

The Kentucky Advertiser.

WINCHESTER, (Kentucky)—Printed by PATTEN & FINNELL.

NUM. 82.]

SATURDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 24, 1816.

[Vol. II.]

CONDITIONS

TWO DOLLARS & FIFTY CENTS, if paid within three months from the time of subscribing, or THREE DOLLARS at the expiration of the year.

No paper will be discontinued until all arrearages have been paid.

Those who do not direct their papers to be discontinued at the end of the year will be considered as engaged for the next.

No subscription will be received for a shorter term than twelve months unless paid in advance.

Subscribers whose papers are sent by private post will be charged 37 cents per annum for postage for those sent 15 miles, and a further proportion.

ADVERTISEMENTS, not exceeding a square, will be inserted for 50 cents the first insertion, and 25 cents for each continuance. Those coming from the country must be accompanied by the CASH, or they will not be attended to.

Letters to the Editors must be post-paid.
From the Religious Remembrancer.

FRANCE.

It is said, that in Paris measures are now taking for organizing no less than five schools on the Lancaster system. Louis XVIII. impressed with a sense of the benefits which France must derive from universal education, has confirmed to M. Martin a building at Paris, to be appropriated as a model school for 400 boys; and at Bordeaux they only wait the return of tranquility to establish a model school, from which masters may be supplied to other towns in the south of France.

POPISH INTOLERANCE.

If we may credit the public papers, the spirit of intolerance has lately mixed itself with the political disturbances on the Continent. We insert, with pain, the following articles from the Times newspaper.

From the Bulletin of Nismes.

"On the 5th of July several domains belonging to Protestants were burned, and on the 6th a still greater number. The steward (Gerisseur) of the estate of Girardin was stretched over a fire. After his death they took him down, and exhibited the body to the passers-by. The 7th, 8th and 9th were more calm days, there were only pillages.—On the 5th, they massacred all the prisoners who were Protestant. A pretended national guard, formed of all the malefactors, and of all the worthless wretches of the environs and the town are accused of these crimes. One of the captains is a person of the name of Toislajon, a sweeper of the streets, who alone has killed fourteen Protestants. They broke open the grave of a young Protestant girl, to throw her into a common receptacle of filth.—Those Protestants whom they do not kill they exile and throw into prison, and yet there were a great number of royalists among them. From the 10th to the 14th July no courier from Paris arrived. On the 16th, the King (Louis XVIII.) was proclaimed by the Urban Guard (composed) of men between 40 and 50 years of age) followed by all the most respectable persons in the town, and the white flag was hoisted. On the 17th, armed bands of brigands, and the national guards of Beaucaire, came to disarm the military, who sustained an assault in the barracks, and they were almost all massacred. Their number amounted to 200.—On the 18th, many peaceable citizens were massacred, many houses pillaged. On the afternoon of that cruel morning, the mad wretches ran about the town, calling out that they wished a second Saint Bartholomew.—On the 19th, the Prefect published a proclamation, recalling the peaceable persons who had quitted the town; he obeyed this order, and a great number were assassinated.—From the 20th to the 29th, the pillages and assassinations did not discontinue.

Those who sought their safety in flight were assassinated on the roads. Some were conducted into prisons, where they are groaning.—On the 29th, the Prefect of the King arrived. The other Prefect, had been named by the royal commissioner.—On the 30th, a Te Deum was chanted. On the 31st, the new Prefect published a very prudent proclamation, but he quitted Nismes.—August 1. M. de Calviere (the person whom the royal commissioner had named) resumed the function of Prefect, 16 Protestants were massacred. They went about, seizing them in their houses, and they cut their throats before their own doors. Many were massacred in the fields. The night between the 1st and 2d was the most cruel. M. de Calviere caused an order to be posted up, which seems to have calmed these pretended royalists.

On the 4th, several country seats were set on fire.

The peaceable citizens, the members of the Urban Guard, have been again forced to flee to save themselves from destruction.

The attorneys (notaries) and the advocates have formed resolutions not to

retain or to receive into their bodies any but Roman Catholics.—Times Sept. 11.
At St. Affrique Protestants had been previously arrested, when, on the 30th of last month, (August) a troop of furies burst the gates of the church, pillaged it, and set on fire.

Times, Sept. 11.

Switzerland.—We lately mentioned the pastoral letter of the Bishop of Ghent, in which he lays it on the consciences of his spiritual flock, not to assent to a liberal principle of politics, which aims at universal toleration: a similar spirit is busy in other parts of Europe, which does not seem to us to augur much good. At Coire, in the Grisons, Dr. Mirer, the Professor of Law in the school of the Canton, was obliged to stop in the middle of a course, and leave his residence in the Bishop's Court, because the pious priest thought it improper that Dr. Mirer, being a Catholic Priest, should instruct an audience composed of pupils of different persuasions.

In the same spirit, the Bishop of Lausanne, on being applied to by the Catholic Priest of Friburg, would not allow the body of a child six years of age, the son of a Protestant merchant, to be buried, unless it were done in the night. The merchant preferred sending the corpse of his son to the burying ground of a Protestant community three leagues off. If what has happened at Ghent, Coire, and Friburg, had passed in Spain, it would be considered as a thing of course; but that such shameful events should pass in the Netherlands and Switzerland, where Maurice of Orange and Ulrich of Zuingli once contended so manfully for freedom of conscience and reason, is an afflicting phenomenon for the friends of humanity."

Times, Sept. 12.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

COMMERCIAL TREATY.

The House in committee of the whole, on the bill for regulating commerce in conformity to the Convention of Commerce with Great Britain, &c.

The committee being about to rise—

Mr. CLAY, (Speaker) said he did not rise on this occasion to enter into a discussion of the general merits of the instrument brought incidentally before the house by the present bill, particularly as there appeared to be no wish on any side of the house to enter on that subject. He rose to make some explanations relative to the third article of the Convention, which opens the trade to the British East Indies, restricted us to certain enumerated ports. This was a restriction not contained in the Treaty of 1794, nor in that negotiated by Messrs. Monroe and Pinkney, commonly called the rejected treaty.—

The reason was, that upon the expiration of the Charter of the East India Company, which took place three or four years ago, the question so long agitated in Great Britain, had again come up, whether the monopoly of the trade to India should remain with the Company, as it had done. On that occasion, it had been thought proper by the British government to deviate to a certain extent from its former policy, and open the trade to British subjects generally under some restrictions. By the act which then passed, the British subjects were limited to these specified ports; and it had been thought right by Great Britain, especially as it was in her opinion a grant to us without an equivalent, to limit our citizens to the same ports. The act of Parliament, Mr. C. said, was a new era in the trade to British India; and it was impossible to estimate the value of the concession to us, without taking into consideration that important change. When the trade was wholly in the hands of the Company, they had been found incompetent to supply India with the specie necessary for circulation; and the trade had been opened to us and other foreign powers to make up the deficit.—

Now that British subjects were let into the Trade, it remained to be ascertained by experience whether they could not furnish the requisite supply of specie, without the aid of foreigners. If they could, the opening of the trade to foreign powers operates as an advantage in their favor and to the prejudice of the British merchant, to the whole amount of the profits derived by such foreign powers. These suggestions Mr. C. said he had thought proper to make to the committee, inasmuch as some gentlemen might not have adverted to the change of the laws by which that trade was regulated.

Mr. GASTON said, that believing the convention since its ratification in due form had become a law of the land, and unable to perceive wherein it needed the help of an act of Congress to give it operation, he had viewed the

bill before the committee as nugatory and unmeaning. Although he had thought it strange that gentlemen who had abjured so many of the errors of their predecessors, should thus, by construction, retain and perhaps extend a most inconvenient error in regard to the effect of treaties; he was willing without interruption on his part, to indulge them in their course. But regarding himself as having no agency in relation to this convention, he had not entertained the most remote thought of examining into its merits or demerits.—He was induced, however, to say a word in relation to the 3d article of the convention, in consequence of the observations made on it by the honorable Speaker. This gentleman had stated, with a view to form an estimate of the value of the limited East India trade therein conceded as compared with the more general grant on the same subject in the treaty of Mr. Jay, that, subsequent to the date of that treaty, Great Britain had opened this trade to her own subjects not of the East India Company, and therefore needed not so much the assistance of foreign merchants to bring supplies of bullion.—

If this formed an item for raising the value of the concession, it was proper to state another fact which would go to the opposite side of the account and serve to adjust the balance. Since Mr. Jay's treaty (he believed in 1797) the British parliament had opened this same trade to the subjects of all friendly foreign powers, and to this day without treaty it remained open to them all—the fact was that the British East India possessions were valuable more for revenue than commerce. This revenue required a free importation of bullion from whatever quarter it could be had, and a free exportation, of their commodities to foreign countries—it was besides desirable that this exportation should be made to distant regions where they were not likely to come into direct competition with the manufactures of the parent kingdom.

Whether the East India trade was at all desirable to this country, was a question on which enlightened statesmen greatly differed; our table was groaning under the weight of petitions for prohibiting the great mass of importations from that quarter, and there had been a long and loud complaint against the perpetual drain of specie to it. However this might be, it was very certain that the only concession made by the 3d article was of a trade already open to us by a general law, and which was so desirable to them that they might find it their interest to pay us a bounty not to abandon it. Great Britain and her rulers well understood the spirit of traffic, and we might rely on it they had not in this instance given us a "quid" without a "quo" in return for it.

Mr. Clay said, that the gentleman from North Carolina and himself were at issue on the fact. Mr. C. denied that the trade to the British East Indies was open to us by act of Parliament.—By the regulations of the local authority of those countries the trade might be open to us; but the difference between such regulations and the stipulations of a treaty was, that if there were any value in the trade to the British East India possessions, the treaty stipulation prevents us from being deprived of it by a repeal of those regulations during the continuance of the Treaty. The benefit of the trade itself was another question; if not beneficial, the Treaty did not force it on us. Mr. C. added, that he was not disposed to enter into a discussion of the treaty-making power. It might be sufficient for him to say, that at the worst, according to the opinions of gentlemen on the other side, the act would be harmless; whilst in the opinion of gentlemen on this side, it was entirely necessary.

Mr. GASTON rejoined a few words, rather in acquiescence in the idea of this bill being harmless. As to the East India trade, he said, it was not to be presumed, that the trade which the government of Great Britain held out to every foreign power without an equivalent, could itself be of any great use. As to the stipulation on this head in the treaty supposed to be so favorable to us, Mr. G. said, that Great Britain was not in the habit of giving advantages without equivalents.

In reply to a previous remark of Mr. Gaston, that it was entirely an error to suppose a law necessary to give effect to a treaty, which, being the supreme law of the land, is paramount to existing laws—

Mr. FORSYTH said he had no disposition to enter into the discussion of this question; but it might be necessary that he should say that the passage of this bill was not merely harmless but indispensable; because the power of legislation was vested in Congress, and could be exercised by no other author-

ity. This doctrine was not only correct and constitutional, but had been acted on by all administrations and in all times. The provisions of the treaty being general, it was, independent of the general question of the effect of a treaty on existing laws, necessary to declare in what manner the act should be carried into effect, &c.

Some further observations passed on this subject between Mr. Gaston and Mr. Forsyth, but being afterwards more amply stated by them in debate, are omitted in this place.

The committee having risen and reported the bill and amendments—an objection was made by Mr. Milnor to an amendment going to limit the operation in the bill to British vessels coming directly from the British territories in Europe. On this question, some debate took place.—Mr. Forsyth contending, though he considered the amendment as of no great importance, that it was according to the letter and spirit of the treaty.

On motion of Mr. Milnor, the house adjourned without deciding this question.

Remarks of Mr. WRIGHT, on the proposition of the committee of ways and means to continue the additional duties, in the House of Representatives.

Mr. WRIGHT.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind the house, that we are legislating for the nation, and not for merchants and manufacturers exclusively, and that the good of the whole ought to be pole star to guide us. I hope the time proposed for the extension of the double duties will not obtain, but the seventeenth of February next, the time fixed by the provisions of the law, which does not only fix the time to one year after the termination of the year, but expressly declares it shall continue "no longer," whereby the faith of the nation has been pledged to the American people, that double duties shall then cease. There is no doubt a portion of the people near the Canada line, who have been engaged in smuggling, who would make it perpetual and thereby pocket the double duties; as the great inundation of tincoats during the war, filled with goods from Canada, will attest. But I should hope that honorable gentlemen on this floor, would not countenance the continuance of so impious a practice.—The merchants of Boston, with the highly respectable Mr. William Gray at their head, petition for the discontinuance of the double duties on the seventeenth of February, agreeably to the pledged faith of the nation, as they had directed their importations so that they might arrive after the expiration of the law imposing them. Sir, I am prepared to adopt a sound corrected tariff of duties, but not prepared to continue, one hour, the double duties in violation of the nation's faith. Sir, permit me here to present briefly my objections to the system of taxes now proposed; I wish therefore to be permitted to call gentlemen back to the year 1795, when the public debt amounted to 70 millions, and when, under General Washington's administration, it was provided by the sinking fund, to sink the debt in twenty eight years; then, sir, twenty-eight years was thought a convenient time to sink 70 millions—but now sir, after a glorious war, which has greatly distressed the American people, especially when the enemy passed them, and I can speak from experience—for Kent Island, twenty-one miles by seven a part of the county where I reside, was a long time in their possession, and our militia were constantly out; nor was the Western shore less oppressed, as my colleague General Stuart can attest—we are called on to pay on the heels of the war, 120 millions in twelve years—Sir, have we forgot quasi war, and the taxes imposed for its prosecution—and the consequences; I hope not; and I hope neither we or the nation will ever forget, that at the commencement of Mr. Jefferson's republican administration, we repealed all the internal taxes as unnecessary, unless some onward circumstance should occur—such as war. We then dismissed the sixteen midnight Judges as they were called—Gentlemen well recollect my devotion to the prosecution of the war, and my readiness to impose the necessary taxes for the purpose; but above all, the readiness of the people to pay those taxes; and that they had covered the nation with glory and themselves with imperishable laurels, so as justly to claim at our hands as much indulgence as had been granted the people under Washington's administration. If then 28 years was allowed for the payment of seventy millions can it now be just to compel our people to pay 120 millions in twelve years, the time proposed by the plan before

us? Sir, we can after the establishment of a correct tariff of duties, dismiss the internal taxes as well now as in 1812, and in my judgement with the same propriety; and it is now necessary for the ease of the people—Sir, the public debt in 1812, when compared with the revenue of that day, and the demands of the Treasury, was as great as it is now, when compared with the increased population and the consequent increase of the Revenue, from imposts and tonnage; and the value of the public lands, and the surplus revenue arising from those sources, will effect a sinking fund sufficient to sink the present debt of 120 millions as rapidly as the debt of 70 millions was provided to be sunk in 1795, I therefore invoke gentlemen to consider well the measures now under consideration, and not act a hasty or imprudent part; although I never considered a national debt a national blessing, I cannot consent to its extinguishment by oppression.

Kentucky Legislature.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, FEB 5, 1816.

TRANSYLVANIA UNIVERSITY.

A petition from the reverend R. H. Bishop was presented, in which he prayed that he might be permitted to produce testimony to disprove that on which the report of the committee was founded; and a motion was made to refer his petition to the committee of the whole, which after considerable discussion was negatived. We had not an opportunity to hear the petition, nor the whole of the debate on the subject. While it was under discussion, Mr. Rowan presented a paper which he said was just handed to him by the Rev. Mr. M'Chord, the agent of the board of trustees.—On assuring the speaker, that the paper was an official document, and that it respected the subject before the house, he was allowed to hand it to the clerk to be read. It proved to be a memorial from the board of trustees in which they arraign in disrespectful terms the report of the committee of enquiry, and demanded to be heard at the bar of the house. After the petition of Mr. Bishop was disposed of, Mr. Rowan offered a resolution, that the board of trustees be permitted to be heard on the subject of their memorial at the bar of the house. This resolution was advocated by Messrs. Patton, Letcher, Rowan and Emerson, and opposed by Messrs. Mills, Allan, &c. On the one hand it was insisted, that the trustees ought not to be condemned and turned out of office without being heard—on the other, it was replied, that they had been amply heard already—that they had given the committee a long report, which had been read in the house; and that no witnesses had been examined on the subject, but those named by themselves. As the memorial was expressed in disrespectful terms, Mr. Marshall moved to amend the resolution to read thus—that the trustees be summoned to appear at the bar of the house and shew cause, if any they have, why they shall not be turned out of office. The offensive memorial would thus be left out of view. A motion was made by Mr. Blackburn, to postpone the further consideration of the resolution for the present. After some debate this motion was withdrawn, and Mr. Rowan again moved an amendment to the resolution, which brought it back to its first shape. Mr. Blackburn again moved to postpone it—Mr. Payne moved to amend the motion, by adding the first of March.—The question being divided, the house first determined by yeas and nays, to postpone it, 40 to 31—and then by yeas and nays, that the postponement should go to the first of March, ayes 37 noes 37—the speaker voting in the affirmative. Several gentlemen beside those named above, took a part in the debate. We were particularly impressed by the arguments of Mr. W. Thompson. He viewed the subject before the house, as a question of policy, whether the institution should be reformed; and not as a criminal prosecution against the trustees. He said, it would have been equally as proper for the assistant judges to have demanded to be heard at the bar of the house in their own behalf, when the circuit court bill was under discussion, as for the trustees to demand it in the present case. He said it was universally acknowledged, that the University had dwindled into a state of insignificance; and that he thought was all which it was material for the house to know—the question then was, whether we should reform it; and he did not conceive that the trustees should be admitted into the house by their agent or counsel, to discuss this question of legislative policy.

A considerable quantity of other