and government among other great masters, that may be perfectly familiar to him, but of which common people hardly know the names? Does he suppose that those who have barely left their schools, are capable of haranguing before even half a dozen of their equals, upon either of the subjects mentioned by him, with advantage to themselves, or those around them? I will not common experience, and common sense, are sufficient, each even "AMICUS," that people do not prefer with propriety? And this he says, had they not betaken their reading at such a character, would not be a waste of time? It appears to me upon farther consideration that these great topics, and their discussion, in the method proposed by "AMICUS," will be to the gentlemen of influence and respectability, and the clergy, and perhaps those who are preparing themselves for a seat in Congress; but can never be handled in this way to any advantage.

A YOUTH.

AUGUSTA, (Georgia) Nov. 21.
On Saturday last, was in the federal Council, for the district of Georgia the trial of Joseph Rivers, Richard Seymour, Jesse Hunt, and Benjamin Putnam, indicted, as mentioned in our last, for fitting out a privateer, under a French Commission, in the port of Savannah. The council on the part of the prisoners were, Messrs. Noll, Walker and Blackburn, and on that of the prosecution, Mr. M. Alders, attorney general of the United States for this district. After a hearing of upwards of ten hours, Judge Pennington told the jury, that he had prepared a charge to give his opinion upon this interesting case; but he had been indisposed, and was too weak to do it; it is fully as intended. He said, the jury ought, in the first place, to consider the nature of the charge as laid in the indictment; and then, if it was proved to be true, whether it was a violation of any known law. The charge against the defendants was, that they, being American citizens, violated the prohibitory laws by treaty between the United States, and England, Prussia, and the United Netherlands, by fitting out a privateer to commit hostilities in a hostile manner, and sending a commission from the republic of France. He then took notice of the evidence produced; and said, that Rivers, though a native of France, had, as appeared in evidence, taken the oath of allegiance to the state of Georgia, several years ago; & done many acts that could only legally be done by a citizen. These acts, said he, of themselves have made him a citizen,

but having taken the oath of allegiance, he constituted himself a citizen. Hunt and Putnam being born in England, and inhabiting in them, were certainly citizens. Seymour having resided only four or five years here, and not having been proved to have taken the oath of allegiance, does not appear to him to be a citizen. The facts of fitting out the vessel in the port of Savannah; arising in a hostile manner, and sailing at sea, under the commission, were confessed by three of the defendants.

There might be some doubts as to the share Dr. Putnam had in this affair; as it depended on several circumstances related by the witnesses, the effect of which it was properly the province of the jury to determine. The charge against therefore to be fully proved as against Rivers and Hunt, if not against Putnam, and it only remained to be ascertained, if it was in violation of any established law. To ascertain this, he said it was necessary to examine the constitution, which was first ground to stand upon; it declares that the treaties then existing, or which might be made, should be the supreme law of the land; and that the judges should be bound by them, any thing in the state laws or constitution, to the contrary notwithstanding. In this case before them, he said, they were having a right to bring in a general verdict of guilty or not guilty, were judges both of the law and the fact, and were bound by the constitution, as judges.

He then turned to the 7th article of the treaty with Great Britain, and the first of the Dutch treaty, which declared they should be a perpetual peace and amity between the respective governments, and between all the citizens and subjects of each; and there was a similar article in the treaty with Prussia.

Here he said, is a plain rule of law, prohibiting and opposing to the citizens of each a peaceful conduct towards the citizens of the other. The treaty constituted this rule to be not only a law, but by way of pre-eminence, a supreme law. Any act of hostility was therefore a violation of this law, and as such, was certainly punishable in the ordinary course of proceedings as a misdemeanour. But it has been said, that the 22d article of the treaty of France being equal a supreme law, and prior in time to others, did authorize the French to fit out their privateers on our coast. He said it certainly was part of the treaty as law as an existing treaty, but was clearly of opinion, it gave us such power. The United States have bound themselves not to permit the enemies of France to do this; but it does not follow, that for that very reason the French are entitled to it. Such an extensive power cannot be claimed by implication, but should be founded on clear, explicit and positive words. But even if such a power was given, still American citizens cannot justify themselves in doing it, in attacking those with whom the United States are bound by treaties of peace and friendship. It would be only a permission to French citizens and could not extend to those of America.

As judge Colthup's opinion varied little in substance from the foregoing, it will be unnecessary, we presume, to give any part of it here.

The jury, after retiring a short time, returned their verdict—NOT GUILTY.

There might be some doubts as to the share Dr. Putnam had in this affair; as it depended on several circumstances related by the witnesses, the effect of which it was properly the province of the jury to determine. The charge against therefore to be fully proved as against Rivers and Hunt, if not against Putnam, and it only remained to be ascertained, if it was in violation of any established law. To ascertain this, he said it was necessary to examine the constitution, which was first ground to stand upon; it declares that the treaties then existing, or which might be made, should be the supreme law of the land; and that the judges should be bound by them, any thing in the state laws or constitution, to the contrary notwithstanding. In this case before them, he said, they were having a right to bring in a general verdict of guilty or not guilty, were judges both of the law and the fact, and were bound by the constitution, as judges.

He then turned to the 7th article of the treaty with Great Britain, and the first of the Dutch treaty, which declared they should be a perpetual peace and amity between the respective governments, and between all the citizens and subjects of each; and there was a similar article in the treaty with Prussia.

Here he said, is a plain rule of law, prohibiting and opposing to the citizens of each a peaceful conduct towards the citizens of the other. The treaty constituted this rule to be not only a law, but by way of pre-eminence, a supreme law. Any act of hostility was therefore a violation of this law, and as such, was certainly punishable in the ordinary course of proceedings as a misdemeanour. But it has been said, that the 22d article of the treaty of France being equal a supreme law, and prior in time to others, did authorize the French to fit out their privateers on our coast. He said it certainly was part of the treaty as law as an existing treaty, but was clearly of opinion, it gave us such power. The United States have bound themselves not to permit the enemies of France to do this; but it does not follow, that for that very reason the French are entitled to it. Such an extensive power cannot be claimed by implication, but should be founded on clear, explicit and positive words. But even if such a power was given, still American citizens cannot justify themselves in doing it, in attacking those with whom the United States are bound by treaties of peace and friendship. It would be only a permission to French citizens and could not extend to those of America.

As judge Colthup's opinion varied little in substance from the foregoing, it will be unnecessary, we presume, to give any part of it here.

The jury, after retiring a short time, returned their verdict—NOT GUILTY.

The following is handed to us as a genuine copy of a copy of a treaty agreed to by the powers therein named. We cannot, however, believe that it is their intention to do more than raise and fall at their own price produce going to France from this country.

Extract of a Convention agreed to between the Kings of Spain and Great Britain, signed at Madrid on the 21st of May, and ratified the 30th July.

ART. V. Their Majesties agree, as the present war most interest all civilized nations, to unite all their efforts in order to prevent that commerce which may not take an active part in said war, from giving, on account of their neutrality, any protection directly or indirectly, either upon the high seas or ports of France, to the French commerce, or any thing that may belong to the subjects of that Power.

ART. VI. All military and naval forces, all wheat, and other grain, all provisions and other, bound to France, shall be seized and condemned for the benefit of the captors, and their Majesties engage to take all other measures in their power to injure the commerce of France and bring them by these means to just conditions of peace.

The above named powers, engage to France's reciprocal treaty of commerce as soon as circumstances shall permit.

ED. DUCOUELLA ALCALDE.
St. HILLAINS.

DIED—In this town, last week, Mr. DAVID BURY.—At Hartford, last Sunday evening, very suddenly, Lieut. ELIZABETH WEBSTER.

to risk their property in American bottoms; but as it is now been alleged by the ministry, conduct mysterious in England, but evident enough here. E. C.

Libert. 15th Oct. 1793.

NORTHAMPTON, Dec. 25.
At Damfries, in the fourth of Scotland, God save the King had been struck up in the Theatre by the musicians a few months ago. Upon this a person in the Pit raised his hat, he was instantly turned out of the house. Next evening a large party of Republicans took possession of the Pit and Boxes. They called for an account of what it began, for an account of what had passed the musicians. The chief amongst the Damfries attempting to quell the disturbance, was treated with as little ceremony as the performers.

The *Laws of Natives* are the supreme laws of the land, and of every civilized country—By those laws, the persons executing the sovereign powers of the nation, has the right to remove all persons in office violating the laws of that nation. *Citizen Duplain*, every one knows, was guilty of violating the laws of the *United States*. The President, being the Executive Representative of all the people of the *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as was the case in France of two Americans, who merely spoke against the measures of the Convention. The crime must be trivial indeed, compared to that of *straying a man of war* from an Executive *United States*, and exercising their sovereign delegated powers, has *strained* him. How can any one with propriety fail the removal of *Duplain* is illegal, unjust or unconstitutional? Had the President exercised the same powers, that the Representatives of some of the people of France do, he would have inflicted on him the pain of death—as