

The highest praise is due to the industrial exertions and efficient dispositions of the Committee of Arrangements which consisted of the following gentlemen—Gen. Thomas H. Perkins, Hon. Peter G. Brooks, Hon. John H. Daniel, Daniel Sargent, Hon. Arthur Ward, Col. John T. Anthony, Wm. Sullivan, Esq. Nath. Gooden, Esq. J. P. Davis, Esq.—The entire satisfaction and delight which was visible in every countenance must have been their "great reward."

The arrangements of the *Mirror* at the Chapel, devised on Col. H. S. Warner. The public may best measure its obligations to him, and to the committee who assisted him, by the perfection to which that department attained.

LITERARY.

PAINE'S WORKS.

[The following selection is from the *ANALYTIC READER*, a publication in a high degree creditable to the literature of our country. It is compiled by WASHINGTON IRVING, Esq., a gentleman who is supposed to have been one of the chief contributors to the "Salmagundi," and at least the editor of "Kuchelbucker's History of New-York." We extract solely that portion of the review which treats of Mr. Paine's character as a poet. We are Americans, and feel a deep interest in whatever contributes to the reputation of our country. We therefore prize—highly prize, the memory of our distinguished townsman. Still we think that injudicious zeal and misplaced admiration will but injure the cause they seek to serve; and that it is much better, by a temperate estimation of the merits of our countrymen and contemporaries, to anticipate the unbiased judgment of other nations, and of future ages, than to usurp for them ere they have earned glory which are unearned, and will assuredly be relinquished. No effort would avail to prove that America has yet produced a great poet, and the attempt would only serve to excite our unbecoming taste and bad discernment.—Ed. Mass.]

"We come now to the most ungracious part of our undertaking; that of considering the literary character of the deceased. This is rendered the more delicate, from the excessive eulogiums passed on him, in the enthusiasm of friendship, by his biographers, and which make us despair of yielding any praise that can approach to their ideas of his deserts.

We are told that Dryden was Mr. P.'s favorite author, and in some measure his prototype; but he appears to have admired, rather than to have studied him. Like all those writers who take up some particular author as a model, a degree of bigotry has entered into his devotion, which made him blind to the faults of his original; or, rather, these faults became beauties in his eyes. Such, for instance, is that propensity to far-fought allusions, and forced conceits. Had he studied Dryden in connexion with the literature of his day, contrasting him with the poets who preceded him, and those who were his contemporaries—Mr. P. would have discovered that these were faults which Dryden reproached himself. They were the lingering traces of a taste which he was himself endeavoring to abolish. Dryden was a great reformer of English poetry; not merely by improving the versification, and taming the rude roughness of the language into smoothness and harmony; but by abolishing from it those incredible and extravagant combinations, which had been the pride and study of the old school. Thus struggling to cure others and himself of these excesses, it is not surprising that some of them still lurked about his writings; it is rather a matter of surprise, that the number should be so inconsiderable.

These, however, seem to have caught the elegant and ill-regulated imagination of Mr. Paine, and to have given a tincture to the whole current of his writings. We find him continually aiming at fine thoughts, fine figures, and epigrammatic point. The centre that Johnson passes on his great prototype, may be applied with tenfold justice to him: "His delight was in wild and daring sallies of sentiment—in the irregular and eccentric violence of wit. He d light, and to tread upon the brink of meaning, where light and darkness begin to mingle; to approach the precipice of absurdity, and hover over the abyss of unlearned vacancy." His verses are often so distorted with embellishments, that the subject matter is lost in the ornament—the idea is confused by the illustration; or rather, instead of one plain, distinct idea being presented to the mind, we are bewildered with a score of similitudes—such, for instance, is the case with the following passage, taken at random, and which is intended to be descriptive of misery:

"A hark! hark! pale lips their glimmering soul:
A hark! hark! warm the winter of the pole:
A hark! and cheerless solitude purified,
No sign of a virtue flows the ice of mind.
A hark! a hark! blood, in forty six canisters flow,
And freeze with life, as distance weep in snow,
Like north that bear their dangerous on their backs,
And shut on Babel to save a window bay!"

His lines and illustrations are often striking and beautiful, but too often far-fetched and extravagant. He had always plenty at command, and, indeed, every thought that he conceived drew after it a cluster of similes. Among these he either has used the talent to discriminate, or the selfishness to discard. Every thing that entered his mind was transferred to his page, to be followed by a simile, illustration was heaped on illustration, ornament overlaid ornament, until what at first promised to be beautiful, ended in being lawdry.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

The Army announces the following Army appointments by the President:—
Abraham G. Harding, Esq. Q. M. General.
William B. Allen, a Post at Adjutant General.
James Patton, of New York, Adj. at General.
Nicholas Gray, Inspector General.
Thomas H. Stanton, Ass. Adjutant General.
John C. Phillips, Ass. Inspector General.
Everet Banker, Junr., Advocate.

The Approaching Election!

WHICH INVOLVES THE RIGHTS, THE INTERESTS, AND PERHAPS THE EXISTENCE OF THE STATE!

Countrymen!

YOU must not count on security, unless your exertions are such as to merit it. Every species of intrigue and deception will be used to defeat your well meant endeavours; but your fellow-citizens of the Metropolis depend on your zeal and fidelity.—You saved the State from ignominy the last year; and may now rescue it from misery and ruin. Let it then be proclaimed throughout every District, that it is expected

"EVERY MAN WILL DO HIS DUTY;" and that when the Polls shall be opened on Monday next, that the PEACE and COMMERCE TICKET, bears the revered names of

CALEB STRONG,
FOR GOVERNOR—AND
WILLIAM PHILLIPS,
FOR LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.

COMMUNICATIONS.

MESSRS. EDITORS,

GENTLEMEN—I have just received the copies, for this town, of the Report of the Committee on Impressments. By an error of the press, page 10, it may be supposed that of the merchants' cases, two American seamen, instead of one, remained unaccounted for. From the original minutes of the committee, in my possession, I find that of the twelve Americans impressed, nine were discharged, and two escaped—leaving one only detained agreeably to the result stated in the report.

For the further satisfaction of the public on this very important subject, I request you to publish the following Table, which exhibits, at one view, all the cases of impressment by the British, contained in the depositions of the merchants referred to.

A TABLE.

Exhibiting the Result of Impressments by the British, from the Testimony of the Merchants examined by the Committee on Impressments, appointed by the House of Representatives of Massachusetts:—

Witnesses Names and Residence.	No. of Seamen actually employed by the body.	Whole number of Seamen captured and from their vessels.	Of which were Foreigners.	Americans.	Whole number discharged.	Number of Americans still detained.
Eben Parsons, Boston,	150	5	3	2	3	0
William Parsons, do.	50	1	1	0	0	1
Caleb Loring, do.	40	1	0	1	0	0
John Holland, do.	30	1	0	1	1	0
William Gray, do.	300	2	0	2	2	0
Theodore Lyman, do.	100	2	2	0	0	0
J & T. H. Perkins, do.	150	3	3	0	0	0
Israel Thomdike, do.	200	7	7	0	1	0
Wm. Sturgis, do.	70	3	2	1	1	0
Joseph Peabody, Salem,	150	2	1	1	2	0
Wm. Orne, do.	60	2	2	0	1	0
Nath. Hooper, Marblehead,	50	0	0	0	0	0
B. T. Reed, do.	65	1	1	0	1	0
Matthew Brinlee, Charlestown,	25	1	0	1	1	0
B. Hedge, junr., Plymouth,	60	1	0	1	1	0
Jos. Moody, Kennebunk,	45	0	0	0	0	0
Otis Little, Castine,	15	2	0	2	2	0
	1500	35	23	12	16	1

From the foregoing evidence results this very important fact, that for every two thousand seamen employed by these merchants, for the period of fifteen years, but one American and two Foreigners have been impressed by the English.

The names (as far as can be ascertained) of the twelve Americans impressed, and the circumstances of their impressment, are as follows, to wit:—

- 1—*Ebenezer Gorham*, of Barnstable—had no Protection, and was released three or four months after his impressment, and has returned.
- 2—*Thomas Thacher*, of Yarmouth—had out grown his Protection, and was immediately discharged on a new Protection being sent out.
- 3—*An American*—taken from the *Hugh Johnson* at Palermo; not known if he had a Protection; had not been applied for, and supposed to be still detained abroad.
- 4—*Oliver Blood*, of Roxbury—had no Protection; was impressed in 1799, and discharged on application in 1800.
- 5—*Israel Foster*, of Beverly—impressed at Leith, in 1811; had a Protection, and was released next day.
- 6—*Samuel Tack*, of Beverly—impressed at Leith, in 1811; had a Protection, and made his escape about a month after he was impressed.
- 7—*Levi Bruce*, a mulatto—had no Protection; was impressed at Canton, and returned about a year after.
- 8—*Joseph Cotton*, of Plymouth—taken at a public house, in Trinidad, in company with some English sailors belonging to a man of war; Cotton sided with the sailors, who opposed their officers when ordered aboard;—he was afterwards released without application.
- 9—*A Young Man*, of Portsmouth, (N. H.)—had a Protection; was discharged on application, on the return of the vessel into which he was impressed.
- 10—*Nathaniel Otis, jr.*, of Plymouth—had no Protection, and made his escape in two or three months after he was impressed.
- 11—*Two Men*, belonging to a Castine vessel—being on shore in the West Indies, were taken up by the press-gang, and were immediately released on application.
- 12—It is therefore seen that of these twelve impressed Americans, four were taken for want of Protections; one for having out grown the description in his Protection; and one in company with English sailors, with whom he had sided in opposing their officers; three were released within 24 hours; six were released on application, and within a year; two escaped within three months, and one is supposed still to be detained, no application having been made for his discharge. How desirous is it then, that an enquiry on the subject should be made throughout the Commonwealth. Those who have their views in opposing such an enquiry, may pretend to doubt the value of this evidence; but their apprehensions of its correctness are sufficiently manifest, from their unwillingness to meet an examination; and from their constant attempts to deceive and mislead the public, on a subject, now become of the highest interest and importance, from its being the only remaining cause of the war. Your obedient servant,
GEO. WAYSON.

Bejost, Maine, March 25, 1813.

Why should we prefer Gov. Strong to Gen. Varnum?

The ensuing election is the most important which has occurred since we became an independent nation. It is not a question who shall govern us best in our local and municipal concerns. If at war, I should say, that the friend and companion of WASHINGTON, the man who in all times has proved himself to be moderate, and prudent, and wise, and firm, and disinterested, ought to be preferred to one, who has never shown any capacity to govern a great people—who is a new man for such great and important concerns, and of whose prudence, and moderation, and wisdom, we have had no evidence. But these considerations, important as they are, and favorable as they ought to be to the re-election of Governor STRONG, have but little weight with me, compared to the much more important considerations which press upon my mind. This nation is now involved in a very expensive and ruinous war. The nation that even its friends expect, is to get out of it without disgrace. They catch with rapture and ardour at the very rumour of peace, and they hail the mediation of Russia, as the greatest blessing. This is no misrepresentation. Look at every democratic paper, from the National Intelligencer down to the Chronicle, and you will find the hopes of peace from the Russian mediation, most warmly and strongly advanced.

I then ask myself, why wish so soon for peace, if the war was a proper and prudent measure?

Have we gained any thing by the war? What territories of our enemy have we conquered?

None. What victories on land have we achieved? None.

Have our naval victories made the ocean safer to us?

NO. Our own ports are in jeopardy from our enemy's fleets, and terror and alarm resound through our southern borders.

What then have we gained? Is our enemy more disposed to yield than she was before the war?

NO. We have united her people in sentiment against us. She has had successes in Europe, which have emboldened and encouraged her.

Why then wish for peace now, more than nine months ago, when Britain offered it to us, and we refused it?

There is no reason for such a wish. Yet all the democrats exultingly talk of peace. I infer then, that Gen. VARNUM, who was the procuring means of this war in the Senate—without whose vote it probably would never have taken place, is accountable for it, and therefore is an unfit man for Governor.

Because, if peace is now so desirable, as the democrats contend it is, and if we are not so likely to obtain good terms now, as we could have done when Admiral Warren proposed an armistice six months ago, then the war was originally an improper thing.

I am against General Varnum because he is in favor of ordering out the militia. I am against him because in consequence of his representations the Government made the war.

I am against him because if he had been our Governor last year, we should have had 5000 widows at this moment—probably ten thousand orphans, and the Commonwealth would have sustained a loss of several millions of dollars.

If General Varnum is Governor, he must perform the wailike promises he made to the President.

Ten thousand men must bleed or sicken in camps, in order to effect a conquest of Canada, which we must surrender at a peace.

If General Varnum is Governor, our harbors and ports will be as strictly blockaded as are those of Virginia—He will order out troops, and the British will come here to watch them.

Boston, Marblehead Nantucket and Portland may be laid in ashes only to gratify the wailike taste of this wailike Governor.

Is this wrong? Would any nation permit you to invade her territories, slaughter and butcher her peaceable inhabitants, burn their houses without retaliation?

But if you have a peaceable, peace-seeking, just, and upright man like Governor Strong, your militia will cultivate the earth in peace—Your mechanics will get as much employ at home as this wicked war will allow them. Your enemy will not be exasperated and induced to retaliate. Your few remaining ships will arrive in safety.

Why then should you urge your own destruction by voting for this man of war, though he is not much of a wailike man? But, say the democrats, what! will you have a distinction in your favor? Will you be willing to be spared while other states suffer?

We saw in the war nothing but ruin to our merchants—destruction to our mechanics—a state of misery to our seafaring men—Loans unfilled—Taxes imposed—Blood profusely shed—Paper Money to ruin the poor for the rich know how to avoid it—Disgrace at home and dishonor abroad.

We foresaw that in some six or twelve short months, the War hawks would be catching hold of any pretext, any idle story for peace while the British cannon would be roaring along our shores and the terms we could obtain would be much less advantageous than before the war.

These are some of our reasons against General Varnum.

The Prospect Before Us.

From the present extent laid out, there is but too much ground for the conclusion, that perpetual war is the policy of Mr. Madison. Nothing but the salutary effect of Russian success; nothing but desirability for the complete extinction of the continental system; nothing but a thorough conviction that the further attempt of Napoleon upon Russia are hopeless; nothing but an effectual proscription of French power, which shall take Mr. Madison out of the lugs of French influence, or the decided opposition of the people in the exercise of their elective rights, and their refusal to render any voluntary aid for the purpose of prosecuting the contest, can afford any well founded expectations of peace.

The Act for the regulation of seamen on board the public and private vessels of the U. States, appears to have been conceived in the same spirit which which the famous and very liberal proposition was made by Mr. Wise. After the President had agreed, without any doubt, that Mr. Wise had positive instructions not to offer repatriation for the attack on the Chesapeake, until the interdict against British vessels was revoked; in other words, that compulsion was not consistent with honorable satisfaction; that arms could be tendered till coercion ceased; with the greatest pointed desire to adjust the controversy, he offered to make the restoration of the proclamation and the public of repatriation simultaneous acts, with the most confident that it would be accepted, while from the terms of the proposal, accompanied with the declaration of honorable professions, his hypocrisy might pass with the people for sincerity. So is the present

case, intractably upon the receipt of a solemn declaration of the Prince Regent, that the doctrine of perpetual allegiance, which England has maintained and acted upon for ages, and which other nations have, in like manner, asserted, will not be abandoned; a law is passed, which not only veils the appearance of concession, which looks to the people, like making a sincere alliance towards peace; while in truth, it is but another ephemeral expedient to perpetuate popular confidence by popular deception; to increase attachment by the very means, which, if generally understood and duly appreciated, would induce universal execration.

It is true that the Legislature have graciously concurred, by the act (see 11,) to indulge the President in the exercise of the treaty-making power. But as he has given his sanction to the law, it is to be presumed that he has a disposition, or that he will dare to depart from its spirit?

The supporters of administration, and the advocates of this act, have confidence that it is a prudent and wise measure to ease the evils complained of; why resort to deception to defend it? Whence the necessity of imposing the belief upon the people, that if months what it does not? Why, but from a conviction that the provisions enacted, are necessary to effect the pretended object? Why do they endeavor to impress upon the ignorant the conviction that this act intends nothing more than that the American flag shall be a protection to native American seamen; while it claims to extend this immunity to natives of Great Britain, which is the very ground of controversy. A brief investigation will show that this act is at war, not only with the pretensions of England, but with the generally recognized principles of international law. It asserts not only the claim to naturalization and extend to foreigners the privileges of native citizens in our own territory, within our exclusive jurisdiction, which, it is admitted, is a legitimate exercise of unquestionable right, but also to protect them on a common jurisdiction, when they come in contact with precedent obligations. Even the great, little "Americans," in the Patriot, who discovers such profundity of research, who so learnedly discusses the question of natural right, and who so inextinguishably profess what should be the code for the government of nations will admit, to whatever conclusion his abstract speculations may lead him, as to a state of peace, that no citizen or subject can dissent himself of his allegiance while his country is at war. Now let us suppose that peace between England and the U. States is concluded in the course of the ensuing summer, and that the war between Great Britain and France is protracted till 1820, that immediately upon the conclusion of peace with America, the crews of the British ships desert to our shores, and after complying with the conditions of our law, are naturalized, and ship on board American merchantmen. There has not been a moment in which they could rightfully expatriate themselves; their obligation to their former sovereign continues; they meet with a British man of war, or go into a port of Great Britain. Can our naturalization or the merchant's flag protect them against a precedent and paramount claim? By setting up and enforcing this adverse pretension, do we not infringe upon the rights of another, and justify reclamations even by violence? Yet the present law, which, it is pretended, is designed to bring out peace, goes to this extent.

What are all these hypothetical professions of a desire to restore peace, but the most wanton mockery, while one insupportable barrier to its conclusion is willfully and wittingly interposed.

If the country is to be loaded with an enormous debt; if the people must be subjected to exorbitant double duties and direct taxes; if they must be dragged to slaughter or captivity in Canada to support this war, they ought distinctly to understand the nature and nature of the point in dispute. Their attention ought not to be diverted from the consideration of the principle, by exaggerated statements, designedly made, of abuses in justice, which have, in a great measure, been the consequence of the rejection of an "honorable and advantageous" arrangement by which they would have been prevented, by representing four or five several applications of a foreigner for a discharge, who, perchance, had obtained a protection by forgery and perjury as so many distinct cases of the impressment of native American seamen. If one nation recognizes the right of its citizens to expatriate themselves, it imposes no obligation on another nation to do so. While this right, in time of peace, is maintained by most nations on the law of nations, yet it is denied by others of acknowledged respectability. A right resting upon contradictory authorities is, at least, of a doubtful character. With respect to a state of war, authorities are unanimously against it.—England claims no right which she is not ready to concede.

But if, "an American" should succeed in establishing the belief that the doctrine of perpetual allegiance is an infringement of natural right; that under all possible circumstances, the right of expatriation exists; that nations ought to admit it; and that such is the natural and just spirit of the social compact, in which the whole people covenant with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people; that while one party to the covenant (the individual) chooses to avail himself of its advantages, it remains perpetually and inviolably obligatory upon the other party (the whole people) that it is a contract, in the most important particular, and of reciprocity; that the individual may, to-day, be in compact with England, and in virtue of it claim protection of person and property, but that to-morrow he may, without mutual consent, dissolve it and covenant with America, and then with France, that he may at pleasure, violate and renew it at the instance of interest, humor, or caprice; while the whole people have no legitimate ground of complaint, or if they have, are, under all circumstances, without remedy.

If any very learned Christian and profound Jurist should succeed in impressing upon the people of the United States the belief that the aforesaid principles are perfectly correct; still it remains a question of policy, whether we ought to fight with England till she shall be compelled to subscribe to this creed.—Why should we wage war with her for the purpose of forcing her to abandon a right and to adopt a doctrine which she has maintained towards other nations without producing enmity, and which France and other modern maritime nations support by their laws and by their practice? Is there not something arrogant, presumptuous and Quixotic in our attempt to give laws to the world? Rather is it not the part of wisdom in us to adopt and execute with good faith, such regulations as will give the most equal security to native Americans, without putting their interest, and liberty, and lives in jeopardy by attempting to place native Englishmen upon the same footing with those on board our merchant vessels. If foreigners remain in our own territory, we may assure to them the privileges of native citizens. If they quit this security, they do it voluntarily. If they leave this security for employment in our merchant service, and enter the jurisdiction of their former Sovereign, it is not our business

to interfere with them. If they are not a citizen of the United States, they are not a citizen of the United States, and they are not a citizen of the United States, and they are not a citizen of the United States.

If they are not a citizen of the United States, they are not a citizen of the United States, and they are not a citizen of the United States.

If they are not a citizen of the United States, they are not a citizen of the United States, and they are not a citizen of the United States.

If they are not a citizen of the United States, they are not a citizen of the United States, and they are not a citizen of the United States.