taken in arms, we may be treated as TRAITORS, and denied the rights of prisoners of war.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

From the Public Advertiser.

The urbanity of the republican party arising from the mildness of its principles has in a greater measure consigned the errors of the preceding administration to oblivion. Federalists calculating upon a forbearance which must appear extraordinary to them, appear to imagine that we have forgotten their extravagance and their misdemeanors. It is much to be wished that some political character who possesses the requisite experience and information, would furnish the people of the United States with a regular detail of our national concerns during the period they were administered by the opposition party. The recent opposition of those people to a *measure which they know to have been necessary*, ought to provoke a full disclosure of their conduct. If I could divert the time from other pursuits, I should be greatly inclined to undertake the task. Permit me at present to give you the following statement:

During an administration of ten years, *the federal administration borrowed near twenty-six millions of dollars*, and such was the low ebb of public credit, or the high statement of ministerial prodigality, that a part was taken up at the exorbitant interest of eight per cent.* a circumstance before unknown in the history of funding.

The following is given as the accurate amount of loans for the respective years:

1789, 1790, 1791	5,203,600
1792	5,028,995 56
1793	1,124,000
1794	4,600,000
1795	3,300,000
1796	320,000
1797	70,000
1798	200,000
1799	5,929,200
	$ 25,775,795 56

By this statement you will perceive there was not a year in which the former administration did not borrow monies. Contrast then its conduct with that of the Jefferson administration. Consider that the latter has not only acquired an immense and valuable territory, and defrayed our national debt, to an amount equal to the sum borrowed by its predecessors, but has also upwards of *thirteen millions of dollars*, in cash, in the *Public Treasury.*

STATISTICUS.

* *Observe, the government under the federalists gave an interest against the laws, which, in an individual, would have been usury.*

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PROPHECIES.

JUST published and for sale at R. C. Weightman's Bookstore.

Illustrations of the Prophecies, by the Rev. Joseph Towers, L. L. D. In two volumes octavo, price 5 $, in boards.

In the course of which are elucidated many predictions which occur in *Isaiah and Daniel*, in the *writings of the Evangelists*, and the *Books of Revelation*; and which are thought to foretel among other great events A REVOLUTION IN FRANCE, favorable to the interests of Mankind, the *overthrow of the Papal power* and of Ecclesiastical Tyranny, the downfall of Civil Despotism and the subsequent melioration of the state of the World.

The trade supplied with the above interesting work on usual terms.

R. C. W. has lately received a few splendid pocket editions of valuable works.

A few copies of Sampson's memoirs.

A supply of Stationary.

Several new plays from New York.

Travelling Secretaries from 11 to 13 $ each.

Patent ball skins, &c. &c.

Oct. 17—6t.

SALE AT AUCTION.

ON Wednesday next, at the Hotel lately occupied by P. D. STELLE, will be sold to the highest bidder, sundry articles of HOUSEHOLD AND KITCHEN FURNITURE. Sale to commence at 10 o'clock, A. M. where the conditions will be made known, by

S. SPEAKE, Auct.

Washington, October 7—2t

☞ *SALE POSTPONED.*

The above Sale is posted until WEDNESDAY the 19th inst. S. S.

PUBLIC SALE.

THE Public are notified that on MONDAY the 24th day of October inst. at RHODES's Tavern, at noon, in *Washington city* Will be exposed to Public Sale, under the direction of James A. Porter, LOTS No. 1 and 2 in Square No. 141, making the south-east corner of that square which is opposite to Dr. Elzey's, containing 8795 square feet—LOT No. 6, in square Square No. 84, adjoining Thomas Taylor, and near the Glass House, containing 5293 square feet, and, LOT No. 20 in Square No. 166, containing 5293 square feet. One eighth only of the purchase money will be required in hand, and the remainder in 1, 2, 3 and 4 years, with interest. Undoubted titles will be given as soon as the payment is completed, or approved paper given.

JOHN TEMPLEMAN.

October 17—4t

WASHINGTON CITY.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 17.

There is nothing which more unequivocally tends to prove the wisdom of the embargo than the almost universal approbation of all our great revolutionary characters. We find it supported by a Langdon, an Adams, a Gerry, a Thomson, a Jefferson, a Page, a Pinckney, and a host of other men whose patriotism in the worst of times was most signally exerted for the salvation of their country. We have looked over the names of the illustrious band of patriots who signed the declaration of independence, and among those who survive, we do not find the name of a single individual who has avowed his disapprobation of this measure, whilst we find the names of several of the most distinguished on the list who have come forward with a decided avowal of its propriety. What can more clearly shew the similitude between our revolutionary contest and our present differences with foreign powers? Have we then so degenerated from the high minded spirit and stern virtue of our forefathers, as to think of submitting in the comparative greatness of our power, when they, in our infancy, disdained the degradation?

This *strong* fact ought to have great weight with that part of the community that trusts to the authority of great names. If we take the opinions of any men for our guide, who are intitled to equal confidence with those illustrious characters who risqued their lives and property in the most awful and unequal conflict that could have been waged by freemen against tyrants? Whose virtue burns brighter? Who dares to claim for themselves higher measures of wisdom? If then they are among the most virtuous and wise of our fellow-citizens, let us now follow the light they set before us, as we have most honorably and profitably followed it in the darkest times this country ever saw. Let us rest satisfied that the same councils which extricated from danger and crowned us with honor will, if supported by the virtue and gratitude of the people, again lead to the same results?

There is one very important consideration, which ought to address itself powerfully to the people of N. York.

If the electoral votes of that state be given to *Mr. Clinton* for President, they must be given to some one else for Vice-President.

As the republicans in the other states will either universally, or for the most part, vote for *Mr. Clinton* as Vice-President, it may follow, owing to New-York not so voting for him, that he will lose the Vice-Presidency, and it may likewise happen that that important station may be filled by a federalist.

If it should happen from this mode of voting that *Mr. Clinton* should be President, & *Mr. King* Vice-President, the U. S. will exhibit the extraordinary spectacle of having its two highest officers from the same state, which the Constitution appears to have viewed with so much jealousy, as to have made the special provision that the electors of the respective states should vote for two persons "of whom one at least shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves."

This, however, will be a very unimportant result, compared with another that will enevitably ensue.

Saying nothing of the weight of the Vice-President in the Senate, which ought not to be lightly estimated, on him will devolve the functions of the President in the event of his "removal from office, of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office." These are the precise terms of the constitution. Now let us briefly notice these several events.

1. "Removal from office." This may be by impeachment. Suppose the federalists should have sufficient strength in Congress successfully to conduct an impeachment against a republican Chief Magistrate, would they hesitate about doing it? Can we ever have a Chief Magistrate, who will more faithfully discharge his duty than Mr. Jefferson has done? And yet is not he threatened with an impeachment by the federalists, even in the impotency of their power? Can there then be a doubt of their actually doing that in its plenitude which they now menace?

For this there will be an additional and most powerful stimulus. In case the President be convicted on an impeachment, on his consequent removal from office, the *federal* Vice-President will assume the reins of government.

The House of Representatives may impeach by a bare majority. Suppose they have this majority, but cannot command two-thirds of the votes of the Senate, which are requisite for a conviction. Suppose they impeach the President. Will not this, pending the trial, produce "an inability to discharge the powers and duties" of his office? If it does, they will devolve on the Vice-President. Should this construction not be considered as a thing of course, then the Congress may, according to the constitution "provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability." I do not say that this would be the legitimate contruction of the constitution but I do think it extremely probable that it would be put upon it by the federalists, had they a bare majority of the two branches of the legislature.

2. "Death." In case of Mr. Clinton's death Mr. King would become President. Now, by consulting the best tables of the chances of life, it will be found that the probability is, that of three individuals of the age of seventy one will die within the period of four years. Supposing then Mr. Clinton to be seventy years of age, there is one chance out of three that he will die during the Presidency. Are the republicans of the U. States willing to incur this great risque? This circumstance very satisfactorily accounts for the impression that is understood to exist, that the federalists, if they cannot carry a man of their own, will prefer Mr. Clinton to either of the other candidates, because they are much younger men.

3. "Resignation." Just in proportion to a man's age is the chance of his resigning a station full of care and trouble, which, it is acknowledged, in times like these requires the most active powers. Here then the chances of the federalists are double; first by Mr. Clinton's advanced years, and secondly by having a Vice-President, on whom, on his resignation, the duties of President will devolve.

4. "Inability to discharge the powers & duties" of President. We mean no reproach on *Governor Clinton*, when we say that generally just in proportion to a man's years, after a certain period of life, becomes his inability to discharge great and important duties. That the chances of such inability in case of his being President are greatly multiplied, there can be no doubt. This, therefore, presents a strong inducement, on the part of the federalists to prefer him to any other republican candidate, and more especially in case by making him President they gain the Vice President. But this is not all. Although there may be no inability in *Mr. Clinton*, during the term for which he is elected, to discharge the duties of his office, may not the federalists allege that there is? Will there not be the strongest motive to allege it, when by substantiating the allegation, they will be able to get rid of him, and thereby make way for their Vice-President? Should they possess a majority in the two houses of Congress, is there not a great probability of their doing so? For, although the constitution does not in express terms vest this power in Congress, yet, in declaring that in the case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the same shall devolve on the Vice-President, a necessary implication is involved of some body or individual being the judge of such event; and who can be this judge besides the Vice-President, or Congress? If both be federal, it is evident, that with a federal Vice-President, the cards will be entirely in their own hands; and that they would under such circumstances play them most dexterously cannot admit of a doubt.

Such are some of the considerations which it behoves the republicans of New York solemnly to weigh; & we are greatly mistaken if they do not involve principles and effects infinitely more momentous than personal gratitude and respect or local partialities.

Col. THOMAS HUNT, of the 1st regiment U. States Infantry, deceased at Belle Fontaine Cantonment, on the Mizami, Tery. Louisiana, on the 18th August, 1808.

Of the biography if this good man, let it suffice for the present to say, that at an early age, when yet a boy, he left his parents, and took up arms in defence of his injured country, offering his life a sacrifice for the reparation, when liberty or death was the watch word, and oppression and tyranny the countersign.

He entered the lists as defender of his country as a private centinel, bearing with patience the innumerable toils and fatigues, under which thousands of his countrymen fell, whose memory are still dear to us. His merit as a soldier, and the uniformity of his general deportment was such, that his promotion progressed through the regular gradations until the peace of eighty-three, when he left the service with the grade of captain, laying down his sword when the cause for which it had been taken up ceased to exist.

We see him after this bloody and unnatural conflict between a parent country and her injured colonies—retire to his small patrimonial retreat, where he espoused the tender and affectionate consort whom he has left behind, agonized by the irreparable loss of her once fond husband, and the tender father of a numerous and infantile offspring. Happy in his retirement, he enjoyed the peace and liberty which he had assisted in procuring for his country, himself and his children. But he had not long remained in this happy situation, until called on again by his country, he obeyed, and entered the service under the command of General Wayne, for the Western expedition; since which he has continued to wear the sword, which he never drew without cause, nor sheathed without honor.

FROM THE AURORA.

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

SIR,

If the dissatisfaction which followed the toast, I gave at the public dinner last week, by many supposed to have been "the President of the United States," but actually "the President and United States of America," had been confined to the company present, I should have considered any blame that might have attached to me, fully removed by the general approbation expressed afterwards of my conduct, but as it has excited much observation, I must request your indulgence, to insert a few lines in justification of myself. I have always considered it to be the duty of a chairman to act with impartiality and propriety, and not to introduce any toast at a public dinner in a clandestine manner. To prove that I had no such intention, the toasts were printed, with a translation, for the information of the vistors, and distributed at the table at which I sat, although I believe they were only partially circulated at the other tables. All the friendly governments, with their respective sovereigns, were given in regular succession; Spain, Portugal, Sweden, Sicily, concluding with America. My situation was a public one, and it was not permitted for me to indulge a private opinion or feeling—a strict impartiality and correct propriety demanded that I should propose, and not omit America, with whom we are in amity and friendship, placing that country on an equal footing with the rest. An American minister is here; we have one in America; a state of peace must therefore be supposed to exist; and it would have been presumption for me, in the chair of so respectable an assembly, and in the presence of his majesty's ministers, to have decided whether the present state of the connexions between the two countries was more or less friendly. Under these circumstances, I must confess that I felt neither doubt or difficulty in referring my conduct to the judgment of very dispassionate person. To accusations of party motives or self interested meanness, I can oppose with confidence a long life passed under the eyes of many who were present, and I flatter myself that its uniform tenor renders it not necessary for me to enter into any further defence.

I am, sir,

Your most ob't servt.

FRANCIS BARING.

Hill-street, Aug. 11.

This letter was published by Sir Francis Baring, in consequence of the scandalous scene acted at the dinner given to the deputies of the Spanish junta of Seville—the *light* which *this occurrence* throws upon the disposition and character of the British ministers, and indeed upon the general hatred and animosity that prevails against the U. S. cannot be without its use.

Very rarely at the festive board in England has animosity or gross indecency appeared: the decencies of life have generally been respected in most instances where there has not been open hostillity; and the tone of ministerial measures has generally outstript the tone of convivial sentiment. But the degeneracy of England every day becomes more manifest, and indicates both the decay of intellect and of virtue.

The hostility manifested towards the *Executive* of the United States, or if Sir F. Baring's sentiment was apparent what is more gross still, towards the "*President and people of the United States,*" is in that tone which their enmity and most inveterate hatred always displays itself towards an open and warring enemy.

Take it in whatever light you may, it indicates—an enmity, rare, extraordinary of character, insolent, and pitiful; the dirty brawls of a British *mob*, hired at half a crown a day to insult a political opponent, or to supply the absence of sentiment in the people, by exhibiting a shew of rejoicing; the cellars of St. Giles's, or the dirty dung-hills of the Tower hamlets, might exhibit such grossness, without surprise, but that that the ministers of England should partake in such orgies & be capable of such vulgar malignity, argues indeed a humiliation of spirit and degradation so low as never before been exhibited.

Was it personal enmity to the President?

If we take it in this point of view—we must enquire why and wherefore? Is it a latent long concealed enmity breaking out in a new place? Is it the declaration of independence or is it the defeat of Hammond and Grenville in the discussions of 1774? Or is it the defeat of Lisbon in 1800? Or is it the defeat of the combined and co-operative attacks of Yrujo and Merry, in 1805? Is it all of these, or must we connect these with the more recent and noble resistance to the outrages and insolence—the violence and brutal barbarity of Berkeley and Humphreys, and the imbecile cajolery of Rose? Was it the triumph of pacific principles, or that pacific warfare, which, instead of murdering the innocent subjects of England, made a more effective war on British revenue, and, by curtailing her commerce, at once taught her the value of our friendship, and the danger of enmity? Was it because the embargo has already established in America manufacturing establishments, which must for ever preserve to America a circulation of *ten millions* of dollars annually, which were before sent to England; but which will now not only remain at home, but form the basis of similar establishments, which will multiply with the encrease of population and consumption—or is it in a single word, because *the statesmen of America* for the last eight years, are the only statesmen of the civilized world, who have not been bullied into *subserviency, corrupted or duped*, by Great-Britain? This is indeed the *true cause*—and for America it is a proud day, when the enmity of the most profligate, corrupt, and imbecile administration, that England or Europe has ever seen, is excited by the talents, and wisdom, and virtue, that preserves America in that peace and security, which was the primitive object of the declaration of independence.

But Sir Francis Baring says the sentiment he gave was the *President & the U. S.*; & Mr. Baring observes "An American minister is here, we have one in America, a state of peace must be therefore supposed to exist." And it appears, nevertheless, that in a company composed of so much of the *best blood*, the *well born*, the *well breed*, and the most *accomplished in liberal acquirements* from their education and station, that among 400 of these, such a scene of riot and indecorum took place and perhaps has never before occurred among any company of men aspiring to the charater of gentlemen.

We have looked at it as addressed to the executive of the U. States. Let us now examine it in the same way as sir F. Baring represents it. Did those who hissed the sentiment, understand him as he wishes to be understood, or as we have above examined it; in the matter as it applies to the hostility to the President, no American can feel any other than a sentiment of increased respect for the man whose *virtues*, *talents*, *wisdom*, and *services* to his country, have drawn upon him the resentment of the worst sort of *English mob*, the *great vulgar*.

Let us then take it in Mr. *Baring's* own point of view. How does it stand with him? Why truly he thinks it very bad, because it was the *President and United States*; the inference is that he would not think it so bad, if it had been the President only! This is the very celebrated, and most opulent sir Francis Baring's opinion.—We cannot forget *John Swanwick*, nor that it was by a conspiracy between this same Baring and *Timothy Pickering*, and their English bloodhound, Porcupine, that poor honest Swanwick was literally *murdered* in the prime of life!

But look at it further—we make no doubt that those who were so clamorous against the *separation* of the *President from the people* a few years ago, will now say sir Francis was wrong; and that it was right now, though it was wrong formerly, to separate the *President from the people*, and for the very reasons that we have above stated, that he has not been the dupe or minion of British corruption.

Yet it is not at all improbable, whatever color Mr. Baring may attempt to give it—that the British ministers present did not at all mistake or separate