(Continued from second page.)

The fervor of the revolution war had not entirely cooled, nor its controversies ceased, before the sensibilities of our citizens were quickened with a tenfold vivacity by a new and extraordinary subject of irritation. One of the great nations of Europe underwent a change which has astonished all our wonder, and interested all our sympathies. Whatever they did, the zeal of many went with them, and often went to excess. These impressions met with much to inflame, and nothing to restrain them. In our newspapers, in our feasts, and some of our elections, enthusiasm was admitted a merit, a test of patriotism, and that made it contagious. In the opinion of party we could not love or hate enough. I dare to say, in spite of all the obloquy it may provoke, we were extravagant in both. It is my right to avow that passions so impetuous, enthusiasm so wild, could not subsist without disturbing the sober exercise of reason, without putting at risk the peace and precious interests of our country. They were hazarded. I will not exhaust the little breath I have left to say, how much not by whom, or by what means they are refused from the sacrifice. Shall I be called upon to offer my proofs. They are here, they are every where. No one has forgotten the proceedings of 1794. No one has forgotten the conduct of our rivals and the imminent danger of war. The nation thirsted not merely for reparation but vengeance. Suffering such wrongs and agitated by such resentments, wasit in the power of any words of compass, or could any parchment which its fears prompted us to tranquilize the people? It was impossible. Treaties in England are seldom popular, and least of all when the stipulations of amity succeed to the bitterness of hatred. Even the best treaty though nothing be refused, will chask resentment, but not satisfy it. Every treaty is as sure to displeasure extravagant expectations as to disarm extravagant passions. Of the latter, hatred is one that takes no bribes. They who are animated by the spirit of revenge, will not be quieted by the possibility of profit.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If therefore we should enter on the examination of the question of duty and obligation with some feelings of prepossession, I do not hesitate to say, they are such as we ought to have—it is an after enquiry to determine whether they are such as ought finally to be resisted.

The resolution (Mr. Blount's) is less explicit than the constitution. Its patrons should have made it more so, if possible, if they had any doubts or meant the public should entertain none. Is it the sense of that vote, as some have informed, that we claim a right for any caule or no cause at all, but our own foreign will and pleasure, to refuse to execute, and thereby to annul the stipulations of a treaty? That we have nothing to regard but the expediency or inexpediency of the measure, being absolutely free from all obligation by compact to give it our sanction? A doctrine so monstrous, so shameless, is rejected by being avowed. There are no words in the English language in which we can express both confusion and reproach. It would outrage the ignorance of the tenth century to believe, it would battle the credulity of a papal council to vindicate. I venture to say it is impossible. No less impossible that we should desire to affirt the scandalous privilege of being free after we have pledged our honor.

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

It cannot be a treaty, it is not even a bargain and yet we promise—if it is a promise, I am not to read a lecture to shew why an honest man will keep his promise.

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

Will any man affirm, the American nation is engaged by good faith to the British nation, but that engagement is nothing to the honor? Such a doctrine is a coat of mail that would turn the edge of all the weapons of argument, if they were sharper than a sword.—Will it be imagined the king of Great-Britain and the President are mutually bound by the treaty, but the two nations are free?

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

We feel less repugnant to believe that any other body is bound by obligation than our own. There is not a man here who does not say that Great-Britain is bound by treaty. Bring it nearer home. Let the senate bound it full as much as the house and no more. Suppose the Senate, as part of the treaty on Monday, pledges the public faith to do a certain act. Then, in their ordinary capacity as a branch of the legislature, the senate is called on Tuesday to perform that act, for example, an appropriation of money, is the senate bound by a sober obligation? Is it fettered and dishonored, though it should be silent and forgiving, be a revolutionary tribunal, a rack on which their own reflections would stretch them?

This, sir, is a cause, that would be dishonored and betrayed, if I contented myself with appealing only to the understanding. It is too cold; and its sophistry would not flame before the occasion. I desire to thank God, that since he has given me an intellect so fallible, he has impressed upon me an instinct that is sure. On a question of shame and honor, reasoning is sometimes useless, and worse. I feel the decision in my pulse—If it throws no light upon the brain, it kindles a fire at the heart.

(To be resumed or will appear in our next.)

HARTFORD, May 30.

"LAST Thursday morning, departed this life, Deacon JOHN HALL, merchant, of Ellington, in the 558 year of his age.—The circumstances of this worthy citizen's death are truly surprising. He had an apoplex, a gloom over the minds of his numerous friends and acquaintance.

Having been for years exercised in infirmity which has been increasing upon his hands, his constitution had become weakened and his strength impaired. Toward the close of the last summer, his mind became gloomy, and he was prevented the exercise of his reason partially suspended. His spirits however soon revived and his usual cheerfulness in a great measure returned till of late, his infirmities returned with increasing power. In the depth of his late gloom, he has had suggestions of putting a period to his life, against which in his lucid intervals, he strove against with all his might. Gave information of these suggestions to his wife and family, whom he desired to use a proper circumspection, to guard him from a deed his soul abhorred and the thought of which filled him with horror. The morning on which the tragical event took place, he arose as usual, breakfasted with his family, and according to his custom read the scriptures and led in prayer, but was observed to be more gloomy and more feeble than usual; he gave direction to his workmen to shoe his horse, as he was about journeying to Bolton; this he had some time contemplated and at this time doubtless intended; he was now going to bring up a horse (as was supposed) to ride as far as his son Wells's; he went into the entry to take his bridle, the thought now returned to his gloomy mind, and in the moment of unusual and total insanity, suspended himself with the bridle upon a peg of the hair-cole. A few moments absence a neighbor who was immediately sought for him, and his son found him in this lamentable situation, who called for assistance but alas too late! What must be the feelings of his bereaved family let imagination tell.

Jonathan Lyman,

HAS just received a general assortment of European, India, English and West India

GOODS,

and are now ready for sale near the store lately occupied by Arms and Merrill.

Charlemont, June 6. 1796.

Dancing School.

THE Ladies and Gentlemen of Northampton are informed, that the Dancing School will be opened on the second Monday in June, at Mr. *Ashbel Pomeroy's* Assembly-Hall, at three o'clock in the afternoon; the school will be kept two afternoons in each week during the quarter.

The Ladies and Gentlemen of Amherst are also informed the Dancing School will be opened on the third Wednesday in June, at Mr. *Dickinson's* Tavern, formerly kept by Mr. *Gideon Parsons*, at three o'clock in the afternoon; the school will be kept two afternoons in each week during the quarter.

The Ladies and Gentlemen of the adjacent towns are most respectfully invited to attend the Schools, as they are under the excellent Grammer Schools in both towns, that can be attended at the same time. ASAPH STEBBINS.

Northampton, May 8, 1796.

To be sold at public Vendue,

by order of court, on Thursday the seventh day of July next, at nine o'clock P. M. at the dwelling house of Mr. Warner, inholder in Hadley, the real estate of *Phinehas Lyman*, late of Hadley, deceased, consisting of a dwelling house, and about a quarter of an acre of land, on the main street in Hadley, with sundry pieces of land, improved and unimproved. Conditions will be made known at the time and place of sale.

LEMUEL WARNER, *Administrator.*

Hadley, June 2, 1796.

WE the subscribers being appointed by the Hon. Judge of Probate for the county of Hampshire, Commissioners to examine the claim of the creditors to the estate of *Samuel Green*, late of Charlemont, deceased, represented insolvent, ten months being allowed, from the 18 of April last, for the creditors to bring in their claims, hereby notify all concerned, that we shall attend the service of our appointment on the first Tuesday of June and September next, at the house of Col. Simeon Goodman, inholder in Charlemont, from two to six o'clock P. M. of said days.

ABEL WILDER,
JOSHUA HAWES, } *Commissioners.*
STEPHEN BATES,

N. B. All persons indebted to said estate are requested to make immediate payment to

CALVIN RICE, *Administrator.*

Charlemont, June 2, 1796.

New Goods, Fashionable Goods.

SUCH as light, dark and blue ground Calicoes, Striped, Clouded and Plain Muslins, Muslin Cambrics, Dimitts and Tammies, Bandanna Handkerchiefs, Sattins, Mulls, Muslins, Muslinetts, Russ Stockings, Vest Patterns, and Pocket Handkerchiefs, Holland's, Shirtings, Edgings, Ribbons, &c. at reduced prices for pay this summer or by the 18 Oct. next.

Also, for Sale, Sole Leather, Salt, Old and New Rum, Wines, Tea, Flax Seed Cheese and Tallow, for Cash, Butter in hand, or short credit.

SELAH NORTON.

N. B. I expect a speedy settlement of Note and Book Debts contracted last year without farther notice. Also, a general settlement of all accounts by the first of October next, and then make a new beginning if you please, with

S. N.

Ashfield June 6, 1796.

FRESH GOODS.

Pomeroy and Loomis,

HAVE just received and now opening an assortment of English and West India

GOODS,

Also, an assortment of Crockery Ware, at their store a little north of the Meeting-House in Hadley, which they exchange for Flaxseed or any other reasonable term for ready pay, or short credit.

Hadley, June 1, 1796.

To be sold by order of the Court,

at public Vendue, at the house of Robert Ingersol, inholder in Greenwich, on Monday the 4th day of July next, at one o'clock in the afternoon, a farm lying in the fourth parish of Pelham, containing about forty acres of land, all improved except about twenty and pasturing, with an excellent orchard—also, an house and barn thereon. Likewise at the fourth part of Greenwich, a lot of land containing about 10 acres, with house thereon; also a Pew in fourth parish Meeting House, in Greenwich. It being the real estate of John Ferguson, late of Greenwich, deceased—the widow of said deceased will hold the improvement of the dower, which is at Greenwich, during her natural life.

ELIPHAZ EATON, *Administrator.*

Pelham, May 25, 1796.

We the subscribers, being

appointed by the Hon. Judge of Probate, for the county of Hampshire, Commissioners to examine the claims of the creditors, to the estate of *Timothy Hunter*, late of Chesterfield, deceased, represented insolvent; and six months, from the 7th of May last, being allowed for the creditors to bring in their claims—we hereby give notice, that we shall attend the business of our appointment on the first Monday in August and September next, at the house of John Stone, in Chesterfield, from one to five o'clock on said days.

BENJAMIN BATES, } *Commissioners.*
JOHN RUSSELL,

N. B. All persons indebted to said estate are requested to make immediate payment, to

WILLIAM KEITH, *Administrator.*

May 25, 1796.

Henshaw and Hall,

HAVE just received a large quantity of the best English Hoop and Sheet Iron, which they will sell by the ton or less quantity at a very low rate.—Iron, German Steel, 20 l. 10d. 8d. and 4d. Nails, Window Glass, and W. I. Goods as usual.

Northampton, June 1. 1796.

Zacariah Field,

HAS just received from New-York, a general assortment of English, India and Hard-Ware

GOODS:

also an assortment of West India Goods, which he offers for sale at the lowest price for ready pay or short credit.

Ashfield, May 23, 1796.

NEW GOODS,

Just come to hand, at

Joseph Clap, jun'rs

Store in Easthampton, a large assortment of European and India

GOODS,

among which are a variety of Lutestrings, Plain Coloured, Changeable, Striped and Plain, Canton figured, Striped and Plain Sattins, for Ladies Hats, Clouded, Striped, Plain and Twill'd Nankeens, India Sheetings, &c.

Also, a great variety of elegant Crockery and Glass Ware, Pewter, Brass, Iron mongery, Cutlery, Nails, Glass, Powder, Shot, Crofcut Saws, Iron Shovels, &c. &c.

ALSO,

West-India GOODS as usual.

May 18, 1796.

STRAYED or stolen from the pasture of *Cozzens Porter* in *Chesterfield*, May 22, a black horse mare, three years old, black mark'd, black mane and tail. Whoever will return said Mare, or give information where she may be found, shall be well rewarded by

Northampton, June 1. 1796. OLIVER PARSONS.

CASH PAID FOR CLEAN COTTON AND LINEN RAGS.

Hampshire Gazette.

PRINTED AT NORTHAMPTON [MASSACHUSETTS] BY WILLIAM BUTLER.

[—Vol. X.—] WEDNESDAY, June 22, 1796. [—No. 512.—]

(Mr. AMES's SPEECH, concluded from last week's Paper.)

IF it is not easy to deny, it is impossible to doubt, that a treaty impules an obligation on the American nation. It would be childish to consider the President and Senate obliged, and the nation free from the bonds of faith. What is obligation? Perfect or imperfect? If perfect, the debate is brief to a conclusion. If imperfect, how large a part of our faith is pawned? Is half our honor put at risk, and is that half too cheap to be redeemed? How long has this hair splitting fabrication of good faith been discovered, and why has it escaped the researches of the writers on the law of nations? Shall we add a new chapter to that law, or infer this doctrine as a supplement to, or more properly a repeal of the ten commandments?

The principles and the example of the British parliament have been alledged to coincide with the doctrine of those who deny the obligation of the treaty. I have not had the health to make very laborious researches into this subject. I will however fetch my view of it. Several instances have been noticed, but the treaty of Utrecht is the only one that seems to be at all applicable. It has been asserted, that the conduct of parliament, is that celebrated example, affords no faithin to our refusal to carry the treaty into effect. The obligation of the treaty of Utrecht has been underhand to depend on the concurrence of parliament, as a condition to its becoming of force. If that opinion should however appear incorrect, still the precedent proves, not that the treaty of Utrecht wanted obligation, but that parliament disregarded it, a proof, that the authorities of a Representative body, not of the violation of a national engagement. Adjoining still further, that parliament claimed and exercised its power, not as a breach of faith, but as a matter of constitutional right. I reply that the analogy between parliament and congress totally fails. The nature of the British government may require and justify a course of proceeding in respect to treaties, that is unwarrantable here.

The British government is a mixed one. The king, at the head of the army, of the hierarchy, with an ample civil list, hereditary, nonrepudiable, and possessing the prerogative of peace and war, may be properly observed with some jealousy, in respect to the exercise of the treaty-making power. It seems, and perhaps from a spirit of caution on this account, to be their doctrine, that treaties bind the nation, but are not to be regarded by the courts of law, until laws have been passed conformably to them. Our constitution has expressly regulated the matter differently. The concurrence of Parliament is necessary to treaties becoming laws in England—gentlemen say, and here the Senate, representing the States, must concur in treaties.—The constitution and the union of the state make the concurrence of the Senate, as effectual as the sanction of Parliament, and why not? The Senate is an elective body, and the approbation of a majority of the States affords the nation as ample security against the abuse of the treaty-making power, as the British nation can enjoy in the control of Parliament.

Whatever doubt there may be as to the parliamentary doctrine of the obligation of treaties in Great-Britain, (and perhaps there is some) there is none in their books, or their modern practice. Blackstone represents treaties as of the highest obligation, when ratified by the king—and for almost a century, there has been no instance of opposition by Parliament to this doctrine. Their treaties have been uniformly carried into effect, although many have been ratified of a nature most obnoxious to party, and have produced louder clamour than we have lately witnessed. The example of England, therefore, fairly examined, does not warrant a doubt, that we can refuse to execute.

Gentlemen have said with spirit, whatever the true doctrine of our constitution may be, Great-Britain has no right to complain or to dictate an interpretation. The sense of the American nation is to the treaty power, is to be received by all foreign nations. This is very true as a maxim; but the fact is against those who urge it. The sense of the American nation is not as the vote of the house has declared it. Our claim to some agency in giving force and obligation to treaties, is beyond all kind of controversy novel. The sense of the nation is probably against it. The sense of the government certainly is. The President denies it in our constitutional records, and therefore cannot ever accede to our interpretation. The Senate ratified the treaty, and cannot without dishonour adopt it, as I have attempted to shew. Where then do they find the proof that this is the American sense of the treaty-making power, which is to bind the nation to Great-Britain? Is it by a resolve a majority of two or three, or at the most of four or five of this house, will reject the treaty? Is it thus that the sense of our nation is to be recognized? our governments may thus be flopped in its movements—a struggle for power may thus commence, and the event of the conflict may be followed, if the victims of justice could live again, collect together and form a society, they would, however loath, soon find themselves obliged to make justice, that justice under which they fell, the fundamental law of their state. They would perceive it was their interest to make others respect, and they would therefore form per fame respect themselves to the obligations of good faith.

It is painful, I hope it is superfluous, to make even the supposition that America should furnish the occasion of this opprobrium. No, let us not even imagine, that a republican government, formed and corrupted, a government whose original right and whose daily date, time is duty, can, upon solemn debate, make its option to be faithless—can dare to act what despots dare not avow, what our own examples evince, the states of Barbary are unshaken of. No, let me rather make the supposition that Great-Britain refuses to execute the treaty, after we have done every thing to carry it into effect. Is there any language of reproach pungent enough to express your commentary on the fact? What would you say, or rather, what would you not say? Would you not tell them, wherever an Englishman might travel, shame would flick to him—he would disown his country. You would exclaim, England, proud of your wealth, and arrogant in the possession of power—blush for these distinctions, which become the vehicles of your dishonour. Such a nation might trip up, in corruption.—Thou art my father, and to thy worth, I bow as my mother and my sister. We should lay of such a race of men, their name is a heavier burden than their sins.

I can scarcely prefume myself to believe that the candidcitation I have suggested requires the aid of any auxiliary. But, unfortunately, auxiliary arguments are at hand. Five millions of dollars, and probably more, on the score of spoliations committed on our commerce, depend upon the treaty. The treaty offers the only prospect of indemnity. Such redress is promised as the merchants place some confidence in. Will you lose profit and frustrate that hope? Leaving to many families nothing but beggary and despair. "Is it a friendly proceeding to take a vote in this body—it is in the power of one house to call the yeas and nays and reject the treaty. But what is the effect of it? What but this, the very same formula fo loud for redress, finds three champions that even to ask for justice was too mean, and too low, now turn their capricious fury upon the sufferers—and say, by their votes, to them and their families, *No longer eat bread, petitioners go home and starve, we cannot satisfy your wrongs, and our resentments.*

Will you pay the sufferers out of the treasury? No. The answer was given two years ago, and appears on our journals. Will you give them interest, or insure and requital to pay themselves by force? No. That is war. Besides, it would be an opportunity for those who have already lost much to lose more. Will you go to war to average their injury? If you do, the war will leave you no money to indemnify them. If gain should be successful, you will aggravate existing evils—If unsuccessful, your enemy will have no treasure left to give our merchants, the full losses will be confounded with much greater, and be forgotten. At the end of a war there must be a negotiation, which is the very point we have already gained, and which we begin by the first step we take. Confident that the terms of the negotiation after a defolating war, would be more acceptable to another House of Representatives than the present to have us! Members and opinions may be so changed, that the treaty would then be rejected for being too the greatest majority by it should be whether we shall go on making treaties and refusing to execute them, I know not. Of this I am certain, it will be very difficult to exercise the treaty-making power on the new principles with much reputation or advantage to the country.

The refusal of the posts (inevitable if we reject the treaty) is a measure so decisive in its nature, to be neutral in its consequences. From great causes we are to look for great effects. A plain and obvious one will be, the price of the western lands will fall. Settlers will not chose to fix their habitation on a field of battle. Those who talk so much of the interest of the United States, calculate how deeply it will be affected by rejecting the treaty—how will a tract of wild land will almost cease to be property. This loss, let it be observed, will fall upon a fund expressly devoted to sink the national debt. What then are we called upon to do? However the form of the vote may have protectionists of many very respectable principles, our resolution is in substance, and it deserves to wear the title of a resolution to prevent the sale of the western lands and the discharge of the public debt.

Will the tendency to Indian hostility be sufficiently in our view? Experience gives the answer. The frontiers were scourged with war till the negotiation with Great Britain was far advanced, and then the fame of hostility ceased. Perhaps the public agents of both nations were innocent of fomenting the Indian war, and perhaps they are not. We ought just however to expect that neighboring nations, highly irritated against each other, will neglect the friendship of the savages, the traders will gain an influence, and will choke it—and who is ignorant that their passions are easily raised and hardly refrained from violence? Their situation will oblige them to choke between this country and Great Britain, to side with the party that has rejected—They will not be our friends and at the same time the friends of our enemies.

But am I reduced to the necessity of proving this point? Certainly the very men who charged the Indian war on the detention of the posts, will call for no other proof than the recital of their own speeches. It is remembered with what emphasis, in what accuracy, they expatiated on the burden of taxes, & the drain of blood and treasure into the western country, in consequence of Britain's holding the posts. Until the posts are restored, they exclaimed, the treasury and the frontiers must bleed.

If say, again it all these proofs should maintain that the peace with the Indians will be stable without the posts, to them I will urge another reply. From arguments calculated to produce conviction, I will appeal directly to the hearts of those who hear me, and ask whether it is not already pleaded there? I select especially to the convictions of the Western gentlemen whether, supposing no posts and no treaty, the settlers will remain in security? Can they take it upon them to say the Indian hatred never under their circumstances will prove firm? No, sir, it will not be proof, but a sound; it will be no better than a lure to draw victims within the reach of the tomahawk.

On this theme, my emotions are unutterable: If I could find words for them, if my powers bore any proportion to my zeal, I would, fearless, utter such a note of remonstrance, it should reach every log house beyond the mountains. I would say to the inhabitants, wake from your false security. Your chief danger, your most cruel apprehensions are soon to be renewed: the woods, yet unbeaked, are to be rare open again. In the dear time, your path through the woods, will be ambushed. The darkness of midnight will glitter with the blaze of your dwellings. You are a father—the blood of your sons shall fatten on your cornfields.—You are a mother—the war whoop shall wake the sleep of the cradle.

On this subject you need not fear any deception on your feelings. It is a foe full of horror which cannot be overdrawn. If you have nerves in your hearts, they will speak a language compared with which all I have said at can say, will be poor and frigid.

Will it be whispered that the treaty has made one a new champion for the protection of the frontiers? It is known that my voice as well as vote have been uniformly given in conformity with the ideas I have expressed. Protection is the right of the frontiers; it is our duty to give it.

Who will accuse me of wandering out of the subject? Who will say that I exaggerate the tendencies of our measures? Will any one answer by a sneer, that all this is idle preaching? Will any one deny that we are bound, and I would hope to good purpose, by the most solemn functions of duty for the vote we give? are despots alone to be reproached for inflicting indifference to the tears and blood of their subjects? Are republicans unreproachable? have the principles on which you ground the reproach upon cabinets and kings no practical influence, no binding force? are they merely themes of idle declamation, introduced to decorate the morality of a newspaper essay, or well furnish pretty topics of harangue from the windows of that state house? I trust it is neither too presumptuous nor too late to ask, cap you put the dearest interest of society at risk without guilt, and without remorse?

It is vain to utter as an excuse, that public men are not answerable for the evils that may happen to ensue from their measures. Thus is very true, where they are unforeseen or inevitable. Those I have depicted are not unforeseen; they are so far from inevitable, we are going to bring them into being by our vote. We whole the consequences, and, if we fully understand them, we are as far the measure that we know will produce them.

By rejecting the posts, we light the savage fires, we bind the victims. This day we undertake to render account to the widows & orphans whom our decision will make, to the wretches that will be roasted at the stake, to our country, and to God. We are answerable—and if duty be any thing more than a word of impotence, if conscience be not a bugbear, we are preparing to make ourselves as wretched as our country.

There is no mistake in this case, there can be none. Experience has already shown the prophet of events, and the cries of our future victims have already reached us. The western inhabitants are not a feast and uncomplaining sacrifice. The voice of humanity issues from the shade of their wilderness. It exclaims, that while one hand is held up to reject the treaty, the other grasps a tomahawk, or a scalping knife—Imagination, the faculty that creates what exists. It is no great effort of the imagination to conceive that events far near are already begun. I can fancy that I listen to the yells of savage vengeance and the shrieks of torture. Already they seem to fight in the wind; already they mingle with every echo from the mountains.

It is not the part of prudence to be inattentive to the tendencies of measures. Where there is any ground to fear that their tale will be pernicious, wisdom & duty forbid that we should underake them. If we reject the treaty, will our peace be as safe as if we execute it with good faith? I do honor to the intrepid spirit of those who say it will. It was formerly understood to confirm the excellence of a man's faith to believe without evidence and against it.

But as opinions on this article are changed, and we are called to act for our country, it becomes us to explore the dangers that will attend its peace, and to avoid them if we can.

Fewer is here & fewer still in proportion of our confirmants, will doubt that by rejecting, all those dangers will be guaranteed.

Some idea of war is intuitive as a bugbear. This levity is at least unfashionable, and most of all unbecoming those who refuse to it.

Who has forgotten the Philippics of 1794? The cry then was reparation—no envoy—no treaty—no tedious delays. Now it seems the path of honor, of safety, of duty, is to satisfy the Great Britain, say they, will not wage war upon us.

In 1794, it was urged by those who now say no war, that if we built frigates or refitted the piratics of Algiers, we could not expect peace