CHAPTER XXV.

When the government of the State of New York was organized, in the summer of 1777, four senatorial districts were defined, and known as the southern, middle, eastern and western. Each district was represented by a number of senators, in proportion to its population. The whole number was twenty-four. The constitution provided for an increase of numbers whenever the number of electors of any district should increase one twenty-fourth, until the whole number should reach one hundred.

In 1780, General Schuyler was elected a senator from the western district, comprising the counties of Albany, Tryon (changed to Montgomery, in 1784), and Ontario. The number of senators for the district was six. His colleagues were Jellis Fonda, Jacob G. Klock, Rinier Mynderse, Abraham Ten Broeck, and Abraham Yates, Jr. He first took his seat, at Poughkeepsie, on the 7th of September, 1780, and he continued to faithfully and ably represent his constituents in that body until the seventh session of the Senate, which ended at the city of New York, on the 12th of May, 1784. He was again in that body from the beginning of the ninth session, in 1786, until the end of its thirteenth session in April, 1790, when he was transferred to the Senate of the United States. He was in the State Senate again at the fifteenth session, at the

beginning of 1792, and remained a member of that body until the close of its twentieth session, in April, 1797.

Early in his senatorial career, Schuyler still held the important post of Chairman of the Board of Commissioners for Indian Affairs and also that of Surveyor-general of the State of New York.* His duties in each of these positions were arduous and delicate. In that of the former he was often called upon to act as umpire between the white people and the Indians; for, in the military incursions into the country of the latter during the war, discoveries were made of rich lands unbroken by cultivation, and desires to possess them filled the minds and hearts of many men of wealth and enterprise.

The Oneidas and Tuscaroras, who occupied the frontiers of the white settlements, had been the fast friends of the colonies all through the stormy period of the war, and

* General Schuyler was appointed Surveyor-general of the State of New York in February, 1782; and, at Poughkeepsie, on the 9th of March, he took the following oath, preliminary to receiving his commission:

"I, Philip Schuyler, do solemnly and sincerely swear, on the Holy Evangelists of Almighty God, that I have not, either by myself or by any other person for me or in my behalf, directly or indirectly purchased from any officer, non-commissioned officer or private soldier, or from any other person or persons whatsoever, any certificate or certificates granted for pay or depreciation of or on pay, or any right or rights to such certificates in any wise whatsoever, directly or indirectly. Nor have I, by myself or by any other person for me or in my behalf, directly or indirectly purchased any lands or tenements from any commissioner or commissioners authorized or appointed to sell any of the lands confiscated to this State, under whatsoever law such commissioners may have been appointed or have acted, or under whatever name such commissioners may be or have been known, since the commencement of the present war with Great Britain to this day; nor have I purchased, by myself or by any other person, any such certificates as aforesaid, or any lands or tenements as aforesaid, from any person whatsoever. So help me God."

every consideration of justice demanded that the public authorities of the State should deal generously with their late allies, and take no lands from them without their full consent, and upon payment of a satisfactory price.

In such a just arrangement the services of General Schuyler were very conspicuous. By a compact which he negotiated, the extension of New York settlements westward was checked by a line passing along the eastern border of the present Broome county, and up the Unadilla to its source, and thence on a direct line to a point on Wood Creek, about seven miles west of Rome, or Fort Schuyler. This was known as the *Line of Property*. It was established as the boundary of the Indian lands, and no settlement could be formed beyond it without a formal cession by its acknowledged owners. Beyond this line dwelt the Onondagas, Cayugas and Senecas, who had been enemies of the colonies, and were still warmly attached to the British interests.*

The first Constitution of the State of New York forbade any purchase of lands from the Indians, except by commissioners acting under the authority and in behalf of the State. The first State commissioners were appointed in 1779, but the first efficient step taken by them toward procuring a cession of lands for the purposes of settlement was not made until 1783. Their first treaty was held at Fort Schuyler, in September, 1784, at which, by appointment of the Governor, General Schuyler and other leading gentlemen assisted the State Commissioners.†

* See "Introduction to Proceedings of the Commissioners of Indian Affairs in the extinguishment of Indian titles in the State of New York," by FRANKLIN B. HOUGH, M. D.

† These commissioners, appointed by the Council of Revision—persons appointed to revise all bills passed by the Legislature, to prevent unconstitutional acts—were Abraham Cuyler, Peter Schuyler, and Henry Glen.

To the end of his days, Schuyler was the just friend of the Indian race, and was honored and beloved by all of them who came within the circle of friendly relations with him.

From the inauguration of the new government under the Articles of Confederation, in the spring of 1781, General Schuyler watched with keenest anxiety the jealousies of sections, and with real alarm the more definite jealousies of the State legislatures, evinced in their distrust of the Congress and the withholding of their support in the efforts of that body to sustain the public credit. At a very early date he predicted the utter failure of the Confederation as a national system, and he warmly seconded all efforts to give strength to the general government, whereby it might command the respect of the nations. And, while the Confederation was under advisement, he had favored several movements toward that end made by some of the States, since 1776, chiefly because their principal object had been a concentration of power, by coöperation, for carrying on the war and providing for the payment of the debt incurred thereby, at its close. The States, as well as the Congress, had been freely issuing bills of credit; and, from 1777, these had been fearfully decreasing in specie value, until what at first promised to be the right-arm of strength to the struggling colonists, threatened to be the instrument of their ruin.

One of the conventions above alluded to was held in Boston in August, 1780. Only three New England States, namely, Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Hampshire, were represented. The main object of the convention was to place the currency of the country on a solid and uniform basis, but they also took broader views in the contempla-

tion of the future. They declared that it was all-essential to the promotion of the power and prosperity of the country "that the Union of these States be fixed in a more solid and permanent manner; that the powers of Congress be more clearly ascertained and defined; and that the important national concerns of the United States be under the superintendency and direction of one supreme head."

This was a movement toward nationality which Schuyler hailed with joy; yet it was much short of what he wished, in its scope and tendency. He earnestly desired a national convention to decide upon some positive measures for that kind of centralization seen in our National Constitution, which should make the Congress the supreme head of the Republic. So earnest were his convictions, and so urgent were his arguments, that he inspired the active mind of his son-in-law, Alexander Hamilton,* with that ardor for such centralization which ever afterward distinguished him. During the winter and spring of 1780, Hamilton had frequent and sometimes daily personal intercourse with Schuyler; and it became of that familiar and affectionate nature on the part of the general, which a father, satisfied with his daughter's choice of a husband, would naturally evince toward the object of that choice. Hamilton had heard the wise suggestions and powerful logic from Schuyler, and observed the keen interest which the patriot felt in the convention at Boston; and he appears to have been first fairly aroused to a sense of the absolute necessity of a thoroughly national govern-

* Hamilton was married to Elizabeth, the second daughter of General Schuyler, on the 14th of December, 1780. Brissot described her as "a charming woman, who joins to the graces all the candor and simplicity of an American wife."

ment by the zeal and enthusiasm with which his future father-in-law commended the political action of that convention. So inspired, his great mind seemed to grasp the whole subject at once, and, in a letter to James Duane, in the Congress, written early in September, he gave such a clear and profound exposition of his opinions, that the remarkable phenomenon was exhibited of a young man, twenty-three years of age, expressing well-defined and comprehensive views of the situation and wants of the States, and of the practicability of forming a government adapted to the peculiar condition, resources and exigencies of those commonwealths. "He had wrought out for himself a political system far in advance of the conceptions of his cotemporaries."*

At about the time when Hamilton wrote to Duane, Schuyler, as chairman of the committee of the Senate of the State of New York, to whom the proceedings of the Boston Convention had been referred, made a report, in which he said:

"We perceive the defects in the present system, and the necessity of a supreme and coercive power in the government of these States, and are persuaded that unless Congress are authorized to direct, uncontrollably, the operations of war, and enabled to enforce a compliance with their requisitions, the common force can never be properly united."

Another convention of States, to meet at Hartford, had been called, and Schuyler wrote to Hamilton, the day after the submission of his report to the Senate:

"Some here are for appointing a Dictator and Vice-Dictators, as if it was a thing already determined on. To the convention to be held at Hartford I believe I shall be sent, with instructions to propose that a Dictator should be appointed."

* "History of the Constitution of the United States," by George Ticknor Curtis, i. 415.

Schuyler was opposed to this scheme. Hamilton pronounced it a "mad project." Governor Clinton, also, opposed it. The resolution was not adopted; but, by a joint resolution, the delegates were authorized to "propose and agree in the convention to all such measures as shall appear calculated to give a vigor to the governing powers, equal to the present crisis."

The delegates chosen were Philip Schuyler, John Sloss Hobart and Egbert Benson. The Legislature clothed them with still more important powers, after this appointment, by instructing them "to propose and agree that Congress, during the present war, or until a perpetual confederation shall be completed, should be expressly authorized and empowered to exercise every power which they may deem necessary for the effectual prosecution of the war." They were also directed to propose that whenever it should appear to Congress that any State was deficient in its contributions, that body should "direct the Commander-in-chief, without delay, to march the army, or such part of it as may be requisite, into such State, and, by military force, compel it to furnish its deficiency." This would destroy State sovereignty, if it ever existed (which it did not), and the independence of the States. The convention resulted in no effective action, but was followed, a few months later, by the ratification by all the States of the "Articles of Confederation," as the organic law of the league of American commonwealths, which the Congress had adopted in November, 1777.

The terms of that league perpetuated the vital defects and inherent weakness which had distinguished the national government all through the war, and which Schuyler and others had deplored; and they saw no hopes for

the future under that system. The first efforts of that government, in which the power to perform the most important acts of sovereignty was held by thirteen State legislatures, most conspicuously revealed its impotence. It asked for power to levy taxes, as a basis for sustaining the public credit. It was refused. "It is *money*, not *power*," said the refusing States, "that ought to be the object. The former will pay our *debts*, the latter may destroy our *liberties*."

The League was equally unfortunate in their attempts to establish commercial relations with other governments. They did not represent a *nation;* only a weak *league*, and were treated accordingly. They were regarded with contempt. "If the American States choose to send consuls, receive them," said Lord Sheffield, in a formidable pamphlet, in which he spoke of the States as only dismembered portions of the British empire, which would soon be seeking restoration. "Each State," he continued, "will soon enter into all necessary regulations with the consul, and this is the whole that is necessary." In other words, "the League has no dignity above that of a fifth-rate power."

England haughtily refused to comply with some of the most important stipulations of the treaty of peace, and, in February, 1784, when an open rupture between the United States and Great Britain seemed imminent, John Adams was sent to England, as the representative of the League. He was treated with coldness, and his propositions for commercial reciprocity were rejected with scorn. Believing his mission to be useless, Mr. Adams returned home, disgusted with the enforced weakness of his country.

Meanwhile matters were growing infinitely worse in

the United States. The war had exhausted the people, and poverty was widespread. Debt weighed down all classes, and taxation was repugnant. The States more and more assumed attitudes of sovereignty. New Confederacies were contemplated, and rebellion was rife.* There were doubt and confusion and perplexity on every side, and society seemed to be about to dissolve into its original elements. There was a feverish excitement in the public mind concerning the future, destructive of all confidence, and ruinous to enterprise of every kind.

In a consultation of patriots, in the library at Mount Vernon, Washington suggested a convention of delegates, to make arrangements of a commercial nature over which the Congress, under the Articles of Confederation, had no control. That suggestion, made in the year 1785, beamed out upon the surrounding darkness like a ray of morning light. It seemed to General Schuyler like the dawning of a long wished-for day—of emancipation for his country from the thrall of factions in sectional legislatures, and the growth of a healthful national spirit, for which he had longed most earnestly. His distinguished son-in-law had worked incessantly, with the same end in view. He published many able essays on the subject; and, in the summer of 1782, had succeeded in bringing it before the Legislature of New York, which, on the 21st of July, in a series of resolutions, recommended the "assembling of a

* Virginia stoutly resisted all attempts at centralization, and stood firmly upon the principles of State Sovereignty. So, also, did Pennsylvania, and, immediately after the adoption of the Articles of Confederation, General Schuyler proposed a confederation of all the States eastward of the Delaware, under the general title of the State of Columbia. He afterward, as we shall observe presently, reiterated his proposition for a national confederacy, or a consolidated nation.

general convention of the United States, specially authorized to revise and amend the Confederation, reserving the right to the respective Legislatures to ratify their determination." In the spring of the next year, Hamilton, in a debate in Congress, expressed an earnest desire for a general convention. The subject was a theme for the pens of Thomas Paine, Pelatiah and Noah Webster, and others, in 1784. The propositions were all of a political nature, which the public authorities were not prepared to adopt; but Washington's proposition for a *commercial* convention was favorably received, and, in September, 1786, five States were represented in a convention, which assembled at Annapolis, in Maryland.* A desire seemed to prevail generally among thinking men for the convention to take a broader field of consideration than commerce. And so they did. They recommended the several States to call another convention in May following, and prepared a letter to the Congress, in which the defects of the Articles of Confederation were set forth. This was followed, early in 1787, by a recommendation of Congress for a national convention, to be held at Philadelphia, in May following; not for the regulation of commerce, but for the revision of the Articles of Confederation—in other words, for the reconstruction of the national government. This recommendation brought forth an expression of the views of many thoughtful men on the subject. Among these was a long letter from General Schuyler to Henry Van Schaack, dated

* The following are the names of the representatives: *New York*—Alexander Hamilton, Egbert Benson. *New Jersey*—Abraham Clarke, William C. Hueston. *Pennsylvania*—Tenche Coxe, James Schureman. *Delaware*—George Read, John Dickinson, Richard Bassett. *Virginia*—Edmund Randolph, James Madison, jr., St. George Tucker.

at New York, the 13th of March, 1787, in which, after giving a detailed account of the proceedings of the Legislature of New York in reference to the recommendation of Congress, he wrote:

"But, short-sighted as I am, it is no encomium on my penetration if I declare that, having attentively considered the present Confederation soon after it was promulgated, it struck me as totally inadequate to its object. The observations I made in the progress of the late war, the opportunities I had, in my public character, of experiencing its weakness, confirmed and strengthened the opinion I had formed of its inefficiency. I was seriously alarmed. I feared lest the dissolution [of the Union] during the war would have enabled Britain to subjugate this country. This apprehension became infinitely painful to my mind. I resolved on expedients to prevent the dire calamity. I beheld, with chagrin, that the politicians of this State seldom, if ever, drew with those of the Eastern States. I wished to eradicate the injurious jealousy which prevailed between them and us."*

General Schuyler gave an outline of a plan of government, in which

"An Executive should be triennially appointed; a Senate and Assembly, the seats of one-third of each annually to become vacant; the Executives, as well as Representatives in the Senate and Assembly, to be reëligible; and this Legislature to legislate for all the States, under one common appellation, as, for instance, the State of Columbia, leaving the several States, or rather provinces, forming the State of Columbia, their legislatures, for the purpose of making road-acts and others, for the more orderly government of their internal affairs; also allowing to each a judicial, to preside in the courts for trying causes between *meum* and *tuum;* but all taxes and all laws to be in the name of the

* General Schuyler had, by his exercise of justice toward the New England States, as a commissioner to determine territorial boundaries, won the thorough respect of the people of those States. From October, 1773, until July, 1787, he had been a member of a commission to settle the boundary between the States of New York and Massachusetts. His colleagues, when that boundary was settled, in the summer of 1787, were Gerard Bancker and Simeon De Witt. The Massachusetts commissioners were Timothy Edwards, Samuel Williams and Theodore Sedgwick. The commissioners appointed by Congress to act with the State Commissioners, were John Ewing, David Rittenhouse, and Thomas Hutchins. The final report, defining the boundary, is in the handwriting of General Schuyler, and is signed by him and all of the gentlemen above named.

Legislature of Columbia. In short, that the Legislature of Columbia should be to the States what the British Parliament is to the counties of England.

"I conceive," Schuyler continued, "that if any federal government is established with less stability and power than this, it will be inadequate, not only to oppose an enemy, but to prevent internal commotions; and, if so, must, sooner or later, give way to perhaps a chance government, which may be a despotism, arbitrary monarchy, aristocracy, or, what is still worse, oligarchy.

"I dread a dissolution of all union. Immediate quarrels between the States will ensue. These quarrels will beget armies; these armies a conqueror, and this conqueror may give us such a government as prevails at Constantinople. Certainly, in such a case, we cannot hope for a better than that which France groans under. Let us, therefore, seriously strive to obtain such a government as will secure to us that degree of liberty which is consistent with the social state; not that degree which empowers part of the community, uncontrolled, to injure the whole. That is licentiousness."*

The recommendation of Congress for a national convention was heeded; and, on the 14th of May, 1787, a convention of representatives from twelve States assembled in Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, to consider and amend the Articles of Confederation. The State of New York was represented by Robert Yates, John Lansing, jr., and Alexander Hamilton. Lansing had been Schuyler's confidential clerk during the general's military career, and Hamilton, as we have observed, was his son-in-law.

The representatives were tardy in assembling, and it was not until the 25th that seven States (the requisite number to form a quorum) had delegates at Philadelphia. Then George Washington was chosen to preside over the convention, and William Jackson was appointed their secretary. The ablest men in the several States were there, sixty in number on the roll.

It was soon found that the existing government was too weak for amendments to give it strength, and so it was

* Autograph Letter.

cast aside, and the convention proceeded in the construction of an entirely new system. Their debates were earnest, dignified and patriotic in tone. They finished their labors late in September. On the 10th of that month all the articles of the new Constitution, upon which they had agreed, were referred to a committee for arrangement and a revision of the style. That labor was chiefly performed by Gouverneur Morris, of the committee. By a carefully worded resolution, adopted on the 28th of September, the convention recommended the Congress to lay the new Constitution before the *people* (not the *States*), and ask them, *the source of all sovereignty*, to ratify or reject it.*

The result of the labors of that convention caused intense feeling throughout the land. The doctrine of State supremacy found a host of able advocates, with numerous followers, and they vehemently opposed the new Constitution, because it would actually reduce the States to the condition of municipalities. On the other hand, a still larger number of able advocates were found, with a corresponding retinue of adherents, who saw that in the new Constitution were centred all their hopes for a stable and strong national government, that would enable the United States to take a conspicuous and honorable place in the family of nations, and they advocated its adoption. These were then called Federalists, and the opposers of the Constitution were called Anti-Federalists.

* The following is a copy of that resolution:

"*Resolved unanimously*, That the said report [of the Convention to the Congress], with the resolutions and letters accompanying the same, be transmitted to the several Legislatures, in order to be submitted to a convention of delegates chosen in each State by the people thereof in conformity to the resolves of the Convention made and provided in that case."

In no State in the Union did these opposing sentiments more distinctly crystallize into opposing parties than in the State of New York, where Schuyler, Hamilton and Jay were the acknowledged leaders of the Federalists. The last two, with Madison, of Virginia, who, with Washington, sympathized with the Federalists, at once put forth some of the ablest essays ever written upon the subject of constitutional and representative government, and all in favor of the newly-formed organic law of the land. These essays, collected, form that admirable work known in the political literature of our country as "The Federalist." Robert R. Livingston and his family connections, and also the Van Rensselaers, were all on the side of the Federalists; and these men, with their own and their family influence, proved a power in the State.

Schuyler had been most conspicuous in the State Senate, in efforts to induce the Legislature of New York to give to the Congress the sole power to collect and disburse the impost revenues of the country. This measure he had strongly urged, on every proper occasion, and never more strenuously than in 1786 and 1787. Hamilton, in the Assembly, as strenuously urged the same measure, and they were the acknowledged leaders of the two houses. Around these men the Federalists, in and out of the Legislature, rallied.

The Anti-Federalists of New York were led by that staunch patriot, George Clinton, who had then been Governor of the State more than ten years. He had a powerful hold upon the affections of the people. His ablest political associates were Robert Yates, afterward Chief-Justice of New York; John Lansing, jr., who was also a Chief-Justice and Chancellor of the State; Samuel Jones, who became Controller; and the very able Melancthon

Smith. Yates and Lansing, as we have seen, were members of the National Convention at Philadelphia, but withdrew from it, leaving Hamilton to bear all the honor of placing his State among the subscribers to the new Constitution. Such were the chief leaders of parties in the State of New York, who fought the political battles preceding the ratification of the National Constitution.

Governor Clinton was vehemently opposed to the new organic law, which would deprive him of much of the power and dignity which he possessed; and political writers of the day more than insinuated that personal ambition and a love of that power had a controlling influence in inducing the Governor to oppose the adoption of that instrument. Be that as it may, it is a singular fact that in his message to the Legislature, at the beginning of January, 1788, when the new Constitution had long been published, and had been not only referred to the several legislatures, but was a cause of much anxiety in the public mind, he made no allusion to the subject.

On the 17th of January, Mr. Egbert Benson, a delegate from Duchess county, brought the subject before the Legislature, by offering a resolution that a convention should be called, to be composed of members elected by the people, to act upon the new Constitution. Such election was held in the spring of that year, which resulted in the choice of sixty-five gentlemen who represented fourteen counties of the State of New York. Poughkeepsie, the shire-town of Duchess county, was chosen as the place for the convention to be held, and at the court-house in that village the delegates were assembled on the 17th of June, 1788. Governor Clinton was appointed to preside over their deliberations, which continued until near

the close of July. The leading debaters in that Convention were Alexander Hamilton and Robert R. Livingston, on the Federal side, and Melancthon Smith on the Anti-Federal side.

That Convention was composed of some of the ablest men in the State. The city of New York was represented by John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, Chancellor Livingston, Richard Morris (then Chief-Justice), and James Duane, then mayor of the city. Albany was ably represented. Governor Clinton was chosen from Ulster county, and his brother, General James Clinton, from the county of Orange. Melancthon Smith was a representative from Duchess, and was regarded by Hamilton as his most formidable opponent.

It was found, at the beginning, that a large portion of the delegates were opposed to the adoption of the Constitution, unless it should be materially altered. For three weeks the discussion continued. The various articles of the instrument were carefully considered, and several amendments were proposed. A proposition was made by the Anti-Federalists that the Constitution should be ratified on the condition that certain specified amendments should be made. On this point, General Schuyler, who was in attendance upon the Convention as an anxious spectator, and exerted his influence in favor of the Constitution, wrote from Poughkeepsie to his friend, Henry Van Schaack, as follows:

"I have deferred an answer to your letter, in the hopes that I should have been able to afford you some precise communications of the intention of the convention assembled at this place, but, hitherto, no room has been given to speak with certainty on that head, except only that they will not absolutely reject the Constitution. They talk of conditional adoption, if such amendments shall be previously made as

they intend to propose. The Anties do not seem inclined to make much speed in the business. They probably wish to learn the result of Virginia's convention; and, from accounts conveyed by some of our friends, of the 13th instant, from Richmond, the event is very problematical. Should Virginia reject, I fear the Anties will follow their example."*

Early in July, events changed the aspect of the question at issue in the Convention. News reached them, officially, that the people of New Hampshire and Virginia had ratified the Constitution. This gave the requisite number of States to make that instrument the organic law of the land. It was no longer a question whether the people of New York preferred the old Articles of Confederation to the New Constitution, but whether they should secede from the Union; and, on motion of the Federalists, it was "*Resolved*, That the Constitution be ratified, in full confidence that the amendments proposed by this Convention will be adopted." When the final vote was taken, fifty-seven delegates were present, exclusive of the President, of whom *thirty* voted for ratification, and *twenty-seven* voted against it. That momentous decision was made on the 26th of July. "Thus perseverance, patience and abilities prevailed against numbers and prejudice," General Schuyler wrote.†

To the above-cited resolution were annexed a Bill of Rights and recommendatory amendments. A circular letter was drawn up by Mr. Jay, addressed to the people of the other States of the Union, requesting them to coöperate with New York, by means of a convention to be called for that purpose, for the adoption of the amendments which the New York Convention had annexed to their rat-

* Autograph Letter, June 24, 1788.

† Autograph Letter to Henry Van Schaack.

ification. This was read and approved, and subscribed by all the members present.

The Federalists of Albany, on receiving the news that the requisite number of States, in convention assembled, had ratified the Constitution, appointed a day to celebrate the event. On that day they formed a procession, and began a march through the principal streets, led by General Schuyler and his son-in-law, Stephen Van Rensselaer. The Anti-Federalists came together on the same day, when inflammatory speeches were made, and the Constitution was burnt. Both parties were greatly excited, and, on meeting in Green street, the Anti-Federalists disputed the passage of their opponents, with a cannon which they had charged with pebbles and gravel. Some of the more moderate of the Anti-Federalists, in order to prevent such an outrage, had, without the knowledge of their political friends, spiked the cannon, and so made it harmless. But a serious affray occurred. Its gravity was heightened by the fact that some of the military Federalists, to give more pomp to the occasion, appeared in martial dress, with swords, guns and bayonets. The Anti-Federalists threw stones and bricks, and their opponents used their weapons. Some were badly wounded, but none were fatally injured.*

With the birth of the Nation, in the spring of 1789, when a new Congress assembled, clothed with sovereign powers by the new Constitution, there was a new revelation to mankind. It was perceived that the United States had suddenly become a power in the world—a *Nation*—and were no longer a weak *League of States*, jealous of each other and of the general government. Great Britain has-

* Hammond's "History of Political Parties in the State of New York," i. 20.

tened to send a minister-plenipotentiary to her peer, and asked for that commercial reciprocity which she had so scornfully refused only five years before. France, Holland and Spain sent diplomats to the new government, and the Republic of the West took its place among the leading nations of the globe. Then was realized the prophetic dream of Bishop Berkeley, shadowed in the line:

"Westward the course of Empire takes its way."