

[XXXVth Year.]

THE

[No. 1729.]

MARYLAND GAZETTE.

FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1780.

For the MARYLAND GAZETTE.
NUMBER XXVIII.

FRANCE was first moved with the evils of the war, and, in 1758, she acquainted England with her pacific intentions, by the minister of Denmark; but her adversary had conceived hopes proportionable to her success, and rejected all accommodation. When, the following year, in concert with the king of Prussia, she sent, to the ministers of France, of Vienna, and of Russia, at the Hague, a declaration, by which she seemed to desire the opening of a congress to treat of peace; candour must confess, that it was with a view to relieve herself from the charge of obduracy, in continuing the war. Peace was not seriously thought of until 1761. France made a declaration the 18th of March, which was sent to the court of London, and by which it was proposed to open a congress. The duke de Choiseul addressed a particular memorial to the minister of England, and proposed to initiate a particular negotiation to settle the debates that had arisen between France and that kingdom, relative to their possessions in North-America, and which were the ground of the war.

An answer was remitted to this memorial, and articles of accommodation began to be sketched out by both courts. Several memorials passed between them, in which great consideration, and an anxious desire of peace, on the part of France, were extremely visible. The principal difficulty in the way at present took its rise from a demand of the court of Britain, that France should not introduce the disputes between Spain and Britain, relative to the fisheries of Newfoundland, or the British establishments on the bay of Honduras, or expect that these should be included in the terms of a pacification. It would be difficult, in this case, to justify the proceeding of the English court. There was no reason that this court should be offended with the proposal that the court of Madrid should be a guarantee of the treaty. And still less reason was there to look upon it as a proof of the bad faith of France, that she was willing to prevent a rupture between Spain, who was her ally, and the court of England. If, on the contrary, she had not really desired a lasting peace, is it not evident, that so far from being willing to see accommodated the differences between these powers, she would have chosen that they should remain a seed of division, for a future day, when she might have it in her power to renew the war and carry it on with greater advantage than at present?

If France had been in a situation to give laws to her enemies, it might have been a reproach against her, that she abused her advantages in war or of an ally, and embarrassed the negotiation by things foreign to the peace. But even in this case, she would only have consulted the good of mankind, and would have followed the dictates of a just foresight and clear policy. Why should the court of England take it amiss, that France was willing to institute a negotiation in favour of Spain, seeing she was not in a situation to dictate imperiously what should be the terms? It must be confessed, that in our prospect we were not able to resist the vices which accompany it. An unlimited ambition is, since the birth of society, the rock on which the strength of mighty kingdoms and great states breaks itself. Without doubt England was willing, that after an accommodation with France, the debates with Spain should be left, which she would afterwards settle to her own satisfaction, leaving then to do but with one power, who without allies, was weak, and unable to defend herself.

It will not be necessary here to make mention of the various proposals, and advances on the part of the one kingdom, and the obstinacy and the haughtiness inspired by continual success on the part of the other. It was still demanded on the part of England, that France should neglect the interests of her ally in the accommodation. It must be confessed, that it was above the power of human wisdom to reconcile the two nations on this important point. It is a situation the most destructive to which a state of the first rank can be reduced by the evils of war, to see herself

constrained to destroy the credit of her friendship, in abandoning her allies. What would Europe have said, if England, in the midst of her success, had been capable of betraying the confidence of her allies? The conquests, and vast dominions which she acquired in America, would not have indemnified her for the hatred and contempt which a conduct of this nature must have inspired. A people may lose battles, and cede provinces, without weakening themselves; but honour is the firmest, or rather the only rampart of states. If the evils consequent on war could authorize the violation of engagements, what would become of the religion of treaties? What profit would be drawn from alliances? These are contracted with a view to gain friends, who may assist in our adverse state of affairs. How then shall adversity be an excuse for breaking off from such engagements? Nevertheless the court of England still continued to insist upon it, and the consequence was a more close union between the branches of the house of Bourbon in the family compact, which was entered into August 14, 1761.

The war, from this time was carried on by the joint forces of France and Spain, and it circumstances favourable to the tranquillity of Europe had not permitted, that a negotiation should once more be set on foot, it is probable that England, embarrassed with the friendship and protection of Portugal, would have found in her allies, in support of this ally a counter-balance for her successes elsewhere. But a negotiation was again set on foot in 1762; of which what had been agreed upon in the former stipulations should serve as a basis. Pitt was no longer at the head of the British governments. His name will be famous and respected in every nation of Europe while the world lasts. Nevertheless, moderation and the love of peace were not his qualities; and though he disapproved of the peace which was concluded under his successor, yet posterity will do this successor, bad as he is, the justice to say, that in this instance he did what was reasonable, and for the real interests of the contending nations. The treaty of Paris put an end to the evils of war, February 10, 1763.

The view we have taken of the contents of Europe, for the last and the present centuries, in which England has had a principal share, will serve to give a just idea of the character and conduct of those powers whom we have been heretofore led to consider as the aggressors in all wars. We ourselves having felt the restless spirit of the British nation, and the ambition of her princes, in their views of extensive dominion, are in a disposition to learn the truth. Perhaps we shall find, looking back to the reign of the first Edward, that there never has been a more injured people than the French nation; liable continually to the incursions of those fierce islanders whose possessions on the continent until the reign of Henry VII. gave them an easy access to the territories of their more peaceful neighbour, and whose situation within the four seas, rendered reprisals, at all times, extremely difficult. With regard to the late princes, and especially the Georges, whom we have been heretofore led to consider as the great guardians of the protestant succession, and of liberty in England, we shall find that the support of the former was indirect and unintended, and that the latter owes little to them. On the contrary, it has been the invariable system of every one of the Hanoverian princes, to turn to advantage the goodwills and fears of the people relative to a popish succession, and, under pretence of providing against it, to encroach on those liberties which by free states have been deemed invaluable. Nothing new of this nature being left to be attempted in England, we on this continent have felt the increased movement of that ambition, and now I presume, we will not be averse from believing what Mrs. Macaulay has told us in her late letters on the history of England, and with which I shall conclude these observations. Speaking of James I. and the ridiculous and over-cautious timidity of that prince, yet, considering the ruinous system which has followed down to the present era of the war against America, we cannot help expressing a wish, "that the successors of this so-

lomon of the English nation had possessed the pacific disposition of their great founder."

THE HONEST POLITICIAN.

For the MARYLAND GAZETTE.

HAVING proved, I hope, to the entire conviction of my readers, the injustice of confiscating private British property in this state, within our power; and that the law or practice of civilized nations will not justify the confiscation of the property of the innocent and inoffensive subjects of Great-Britain; and having clearly refuted the principle, on which the delegates originated their bill for confiscation, "that all British subjects, by the declaration of independence, became *aliens* to this state;" and having evinced, by the common law of England (by which only the question, what British subjects are aliens to this country; can be ascertained and determined) that "all the British and Americans, born before the declaration of independence, are *not* aliens, either in Great-Britain or in this state, but that they may inherit in the several countries, as the *natural-born subjects* of both, and may sue in the respective courts of either to recover their debts or lands, if withheld from them; and that only those born in the respective countries since the declaration of independence, are aliens in the respective nations; I shall proceed to make such further remarks and observations as appear to me pertinent to the subject, and to shew the impolicy and imprudence of the leading members of the house of delegates, in urging the senate to give their assent to an act so manifestly unjust, contrary to the law of nations, our common law, and the principles of our constitution.

I think it was the duty of our general assembly to comply with the requisition of congress, to raise the 14,220,000 dollars in nine months, and to make the monthly payment of 1,580,000 dollars from the last of this month until the first of October inclusive. I esteem a requisition of congress as binding and obligatory on all the states in the union. Congress alone is, and ought to be the judge of the number of men, or the sums of money, necessary to carry on the war. If one state may refuse or delay to raise its proportion of the supplies required, another may do the same, and by such conduct endanger the safety of the whole. In truth, the state which omits, from any cause, but inability, breaks its public faith and slighted honour. I am far from thinking it was imprudent or impracticable to raise the whole sum by a tax and assessment on property; I conceive it would have been wise in our delegates to have laid the tax, and that the people could have paid it with great ease and convenience. I agree with the Senator, who hath expressed himself with great modesty, that it does not become an individual to determine this question, contrary to the assertion of the delegates, but yet I hope, one of the people, who is to pay his proportion of the tax, may be indulged to differ from them in sentiment, and to assign his reasons for his opinion. There ever has been, and always will be a small part of the community, to whom taxes will be disagreeable and burthensome. The true question is, whether the people, in general, are not in circumstances to pay a tax sufficient to raise the sum required by congress. The house of delegates declared, "they were under the strongest impressions of the propriety, the necessity of raising the sum required by congress; to prevent further emissions; to support the credit and value of our paper money; and to enable congress to carry on the war;" and they seemed to be apprehensive of great and fatal consequences, if the supplies were not raised. Though I see but little force in any of the reasons urged by the delegates, except the last (to enable congress to defray the current expences of the war) yet as they appeared solid and substantial to them, it ought to have induced them the more to exert their every endeavour to raise the money.

The delegates allege that the monthly tax, to raise our whole quota of 14,220,000 dollars, would be £. 3 on every £. 100 of property; that this in the nine months would be £. 27; and that the expences of our government, for the current year, would require a further tax of 30/ on every £. 100. The whole tax therefore in the year would

* But.