WASHINGTON CITY, Feb. 24.

The following are *original* letters of the illustrious *Washington*, most eminently adapted to the present crisis.—The sentiments are sterling; such as that upright man felt from the bottom of his soul. Were he now alive, what terrors would not his indignant frown strike into the hearts of those wretches, who, for the base purposes of disaffection, of errant toryism, of foreign attachments, dare to invoke his name; who, with the flexible malignity of the serpent, turn and twist themselves into endless contortions to deceive and seduce the unweary; who assert and retract, retract and assert, the most profligate falsehoods, with the insensibility and impudence of a stage player.

Mount Vernon, July 20th, 1774.

DEAR SIR,

Your letter of the 17th was not presented to me till after the resolutions (which were adjudged advisable for this country to come to) had been revised, altered, and corrected in the committee; nor till we had gone into a general meeting in the court-house, and my attention necessarily called every moment to the business that was before it; I did however upon the receipt of it (in that hurry and bustle) hastily run it over, and handed it round to the gentlemen on the bench, of which there were many; but as no person present seemed in the least disposed to adopt your sentiments—as there appeared a perfect satisfaction and acquiesence to the measures proposed (except from a Mr. Williamson, who was for adopting your advice, literally, without obtaining a second voice on his side)—and as the gentlemen to whom the letter was shewn advised me not to have it read, as it was not like to make a convert, and repugnant (some of them thought) to the very principle we were contending for, I forborne to offer it otherwise than in the manner above mentioned, which I shall be sorry for, if it gives you any dissatisfaction in not having your sentiments read to the county at large, instead of communicating them to the first people in it, by offering them the letter in the manner I did.

That I differ very widely from you, in respect to the mode of obtaining a repeal of the acts so much, and so justly complained of, I shall not hesitate to acknowledge; and that this difference of opinion may probably proceed from the different constructions we put upon the conduct and intention of the ministry, may also be true; but as I see nothing on the one hand, to induce a belief that the parliament would embrace a favorable opportunity of repealing acts which they go on with great rapidity to pass, in order to enforce their tyrannical system; and on the other observe, or think I observe, that government is pursuing a regular plan at the expence of law and justice, to overthrow our constitutional rights and liberties, how can I expect any redress from a measure which hath been ineffectually tried already. For, sir, what is it we are contending against? Is it against paying the duty of 3d. per lb. on tea, because burthensome? No, it is the right only, we have all along disputed, and to this end we have already petitioned his majesty in as humble and dutiful a manner as subjects could do; nay more, we applied to the House of Lords & House of Commons in their different legislative capacities, setting forth that as Englishmen we could not be deprived of this essential and valuable part of our constitution. If then, as the fact really is, it is against the right of taxation we now do, and (as I before said) all along have contended, why should they suppose an exertion of this power would be less obnoxious now than formerly? And what reason have we to believe that they would make a second attempt whilst the same sentiments filled the breast of every American, if they did not intend to enforce it if possible? The conduct of the Boston people could not justify the rigor of their measures, unless there had been a requisition of payment and refusal of it; nor did that measure require an act to deprive the government of Massachusetts Bay of their charter, or to exempt offenders from trial in the place, where offences were committed; as there was not nor could not be a single instance produced to manifest the necessity of it. Are not all these things self-evident proofs of a fixed and uniform plan to tax us? If we want further proofs, does not all the debates in the House of Commons serve to confirm this? and hath not general Gage's conduct since his arrival (in stopping the address of his council, and publishing a proclamation more becoming a Turkish Bashaw than an English governor declaring it treason to associate in any manner by which the commerce of Great Britain is to be effected) exhibited unexampled testimony of the most despotic system of tyranny that ever was practised in a free government. In short, what farther proofs are wanting to satisfy one, of the designs of the ministry that their own acts; which are uniform, and plainly tending to the same point—nay, if I mistake not, avowedly to fix the right of taxation—what hope then from petitioning, when they tell us that now, or never, is the time to fix the matter? Shall we after this whine and cry for relief, when we have already tried it in vain? or shall we supinely sit and see one province after another fall a sacrifice to despotism?—If I were in any doubt as to the right which the Parliament of Great Britain had to tax us without our consents, I should most heartily coincide with you in opinion, that to petition, and petition only, is the proper method to apply for relief; because we should then be asking a favor, and not claiming a right which, by the law of nature and our constitution, we are, in my opinion, indubitably entitled to; I should even think it criminal to go farther than this, under such an idea; but none such I have, I think the Parliament of Great Britain hath no more right to put their hands into my pocket, without my consent, than I have to put my hands into yours for money; and this being already urged to them in a firm, but decent manner, by all the colonies, what reason is there to expect any thing from their justice?

As to the resolution for addressing the Throne, I own to you, sir, I think the whole might as well have been expunged; I expect nothing from the measure; nor should my voice have accompanied it, if the non-importation scheme was intended to be retarded by it; for I am convinced as much as I am of my existence, that there is no relief for us but in their distress; and I think, at least I hope, that there is public virtue enough left among us to deny ourselves every thing but the bare necessaries of life, to accomplish this end: this we have a right to do, and no power upon earth can compel us to do otherwise, till they have first reduced us to the most abject state of slavery that ever was designed for mankind. The stopping our exports would, no doubt, be a shorter cut than the other, to effect this purpose, but if we owe money to Great Britain, nothing but the last necessity can justify the non-payment of it; and therefore I have great doubts upon this head, and wish to see the other method, which is legal and will facilitate these payments, first tried.

I cannot conclude without expressing some concern, that I should differ so widely in sentiments from you in a matter of such great moment, and general import; and should much distrust my own judgment upon the occasion, if my nature did not recoil at the thought of submitting to measures which I think subversive of every thing that I ought to hold dear and valuable—and did I not find, at the same time, that the voice of mankind is with me. I must apologise for sending you so rough a sketch of my thoughts upon your letter. When I looked back and saw the length of my own, I could not, as I am also a good deal hurried at this time, bear the thoughts of making off a fair copy.

I am, dear sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

GEO. WASHINGTON.

To Bryan Fairfax, Esq. at Towlston.

HEAD QUARTERS,
Valley Forge, March 1, 1778.

DEAR SIR,

Your favor of the 8th of December came safe to my hands, after considerable delay in its passage.

The sentiments you have expressed of me in this letter are highly flattering—meriting my warmest acknowledgements, as I have too good an opinion of your sincerity and candor, to believe that you are capable of unmeaning professions, and speaking a language foreign from your heart; the friendship I ever professed, and felt for you, met with no diminution from the difference in our political sentiments. I knew the rectitude of my own intentions and believing in the sincerity of yours, lamented, tho' I did not condemn, your renunciation of the creed I had adopted.—Nor do I think any person, or power ought to do it whilst your conduct is not opposed to the general interests of the people, and the measures they are pursuing. The latter, that is our actions, depending on ourselves may be controled, while the powers of thinking originating from higher causes, cannot always be moulded to our wishes.

The determinations of Providence are always wise—often inscrutable—and, though its decrees appear to bear hard upon us at times, is, nevertheless meant for gracious purposes. In this light I cannot help viewing your late disappointment; for if you had been permitted to have gone to England, unrestrained even by the rigid oaths which are administered upon those occasions, your feelings as a husband, parent, &c. must have been considerably wounded in the prospect of a long, perhaps lasting separation from your nearest relatives—what then must they have been if the obligation of an oath had left you without a will?

Your hope of being instrumental in restoring peace would prove as unsubstantial as mist before a noon-day sun, and would as soon dispel; for believe me, sir, Great Britain understood her, self perfectly well in this dispute, but did not comprehend America. She meant as Lord Camden in his late speech in Parliament, clearly and explicitly declares, to drive America into rebellion, that her own purposes might be more fully answered by it; but take this along with it, that this plan originating in a firm belief founded on misinformation, that no effectual opposition would or could be made; they little dreamt of what has happened, and are disappointed in their views.

Does not every act of administration from the tea act to the present sessions of Parliament, declare this in plain and self-evident characters? Had the commissioners any powers to treat with America? If they meant peace, would Lord Howe have been detained in England five months after passing the act? Would the powers of these Commissioners have been confined to mere acts of grace upon condition of absolute submission? No. Surely no! They meant to draw us into what they termed rebellion, that they might be furnished with a pretext to disarm, and then strip us of the rights and privileges of Englishmen. If they were actuated by principles of justice, why did they refuse, indignantly, to accede to the terms which we humbly supplicated before hostilities commenced, and this country deluged in blood, and now make their principal officers, and even the commissioners themselves, say that these terms are just and reasonable; nay, that more will be granted than we have yet asked, if we will relinquish our claim to independency. What name does such conduct as this deserve? And what punishment is there in store for the men who have distressed millions—involved themselves in ruin—and plunged numberless families in inextricable woe!—Could that which is just and reasonable now, have been unjust four years ago? If not, upon what principles I repeat, does administration act? They must either be wantonly wicked and cruel, or (which is only another mode of expressing the same thing) under false colors are now endeavoring to deceive the great body of the people industriously propagating an idea, that Great Britain is willing to offer any, and that we will accept of no terms; thereby hoping to poison, and disaffect the minds of those who wish for peace, and create feuds and dissentions in consequence—in a word, having less dependence now on their arms than their arts, they are practising such low and dirty tricks, that men of sentiment and honor must blush for their fall. Among other measures in this way, they are forging letters and publishing them as intercepted ones, of mine, to prove that I am an enemy to the present measures of this continent; having been deceived, and led on by Congress in hopes that at length, they would recede from their claims and withdraw their opposition to G. Britain.

Dear sir, your most obedient and affectionate,

GEO: WASHINGTON.

MR. SMITH,

I am once more obliged reluctantly, to appear in your paper, for the purpose of substantiating, by indubitable testimony, what I have heretofore said of Mr. Brown, as furnisher of the poor of Caroline county; in doing which, I shall notice superficially, his inconsistencies and misrepresentations, and haste to a conclusion.

As Mr. Brown has proceeded in a systematical manner, in noticing the objections I made to his conduct in furnishing the poor, I think it most proper to attempt that plan, and meet him on his own grounds. According then to that plan, the article of shoes is the first thing that merits my attention;—I have before stated that Mr. Brown charged the county $2 a pair for course shoes—this I repeat, and 12/6 for other shoes, the quality of which I have not been able to ascertain, as Mr. Brown takes care not to identify the quality of his shoes in his account. In order to reconcile so unwarrantable a charge to the public feelings, he has obtained the certificate of Mr. Samuel Emmerson, of this village, that his price for best double soled shoes is $2, and that they are worth it,—to this I assent, but it does not prove the shoes furnished by Mr. Brown were of that description; and if it did, it could not prove that such high priced shoes were proper to be furnished to the county; for I am authorised by the same gentleman to say, that he has made shoes for the poor, for which he never charged more than $1 25. Mr. Brown has asserted that at the time those shoes were furnished, I was in part furnisher of the poor, and that the overseer was at liberty to deal with either of us, as he could be served upon the best terms; which upon the authority of Mr. Charles Manship, I assert to be a mistatement, as that gentleman was witness to a conversation which took place between James Hamilton, the then overseer, and myself, in which he intimated that he was not at liberty in that respect, but to use his own words, obliged to obey the directions of his master. This will serve to shew that he had orders not to deal with me, if he could procure any article wanted of Mr. Brown.

He has contended that no allowance ever was made for a certain Elizabeth Price, and indeed the books of the poor house give no evidence of it, but from the face of an extract, made in the hand writing of Mr. Thomas Richardson, clerk of the county, from the account of Mr. Brown for the year 1805, as returned, and filed in the clerk's office; it will clearly appear that the county has been charged with £3 3 8 on her account, £2 3 9 of which has been paid to John Chaffinch, as will appear from his certificate, in part payment for the maintenance of her child, and a balance of £5 19 11 yet due, which Mr. Brown has received, and from the tenor of her certificate* appears never to have accounted with her for.

This gentleman has admitted that he overpaid the order of Deborah Pearson for 1805, £3 8 10, and charged the same to the county in his account for that year; and alledges for so doing that he was irrisistably prompted to it by her "extreme wants and sufferings," which would seem at once to infallibly prove the goodness of the man's heart. But this I called misplaced charity. If a young, healthy woman could not gain a support by her industry, with the aid of a pension from the county of £11 5 0, she ought not to be entitled to the consideration of any charitable institution—and as to her children, some of them were of illegitimate offspring, and sworn to Timothy L. Price, a man of property, who had at that time credit in William Potter's store to the amount of £80 or 90. The article of corn is the next in order; and here I begin to blush for this gentleman's inconsistency. At the time this corn was furnished, he says no contract existed between the trustees and himself, which heightens the dye of the imposition, and fully proves that he conceived himself at liberty to extort from the county, when not bound down by the iron bands of a legal contract. And in order to give a finishing stroke to his misrepresentations, he has made an extract from his account for 1805, to shew that he dealt with his individual customers as with the county. But two of those persons† mentionod in that extract, I can venture to assert, never got a bushel from Mr. Brown at that price; the corn being obtained for persons who had allowances made them from the county, as the certificate of Mr. Rhodes will prove.

I observe he has laid before the public a contract which took place between the trustees and himself, for the furnishing of 60 bushels of corn at Fountain's Mill at 4/ a bushel; and in order to impress the public with a belief that he sustained a loss by that contract, has made an extract from his books to prove that he was giving more for corn than he was receiving from the county.

It will be proper here to state, that that contract took place in December 1803, at which time corn was selling for 3/9 throughout the county; but Mr. Brown not having furnished that quantity until October 1804, it will clearly appear in that time corn must have taken a considerable rise, and though he might have been obliged to give more for it, yet he was at liberty to have furnished it the next day after his contract.

Mr. Brown calls my attention to the high price of coffee and sugar, in 1805, and wishes to induce me to believe, they would bear but a small advance, without selling them at an enormous price; to this I can only say, at the time Mr. Brown was charging the county 3/ for coffee, Mr. Potter was selling it for 2/6, and at the time he was selling sugar for 1/6, Mr. Potter was selling it for 1/1.

I should do injustice to Mr. Brown, was I not to acknowledge that I was incorrect about a charge for shoes at 13/6—the face of his account being to me somewhat unintelligible, and therefore haste to do it. I come now to the charge of peach brandy at 12/6, which he justifies himself in, by saying that he had since sold it for that price to his other customers; but this explanation will not hold good, because by the same parody of reasoning, he ought to have sold coffee, sugar, and a hundred other things, in the same way—but this I shall prove by the certificate of Mr. Cranor he never did.‡

* As the certificate of Elizabeth Smith, formerly Elizabeth Price, states that she never received any part of the money with which the county appears to be charged on her account, it has become a matter of enquiry, how it was appropriated, and it will rest with Mr. Brown to satisfy the public curiosity.

† The customers mentioned by Mr. Brown, who were mad enough to give eight shillings a bushel for corn, at a time when it might be purchased for much less, were Jeremiah Rhodes, and John Ward—the certificate of Mr. Rhodes will prove he never got any corn of Mr. Brown at that price; and I assert, and defy Mr. Brown to disprove it, that John Ward never did on his own account, it being for his sister, a pensioner, who being a branch of the family of the poor house, Mr. B. thought would bear a considerable advance.

‡ I am authorised by Mr. Charles Jones, one of the trustees for 1804, to say, that when Mr. Brown laid his account before the trustees for that year, a number of objections were made to his charges; some of which Mr. Brown acknowledged high, and indeed higher, than he charged his other customers, and excused himself for so doing, by saying he had so long to wait with the county for his money, though his account for that year was paid off by the first of January, 1805.

What can be Mr. Brown's object, in so repeatedly asserting, that no dispute took place between the trustees and himself relative to his account; I cannot tell, but I am very confident, as often as he has asserted it, he has deviated from truth, and the certificate of John Ruth, Esquire, will unequivocally prove it. I have heretofore said that Mr. Brown as treasurer, had a singular advantage of other persons who have claims against the county; and that he does not handle the money levied for its use, with fairness and liberality. He has procured the certificate of the Collector, that he has received but $240 which I admitted long ago; but I should be obliged to him to produce a certificate to shew, how that money was appropriated. No, that would not suit Mr. Brown's purpose, it would speak in too loud terms:—It would prove what really is the fact; that it has been kept in his hands, to be applied to the payment of his account, when passed, (which was done some time in February last,) to the exclusion of accounts some of which are now nearly of three years standing.

ANTHONY ROSS, junr.

March 7th, 1809.

STATE OF MARYLAND,
Caroline County, to wit:

I hereby certify to all persons whom it doth, or may concern, that in the account of Solomon Brown, against the trustees of the poor of Caroline county, for the year one thousand eight hundred and five, filed by the trustees of the poor of said county, amongst the papers of the Levy Court of said county, in the year, one thousand eight hundred and seven, are contained the following charges, to wit:

1805.

August 20.	Cr. Eliza Price,	2 3 9
Yet due. S. B. 3 8 10	To the trustees order in favor of Deborah Pearson dated the for	11 5 0
	Add for error in Deborah Pearson and Eliza Price.	9 8 9

SEAL. IN testimony whereof I hereto set my hand, and affixed the public seal of my office, this third day of March, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and nine.

THO. RICHARDSON, Clk,
Caroline County Court.

I hereby certify that myself, and two children, went to John Chaffinch's in February, 1805, and that I was there until the 18th of March following, during which time one of the children died. I then went to live with Solomon Brown, and left my other child with Mr. Chaffinch; a few days after living with Mr. Brown, Mr. Chaffinch, and his wife, came down and brought my child, when Mr. Brown observed, if he would keep it, he would see him paid for it. I further certify, that I never paid said Chaffinch any thing myself, nor do I know of any thing paid him by Mr. Brown. I further certify, that I received $2 a month, whilst living with Mr. Brown, and that I have paid my child's board, ever since he left Chaffinch, who is now in his twelfth year of his age, and that I have never received one cent from the county.

her
ELIZABETH ⋊ SMITH.
mark.

I hereby certify that Elizabeth Price, and her two children were at my house for some time, in February, 1805, in which time, one of the children died, that between that time, and the 18th March, Mr. Solomon Brown came to my house, and solicited me to keep the surviving child, for which he agreed to see me paid. I further certify, that I kept the child, from the 18th March, until some time in November following, for which I charged at the rate of $2 50 per month, which I expected Mr. Brown to pay; but when we came to a settlement, he would only pay me, £2 3 9 which caused some altercation between us: he then observed, if I would not get in a passion, he would put me in a way to get my money, which was to draw off my account, and present it to the trustees, whom he had no doubt would make an appropriation in my favour, which I accordingly did; the account was allowed for the balance, being £5 6 3 and paid off in February, 1808.

JOHN CHAFFINCH.

March 4th, 1809.

I hereby certify, that I never purchased any corn of Mr. Brown at 8/ a bushel; but that the corn which appears in Mr. Brown's account to be charged to me, was got by Lemuel Stokes for the use of two pensioners of the county, who he at that time kept; the maintainance of whom I was security for.

his
JERE. ⋊ RHODES.
4th March, 1809. mark.