

destroyed, as not to possess any property capable of being excited into action even by variola itself, which amounts to a conclusion of its entire destruction: for if the variolous matter cannot find a predisposition in the system, capable of being excited into action by its virus, then, there is, consequently, no disposition by which the disease can be produced.

This brings us to consider the subject, as it respects its total extinction of temporary liability by vaccination. In order to afford a fair ground for argument on this subject, the opposers of vaccination ought to have shown the effects of vaccine virus on the system, and how it destroyed the predisposition of which they have spoken—and also by what law of organic action or physiological principle, this liability was regenerated after its extinction. This, however, it is presumed, no medical gentleman has yet done. From an investigation of the laws of animal, or organic action, I am totally unable to comprehend any general principle, by which the system can possess the power of regenerating a liability to any specific disease, after it has once been extinguished. The absorbents are, probably, the principal, if not the entire class of vessels concerned in transmitting the virus of any contagion through the system; and this power in those vessels becomes destroyed by the effect of vaccine matter. Then if those vessels are totally deprived of any ability to bring the system into any general concert of action by the application of variolous matter, it would amount to a conclusion, that they were able to change, or create anew, any predisposition, independent of exciting causes; or this liability could never be regenerated. But it is probably the fact that no change of action can take place in the system independent of exciting causes, therefore it is believed that if vaccination destroys the liability to the small pox one month, or year, that it also destroys it for life.

PHILO-VACCINATUS.

FOR THE KINGSTON CHRONICLE.

LETTER 10.

To ROBERT WALSH, Esq.

Sir,
A good account of the American war is yet wanting, and can hardly be written in the true spirit of history for some time to come. Its origin may be found in the peace of 1763. Had Great Britain consented to restore Canada to France, the States of America had been still Colonies. Possessed of the navigation of the Lakes, and claiming a passage to Louisiana, with a complete command of the St. Lawrence on the one side, and the Mississippi on the other, the French would have kept the Colonists in continual alarm. They would have harassed their frontiers made encroachments upon their territories, and rendered it necessary for them to have been continually on their guard. But a state of permanent hostility would have been attended with an expense which the Colonists had not the means of defraying, and as they were incapable of defending themselves effectually against a nation so powerful, they would have anxiously maintained their connection with their mother country, and willingly contributed their share of the sums necessary to pay for their protection. But no sooner were they relieved from impending danger than they turned upon their protector, and stung the hand that saved them from destruction.
You endeavour, in this section, to prove that on the peace of 1763, the Colonies manifested the most affectionate loyalty, and hence you infer the injustice of adopting any measures displeasing to children so kind and dutiful, and take occasion, after those preliminary remarks, to hold up the policy adopted in England to general execration. You even hazard the assertion, that the Colonies at this period entertained no designs of independence, and are extremely angry with Chambers and Robertson, who take the liberty of asserting the contrary. As the truth of the whole of your sixth section depends upon the correctness or incorrectness of Dr. Robertson's assertion, I will state what he says, and give a summary of what you triumphantly call his refutation. Dr. Robertson remarks that the league among the New England Colonies in 1643, "was a transaction in which they seem to have considered themselves as independent Societies, possessing all the rights of Sovereignty, and free from the control of any superior power."—What is your refutation of this opinion of the historian—merely the necessity of the measure—you cannot deny that it was a step towards independence; and your plea is that the situation of the Colonies, surrounded by enemies, required a measure of this kind. Now the celebrated author whom, in an evil hour, you talk of refuting, contents himself with stating the fact, its origin and natural consequence. If it was necessary, which may have been the case, the sanction of the Parent State ought to have been obtained, if not to its commencement yet to its continuance. But the candid writer of the life of Washington goes much farther than Dr. Robertson, and ought therefore to have experienced from you a double share of animadversion. "The Colony of Massachusetts, having been settled by men whose political as well as religious opinions were strongly tinged with the spirit of republicanism, had been conducted from its commencement very much upon the plan of an independent Society." (vol. 1. p. 101.) The whole history of the New England Colonies justifies this language, and fully shows that independence was never lost sight of, although it was necessary to cover it at times, and to wait for opportunities for its actual enjoyment. "The Governments of New England, left very much to themselves, had been in the habits of directing their own affairs as an independent nation. They had carried on a free trade with the world. The Commissioners of the United Colonies (viz. those joined by the league of 1643.) had held negotiations with the French Colony in Canada on the subjects of peace, war and commerce, and in 1650 they had settled their differences, and adjusted their boundaries with the Dutch." (Life of Wash. vol. 1. p. 142.) Again, p. 144, "In this year, 1651, war was declared against Holland. Accustomed for some time to conduct their affairs in their own way, the United Colonies did not think themselves involved in this contest unless engaged in it by some act of their own." If these are not measures which indicate not merely a wish, but even the possession of independence, no transactions of Governments can. The history of these colonies proves beyond dispute that they never were attached to the Parent State, never disposed to yield any obedience

which they could avoid, and were only held in some sort of subjection by their own weakness and fear of the French. It is true that in words they were often under the necessity of making submissions; but even in doing this they were slow and reluctant. "Massachusetts" says Judge Marshall (p. 160) "seems during the frequent changes which took place in England after the death of Cromwell, to have preserved a cautious neutrality, and to have been disposed to avail herself of such favourable circumstances as might occur, without exposing herself to the resentments of any party, which might ultimately obtain the ascendancy. Although expressly ordered, she did not proclaim Richard as Lord Protector; nor did she take any step to recognize the authority of Parliament. The first intelligence of the restoration of Charles was received with incredulity, and when informed in a way not to be questioned they neither proclaimed the King nor by any public act evidenced their admission of his authority. This was not the only testimony of their general disposition. In the vessel bringing this intelligence, Whaley and Goff, two of the Judges of King Charles 1st, came passengers, and were received with distinction by the Government, and affection by the people." Is it to be supposed that these Colonies would have hesitated to throw off their dependence upon the British Crown at this period had they been able? It was not till 1661, a year after the restoration, that Charles 2d was proclaimed King; but as if unable, says Judge Marshall (p. 164) to conceal the coldness and reluctance with which this step was taken, an order was made on the same day prohibiting all disorderly behaviour on the occasion, and in particular directing that no man should presume to drink his Majesty's health, which, adds the order, he hath in a special manner forbid. In 1730 the conduct of the Legislature of Massachusetts forced the King to declare that he "should find himself under the necessity of laying the unbecoming behaviour of the Province before the Legislature of Great Britain, not only in the single instance of not conferring a permanent salary on the Governor, but in many others of the same nature and tendency, whereby it manifestly appears that this assembly for some years past have attempted by unwarrantable practices, to weaken, if not cast off, the obedience which all Colonies ought to have on their mother country."

It would take up more space than is intended for this letter to mention half of the proofs that independence, when strength and safety concur, was never forgotten, and therefore Dr. Robertson might with perfect justice have made use of stronger language. As to the enthusiastic joy manifested by the Colonies on the peace of 1763, it may be accounted for on other grounds than affection for the mother country. It removed from their frontier an inveterate enemy, who had long harassed and alarmed them; it opened for them new sources of trade, and lessened their dependence upon the Parent State. As usual all your authorities are Parliamentary speeches; their colouring and exaggeration best suit your purposes. They exhibit a strange phenomenon, men defending the enemies of their country and strengthening their hands till they become victorious. I am aware of taking unpopular ground in saying any thing against the American revolution; but truth is not always agreeable, and after promising that I think the policy adopted by the British Ministry after the peace of 1763 was unwise, I take the liberty of remarking that the error they committed was very natural. The supremacy of the Parliament had never been called in question, and was not doubted even by the chief promoter of the American Revolution, Mr. Otis. "This principle was assumed by Lord Chatham, in his famous proposal for reconciliation in 1775, and after the dispute commenced it was never in the power of the Ministry to heal the breach. That they were endeavouring to lay a foundation for arbitrary power will not be easily credited by any impartial person. During the war of 1756 more than a million of money had been voted to the Colonies to defray their extraordinary expenses, and three hundred thousand after the peace. This liberality does not appear very consistent with plans of immediate oppression."

It is worthy of remark that when the first bill for taxing America was brought into Parliament, it met with an opposition: the political enemies of the Ministry, who declared afterwards so bitterly against it were at that time silent. Indeed nothing could appear more reasonable than that those parts of the empire which had benefited most by the war should contribute something towards lessening the heavy debt which it had occasioned; and not a Member at that time in the House of Commons had the smallest doubt of the constitutional right vested in the Parliament to raise the contribution. After wards, when the Colonies resisted, the Parliamentary Opposition began to discover arguments in their favour, though they still admitted that Great Britain possessed the supreme governing and legislative power, and had always bound the Colonies, by her laws, and by her navigation and commerce—but a distinction was attempted to be made between this power and that of taxing, then not very evident. All parties allowed that external taxes might be levied by Parliament but not internal. The Parliament therefore conceded this point, and after repealing the stamp act, they imposed a trifling tax on tea. But the Colonies, as had been foretold, began to exclaim, if the Parliament of Great Britain has no right to tax us internally it can have none to tax us externally, and if it has no power to tax us without our own consent, it has none to govern or legislate for us. It has been said that the Colonies would have been content with a limited Representation in Parliament, but this is extremely doubtful, for we have seen that they aimed at independence from the beginning, and it is more probable that no concessions, no advantages offered them by Great Britain could have long availed, New differences would have arisen, and a separation have taken place. Moreover, supposing concessions to have been effectual, yet they could hardly be looked for after the violent measures adopted by the Colonies. Even granting that the acts of Parliament were unjust as well as inexpedient, it was difficult to repeal them in the face of insurrection and defiance. As the contest has long ceased it might have been far better not to have entered upon the subject, but you bring it forward with so many flourishes of exultation that they must be checked. Let it then be remembered, that Great Britain, in imposing certain duties, was not actuated by a spirit of oppression, but a desire of rendering her protection more effectual, that the States had determined to be satisfied with no concessions, and that they had thanked Providence that they had arrived at growth and strength sufficient to resist the Parent State. These truths sufficiently repel the insidious attacks which you have made on Great Britain in this Section. It is indeed true that there is a time when Colonies may be allowed to lay aside their leading strings, and rise up in their place among the nations of the Earth; but you were not adequate till the French were driven out of Canada, and after the contention commenced reason could not be heard. When two parties disagree mutual forbearance becomes necessary before

there can be any harmony. That Great Britain showed this is certain, but which of the Colonies followed her example? Had representation in Parliament been given before the disputes began, the presence of all the Members you could have sent would not have prevented the passage of a single act; but as was already remarked, there was no disposition on the side of the Colonies to reconcile matters, for while they were presenting petitions to the King and Parliament, they were not only engaged in defensive but even offensive war. The best plan would have been that of Dean Tucker, to have left you to yourselves, but this could not be expected, for no British Ministry durst have proposed it to Parliament. In fine, future historians, in relating this contest, will do justice to Great Britain, when the mania for undefined liberty and licentiousness shall have passed away.—No longer blinded by prejudice, the facts will not then bear the previous sentiments of those who relate them, and who will trace with coolness and precision the long train of miseries which have sprung from a rebellion nourished by faction and rendered successful through treachery.

Yours, &c.

FOREIGN NEWS.

From the N. E. Post, April 5.

Foreign news.—By the arrival last evening of the packet ship James Monroe, in 30 days from Liverpool, we have received from our correspondent, a regular file of the London Courier to the 2d of March. Parliament was prorogued on the 28th of February to the 13th of March.

The Princess of Wales arrived at Leghorn on the 10th of February, from Marseilles, with a limited suite. A few hours afterwards a courier from London, brought her the intelligence of the death of King George the third. She was to have set out in a few days for London.

The Duchess de Berri has presented to the person who first seized the assassin of her husband, one thousand francs and to the soldier of the Royal Guard who secured him, a gold watch of considerable value.

A subscription has been opened in London for the benefit of the widow of Smithers, who was killed in arresting the conspirators that had assembled to assassinate the king's ministers, and large sums received. Mr. Elliston, manager of Drury Lane Theatre, has offered to give a benefit to the widow and officers, any night they might choose to select for the purpose.

Advices from Constantinople announce that on the 5th of January last, Dervish Pacha grand visier of the Ottoman empire, was deposed. He is allowed to retire to Gallipoli, and to enjoy all his wealth.

Some of the western districts in Ireland, appear to be agitated by the machinations and actual excesses of the ribbonmen. Throughout the county of Galway, the banditti continued their depredations upon private property, and daily acquired new strength. They spared neither friend nor foe.

Liverpool market, March 4.—The import of Cotton last month, was 43,232 bags, of which 22,442 were from the United States; sales, 29,770 bags, of which 18,120 bags American. Present prices, Upland, 11 a 12 1-4d; New Orleans, 11 1-2 a 15d; Sea Island, 1s 7 to 2s 2; New York Ashes, 39 a 40s; Bark, 12 to 20s; Tobacco, Kentucky, 3 1-4 to 5d; Stemmed, 5 a 7 1-4d; Rice, Am. in bond, 16 a 21s; Flour, 32s. a 33s.

The average price of wheat, received to day, is 65s. per quarter.

The sales of Cotton this week have been limited, amounting to only 4000 bags.

House of Commons, Feb. 21.

The Queen.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer moved that the house should resolve itself into a committee of supply, and also that the gracious message of his majesty to that house, together with the army estimates, and civil contingencies, should be referred to the said committee, which motions were severally agreed to.

Upon the motion for the Speaker leaving the chair being put,
Mr. Hume confessed, after what had been said by the noble lord (Castlereagh) of the blessings which this country had derived from the auspicious rule of the House of Brunswick, he was anxious to learn the reason why so illustrious a branch of it as the queen of these realms was suffered to remain unacknowledged; and from what he could collect abroad, he was afraid it was determined she should remain unacknowledged.—(A cry of order!) He by no means intended to allude to or circumscribe any remedy that might be taken according to the rites of the church.

Lord Castlereagh thought the hon. member would have acted more advisedly had he followed the opinion of the greater part of the nation, who, with becoming delicacy, declined as much as possible entering upon this very interesting subject. The less it was agitated, he thought, the better; at the same time he assured the house, that the high personage alluded to should experience no want of attention to her rank or comforts at the hands of his majesty's government.

Mr. Hume still persisted in having an explicit answer, how ministers could, out of the £50,000 intended to be moved for in the committee, grant a suitable allowance to the queen.

Lord Castlereagh replied, that had the hon. member waited to hear the proposition of the right hon. the chancellor of the exchequer, he would be satisfied the subject had sufficiently occupied the attention of his majesty's government.

Tuesday, February 22.

The Queen.—On the resolution for granting £200,000 for enabling his majesty to provide for the payments char-

ged on the civil list.

Mr. Tierney asked of the chancellor of the exchequer, how any payment could be made to the queen under this grant.

Mr. Vansittart said, the payment would be made as formerly to the princess of Wales; the grant was made to the person.

Mr. Tierney said, the grant was made to the princess of Wales, and there was now no such person in existence; and any person who should presume to pay the annuity granted to the princess of Wales to any person except the princess of Wales would be guilty of an offence against the house of commons.

Mr. Vansittart conceived the annuity was granted to the person and not to the title, and therefore might be paid notwithstanding any demise of the crown.

Mr. Tierney—To the Princess of Wales but not to any other person.

Mr. Vansittart said, he had nothing more to add on the subject.

Mr. Tierney believed the right hon. gentleman had nothing more to say on the subject. He was aware the right hon. gentleman must not utter the word Queen. He would repeat that this grant was not to the person, but to support the title and dignity of Princess of Wales, and the Princess of Wales no longer existed.—If the right hon. gentleman should presume to pay money to any other person he would incur a heavier responsibility than any person in his situation had ever done before.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer repeated his former opinion. The grant was made to the person in one political character, and might be paid to the same person, although that person was now known under another appellation.

Mr. Hume could not conceive why the name of the Queen should not be introduced.

Mr. Lushington said this could not be done without introducing the name of every other individual mentioned in the Civil List. This was a grant to the King to be applied to the service of the Civil List, as would have been done had there been no demise to the Crown.

Mr. Tierney said there would be no Princess of Wales to receive it.

Sir R. Wilson asked, under what authority this money would be issued?

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said, under the usual authority, the grant of the House which had always been deemed sufficient.

The report was then agreed to.

LONDON, Feb. 27.

Speech of his majesty's commissioners in proroguing parliament this afternoon.

"My lords and gentlemen—We are commanded by his majesty to inform you that it is a great disappointment to his majesty, that on this first and solemn occasion he is prevented by indisposition from meeting you in person.

It would have been a consolation to his majesty to give utterance in this place to those feelings with which his majesty and the nation alike deplore the loss of a sovereign, the common father of all his people.

The king commands us to inform you, that in determining to call without delay the new parliament, his majesty has been influenced by the consideration of what is most expedient for public business, as well as most conducive to general convenience.

Gentlemen of the house of commons—We are directed by his majesty to thank you for the provision which you have made for the several branches of the public service, from the commencement of the present year, and during the interval which must elapse before a new parliament can be assembled.

My lords and gentlemen—We are commanded to inform you, that in taking leave of the present parliament, his majesty cannot refrain from conveying to you his warmest assurances of the sense which his majesty entertains of the important services which you have rendered the country.

Deeply as his majesty lamented that designs and practices such as those which you have been recently called upon to repress, should have existed in this free and happy country, he cannot sufficiently commend the prudence and firmness with which you directed your attention to the means of counteracting.

If any doubt had remained as to the nature of those principles by which the peace and happiness of the nation were so seriously menaced, or of the excesses to which they were likely to lead, the flagrant and sanguinary confederacy which has lately been detected, must open the eyes of the most incredulous, and must vindicate to the whole world the justice and expediency of those measures to which you judged it necessary to resort in defence of the laws and constitution of the realm."

LONDON, March 2.

The conspiracy.—On Monday last the well known Thomas Preston was apprehended at his lodging on a charge of high treason, and underwent an examination at the Bow-street office.—He was detained in custody. Thistlewood is committed on charges of high treason and murder. Brunt for high treason only. The other nine for murder. There were no proceedings at the secretary's office yesterday in the case of the conspiracy. There have been no arrests since Monday, nor have any further particulars of this horrid plot transpired. The precise time and mode of trial of the conspirators is not yet fixed. Should they be indicted for murder, their conviction is certain. The government, it is presumed, will proceed against them, on the

more heinous offence of high treason. It is supposed the trials will not come on until after the election.

A gentleman of high fashion and noble family, has called a meeting of his creditors, to whom he declared that all the reports of his repeated losses at play were unfounded; that his great pecuniary embarrassment arose solely from the sudden demise of his principal agent who had left all his affairs in such a perplexed state that nothing but rigid economy could retrieve them. He added, with tears in his eyes, that he had called the claimants together, not with a view to compound with their claims, but to make over estates of £30,000 per annum, until their demands were liquidated.

PARIS, Feb. 24.

A letter from Narci states, that it has been proved by a deposition taken before the Judge of the Preliminary Tribunal of that town, that on Monday evening the assassination of the Duke de Berri was talked of there, although it only took place in Paris the preceding night, about 11 o'clock. The distance from Paris to Nanci is 90 leagues.

From the N. Y. Spectator, April 7.

The Spanish Ambassador, General Francisco Vives, so long expected, has arrived in the James Monroe.

Fifty one persons are said to have been arrested in France as concerned in the assassination of the Duke de Berri.

The Duke of Wellington had arrived at Paris.

A number of persons concerned in the late conspiracy to assassinate the Cabinet Ministers had been taken, among them was Mr. Brunt, Mr. Firth, Wm. Simmonds, Abel Hall, Robert Adams, John Harrison, and Mr. Tidd. A number of other persons had been examined, and committed, in all 16.

In the house of Tidd, 2000 ball cartridges were found.

Count Simon has been appointed minister of France, in place of Count M. de Cazes.

Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Hobhouse are the Parliamentary candidates for Westminster.

A coroners inquest had pronounced Arthur Thistlewood the murderer of Smithers, assisted by Wm. Davidson, James Ings, Charles Cooper, Richard Tidd, John Monument, John Shaw Strange, Richard Blackburn, James Wilson, James Gilchrist, and others.

Thistlewood is in Coldbath-fields prison. He is watched night and day. He slept well on Thursday night, and ate a hearty breakfast on Friday morning. He does not enter at all into conversation with the officers.

At present it seems not to be understood whether the delinquents will be placed on their trial upon a charge of high treason or of murder.

Though only 25 persons were in the loft at the time when they were surprised by the police, yet it is understood, that in the course of the evening, not less than 50 had been present; but half of them had slunk away, it is supposed, from a suspicion that the Cabinet Ministers would not dine together at Lord Harrowby's, the remaining half began gradually to entertain the same suspicion, and were, it is said, deliberating, whether they should defer their diabolical purpose to another night; when Ruthven burst into the room.

It is intimated that the plan of assassinating the Ministers at a cabinet dinner, was not a sudden project. It was intended to have been executed about a month before the detection of the final plot, when the cabinet were to have dined at the Earl of Westmoreland's in Grosvenor square, whose house was supposed to afford equal facilities with Lord Harrowby's. Some precautions taken at that time by the Ministers, gave the alarm to the conspirators, and they postponed their designs.

A poor creature inveigled into a course of crime which his better nature abhorred, discovered the plot in a letter ill-spelled and ill-written, addressed to lord Castlereagh; and as if afraid that it might not reach its destination safely, he put it into the hands of Lord Harrowby, whom he met in the park.

Twenty-seven Radical Delegates in full conclave at Glasgow, have been apprehended. The Courier intimates that evidence has been obtained of the conspiracy being connected with a project for a simultaneous rising in the beginning of March, and that the delegates arrested in Glasgow, appear in some degree connected with the plot.

The Englishman, of the 27th February, gives the following summary of the most important transactions on the Continent.

The French Papers of Tuesday and Wednesday arrived yesterday. Count Simeon has been appointed Minister of the Interior, in the room of the Duke. Decazes; Baron Mounier, Director General of the Departmental Administration of Police; and Count Portalis, Under Secretary of State to the Minister of Justice. On Tuesday the remains of the Duke de Berri were removed from the Louvre to St. Denis. The procession reached St. Denis at half past two. The coffin was met at the door of the cathedral by the clergy. Marshals de Vioménil and Moncey, and Generals de Bethizy and Dupont, were the pall-bearers. The body was placed on a stage in the middle of the church during the celebration of Mass, and afterwards removed to the Chapelle Ardente. More than 100,000 of the inhabitants of Paris attended the procession. All the shops in that city were closed, and a great number of houses were hung with