Eastern Shore REPUBLICAN STAR OR General Advertiser

EASTON—(MARYLAND) Printed and Published every *Tuesday Morning*, by THOMAS PERRIN SMITH, near the Court House.

[VOL. I....4.] TUESDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 7, 1802. [NO. 14....170.]

THE TERMS OF THE STAR

ARE TWO DOLLARS and FIFTY CENTS per annum—payable half yearly, in advance.——No paper discontinued until the same is paid for.

Advertisements inserted three weeks for ONE DOLLAR a square, and TWENTY-FIVE CENTS per week for continuance.

From the NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER

SYDNEY, No. VII.
TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

To test the sincerity and consistency of the leaders of the federal party, I have appealed to the events and language of the memorable period of 1798; a period, which has been denominated the period of terror. At the commencement of that year, Mr. Adams had been only ten months in office. It will be recollected by those who participated in the events of that day, that a great conflict of opinion had been waged between the republicans and federalists, in which the characters of the rival candidates, Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Adams, underwent the severe ordeal of public investigation.

No sooner had Mr. Adams placed himself in the chair of state than a serene horizon was exchanged for one louring with the omens of storms. The measures, which he took with a rashness, which has been falsely called vigor, carried the appearance of tranquility still further and further from our hopes. In December 1797, congress assembled; and then it was that every organ of presidential power was forced into exercise. The public mind, already sufficiently elevated, was attempted to be carried to a pitch of fury; and divisions of an alarming hue were fomented among the people. The federalists seized the national enthusiasm, and having obtained that, pushed on to a developement of views hitherto hidden.

Among the measures of this memorable session, was one, which though not of the greatest importance, served the federalists as the occasion of making known, at a propitious period, their peculiar and characteristic political sentiments.

Flushed with victory, and in the full hope of brighter triumphs, it may safely be inferred that they, on this occasion, spoke what they thought.

The occasion referred to was on the passage of the bill respecting foreign intercourse. From the debate that took place we shall make copious extracts from federal speeches, occasionally noticing the remarks of the republican members, where they tend to elucidate the view proposed to be taken. These extracts shall be first exhibitted, with but concise comment, until they are closed, when, if it shall be thought useful, some further remarks will be made.

On the 18th Jan. 1798, a bill was taken up in the house of representatives, extending the usual appropriations for foreign intercourse, allowing therefor the annual sum of 68,650 dollars.

Mr. Nicholas opened the debate by declaring his hostility to the bill, and his desire to bring back the subject of foreign intercourse to the ground on which it stood previous to its extension in 1796.

He said "It was particularly necessary to guard against the encrease of executive patronage; because the number of representatives in that department of government was small, in proportion to their constituents; and their power of gaining influence was great, in proportion to the smallness of their number. It was necessary to attend to the patronage entrusted to this branch of the government, as he was sorry to say that he believed that patronage had been made use of to influence the public mind in a particular direction; as was a fact very evident that no man could be admitted into the offices of the government of this country, unless he made a sacrifice of political opinion to executive infallibility.

"There was another reason for adopting the charge which he proposed. Our public agents abroad were mostly chosen from the legislature itself; and it was worthy of serious consideration, that the most attractive offices which government had to bestow, were filled with legislative characters.

"Mr. N. said, his own opinion with respect to foreign diplomatic intercourse was, that we ought to have none. We should be better without any sort of political intercourse with foreign nations, and he should wish commerce to be left to seek its own markets. He did not wish, however, to set up his opinion as a standard in this business; all he desired was, to bring it back to its original establishment."

Mr. Harper, a federal member, said, in reply, that, "Whenever a set of gentlemen in any country found their views opposed by the measures of government, they became vexed, and attributed the proceedings of those who differed from them in opinion to any motive rather than the public good. The desire of executive favor, or executive offices, was an usual charge, and it was at this day well understood."

Mr. Allen, a federal member, said, "He [Mr. Nicholas] had strongly warned the house against executive patronage. He spoke of the different departments of government as distinct bodies, having different interests, as if the executive was forming a patronage against which it was important for that house to guard. He thought language of this kind very improper. He believed it might have bad effect out of doors, when the people heard of the executive being thus charged. Instead of making these charges, he wished the gentleman had said, "come now, let us reason together." This would have been preferable to calling of hard names, to speaking of the lust of dominion, and of patronage; as if one branch of the government was in danger of being swallowed up by the other."

Mr. Gallatin, a republican member, "believed that there was a number of people in the United States—people otherwise enlightened, and upon all common subjects, possessed of sound understandings, who were fully convinced that there was a faction existing within the United States, and even within the walls of that house who wished to demolish the government; and he further believed that this opinion was supported by such declarations as had been made by the gentleman from Connecticut; but they should not be considered as dangerous to the safety of the community. Nor could he consider the determination of the executive to employ only such persons as are of the same political opinion with themselves, as of such a nature as to produce fatal consequences, and that government, on that account, was unworthy of confidence. He believed that such a line of conduct must flow from the present state of parties in America, divided as the people were upon many important occasions. To say, therefore, that the executive employed persons of consonant political opinions to its own, was not to say the government did not deserve confidence."

The reader will feel the pointed application of these cool remarks of Mr. Gallatin to the present state of things — Though the favoritism of the executive had become exclusive, still he did not consider it as proof that "the government did not deserve confidence." On the contrary he "believed that such a line of conduct must flow from the present state of parties in America, divided as the people were upon many important occasion." If then the *exclusive* partiality of the Adams administration ought not, in his opinion, to have deprived the government of confidence, even in the opinion of their opponents, how much less should a few removals of federalists by the present administraion deprive them of confidence, in the opinion of their opponents?

Mr. Sitgreaves, a federal member, said "It has also been observed, that it had become an avowed principle in the government, to exclude from public offices, all those who were of a different opinion from the executive. He knew not upon what foundation this assertion was made, and it was very immaterial whether true or not, for himself, he had no objection to declare it to be his opinion, that whenever the administrarion of government had deviated from a rule of this kind, they had done so to their sorrow and to their loss, and the experiencies of government in this respect had produced a sad and awful lesson which would doubtless have its effect in future.

"But, was it for that house to enquire into these things? He believed not, the constitution and laws of the country had made certain offices necessary, and it left the executive to fill them as he pleased; and was it for that house to attempt to controul this discretion? If it were executed to the injury of the people, the constitution had pointed out the remedy to be by impeachment. But where was the crime, the offence, or the impropriety of the conduct ascribed to the executive, if it had been adopted? Would gentlemen say that the executive ought to appoint persons to office who professed an opinion contrary to its own? Did gentlemen suppose that there was such a want of integrity of this department of government, that it adopted a political opinion which it did not believe to be right; and if it were believed to act from principle, would it be prudent, or right, to admit to a participation in the execution of the important duties of government, persons whose sentiments were not in unison with those of the executive, and who could only create discord and confusion, where nothing but harmony and union ought to prevail? If the executive acted upon just principles, it would endeavor to give singleness of design to its operation, and it could only do this by admitting persons into the government who thought with it. Where this has been deviated from (as he had before observed) government had received an awful lesson for its future conduct."

Read, fellow-citizens, these unqualified remarks over and over again. Impress them upon your memories. Compare them with the clamour excited by the violence of federalism, by a few removals of federal, and a few appointments of republican officers! Make the inconsistency between men in power and out of power. Recollect that this man received an office from Mr. Adams, with the emolument of £. 1,000 sterling, near 5,000 dollars a year. When you are stunned with the abuse of your president, contrast his moderation with the violence of his enemies.

Mr. T. Pinckney (a federal member, the same who formed our treaty with Spain) spoke against the adoption of Mr. Nicholas's amendment at that time; but observed, "If peace were restored in Europe, and we had no difference to settle there, he should agree with the gentleman from Virginia, and with the opinion of the old congress, that it would be well to keep no foreign ministers in Europe All commercial regulations might be as well carried on by consuls as by ministers; and if any difference should arise betwixt this country and any of the European governments, special envoys might be sent to settle them, as heretofore, for when the situation of this country was considered, it would appear to be for our interest to have as little political connection with Europe as possible, and therefore ministers could be of no use, but might do mischief. Gentlemen of different opinions in that house, must see that we have had ministers in foreign countries who have done no good, and that foreign ministers have been sent to this country who have done harm."

In these remarks, a strong confirmation of the wisdom of our exeeutive will be found, in the suppression of all but three foreign missions, rendered necessary by peculiar objects that reqnired attention. This sanction entitled to greater weight from the experience of Mr. Pinckney, whose situation had enabled him from actual observation, to test the accuracy of his opinions. But it, unfortunately, so happened that the measures of the executive, adopted from principle, removed three federalists of distinction, and this is a crime which admits of no atonement!

Mr. Buyard followed Mr. Griswold. He observed, that "Gentlemen who advocated this amendment, seemed to do it, because men of a certain opinion were appointed to office, as if they were to say, we know our principles are such that we have no chance of being appointed, therefore we will not suffer the president to appoint any body else. The gentleman from Georgia had expressed great surprise on hearing the principle avowed. But he asked whether this was not a principle of the first authority in this country—it was the principle upon which the sovereign people themselves acted.—Did they ever chuse representatives of a different opinion from themselves? He believed no one would say they did. If he, or the gentlemen who differed from him, held different opinions from those they held, they should not appear in their present situations. The president was therefore justified in acting in the same way; and if he had ever deviated from it the deviation had convinced him of his error; and profiting by this experience, he trusted a similar conduct would be avoided in future."

Notwithstanding these bold, absolute declarations on executive duty, this man has been not only among the most violent members of the community, but, perhaps, the most violent in his denunciations of the present administration for those very measures carried to but a moderate extent, which he enforced as a duty on his predecessor, when carried to the utmost extent. Alas! frail man! What a child do thy interests and passions make of thee. James A. Bayard was nominated a minister plenipotentiary by Mr. Adams—Mr. Jefferson treated the nomination with disregard.

On the 24th of January, Mr. Craik, a federal member, said "He laid it down as incontrovertible, that in the government, the moment the executive lose the confidence of the people, that moment the government is destroyed. He deemed the idea, that the executive could have influence by means of its patronage, a mere chimera."

This is strange doctrine! It is the climax of federal delusion, and is nothing short of absolute monarchy! It cannot, therefore, be supposed to be quoted for its truth. It is quoted to shew that federalism is condemned out of its own mouth. For if it is "incontrovertible, that in the government, the moment the executive lose the confidence of the people, that moment the government is destroyed."—Then does it follow by inevitable inference, that every citizen, even should he be a flaming federalists, once in search of office, but now unfortunately disappointed, who attempts to deprive the executive of the confidence of the people, at that very moment does all in his power to destroy the government, and is unequivocally a disorganizer, and an enemy to the constitution. The confession is a precious one, as it confirms, beyond denial, the strongest charges made by their opponents.

Mr. Craik further says "He did not feel it incumbent on him to vindicate the executive against the charge of having determined to appoint only such persons as agreed with him in opinion, for he believed such a determination would be proper, unless it should ever happen that persons of that description should be found bereft of talents."

Mr. Goodrich, a federal member, remarked "It was said to be the interest of this country to annul all our foreign political intercourse. He did not deny, that separated as we are from Europe, that it might be for the interest and happiness of this country to have no connection with European powers."

It will be remarked that these expressions are strong corroborations of one of the leading sentiments entertained by the republican side.

Mr. Goodrich further observes "But it was said, the doctrine of favoritism had been adopted, and that only one description of men were appointed to office. He thought there was a great want of order in gentlemen who first brought forward this subject upon which it was difficult and indelicate to speak. The doctrine had been allowed without authority, for the president of the United States had not said that he had formed any such determination as was attributed to him; but if he had determined to select to office only those persons who had evinced, by their manners, an attachment to the constitution of their country, and to those measures which had been sanctioned by the legislature and himself, he thought he had adopted a right principle."

Remember, reader, that Mr Goodrich was nominated to an office in the last moments of an expiring administration; long after Mr. Jefferson was, in accordance with the public will, named president of the United States. The nomination was properly considered by him as an insult offered to the sovereignty of the people. He, therefore, passed it by as a non-entity, and viewing the office as vacant, appointed another to fill it. Hence the New Haven remonstrance so perpetually buzzed in our ears. Hence the loud and dolorous pity for Mr. Goodrich so tiresomely rung through the nation—And yet you will see that this very man, thus commiserated sacrifice to the will of the people, this citizen of such amiable and benignant spirit, is in fact his own executioner. For in so many words, he tells the president, *remove me.* That will be the necessary effect of "a right principle."

Mr. G. further says "The duties of the executive were to preserve the power of the country, to vindicate its rights; to protect its sovereignty, to execute the public will expressed through the laws. Rob it of one of these powers, and you destroy the most valuable part of the government—depress it, and you only do it for a short time. It will rise on the affection and favor of the people, with new life and vigor. Indeed those attempts against the executive were calculated to produce a more strange and powerful executive than we now have."

Was he gifted with the spirit of prophecy when he made these remarks? Is it not a perfect delineation of federal violence and its effect upon the people?

Mr. Otis observed that "When a man after rendering the most important services to his country for a series of years, is elected at an important crisis of national affairs to the high office of president of these states; his political opinions in general, and his sentiments upon the existing state of affairs, must have been known to the people by whom he was elected. It must also have been foreseen that he would pursue such a system of administration, and by the aid of such measures and agents as would be best calculated to give efficacy to his own sentiments and system. His system, therefore, may be considered as sanctioned by the previous assent of the majority of the people. His constitutional patronage is the patronage of the majority, and to increase that majority by all fair means, is to increase the chance of public tranquility. It is an important duty that should be judiciously exercised, and not an offence to be disavowed."

Words cannot contain a more direct application of the measures of the president, or disapprobation of those who condemn them: and yet this very gentleman has fulminated on some recent occasions the most inflamatory denunciations against the executive magistrate.

From the NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

SERIOUS CONSIDERATIONS,
Addressed to all sincere Federalists.
No. I.

Fellow Citizens,

When the federal constitution was published for consideration, I examined it with all the attention in my power, impressed with a conviction that it was the duty of every citizen to exercise on that momentous occasion an independent judgment. I was well aware that on its provisions, if adopted, depended a large portion of national and individual felicity. The result of an examination, the most dispassionate, convinced me of the superiority of this instrument to all others in the universe. Having for its object the general happiness, and contemplating it as the best shield for the preservation of liberty, I did not hesitate to recommend its adoption to others. Though I thought I discerned a few defects in it I rejoiced in its entire ratification, and I considered the day which made it the supreme law of the land, the proudest my country had ever seen since the memorable day which declared us independent and free.

Over the exercise of the powers confided by this instrument I have watched with uninterrupted vigilance. In action I have remained neutral, but my feelings have risen and fallen with every vicissitude of political affairs. To the great measures of the Washington and Adams administrations, I have yielded a cordial assent. Some of those measures, it is true, were not such as I would have recommended; but being for the most part adopted from honest motives and with upright views, I felt willing to sacrifice my own opinion on the altar of national harmony, and desirous of presenting to a hostile world a phalanx of power unimpaired by internal division.

These feelings and principles still warm my heart and guide my understanding. I still feel myself an American, and a federalist. My first love is that of my country; my second that of our invaluable constitution. This country and this constitution have become more sacredly endeared to me by a contemplation of the universal fraud of other governments; and the universal misery of their subjects.

Amidst all the aspersions of party prejudice and injustice, I have inquired "*Is not the country flourishing and happy?*" My heart has invariably answered in the affirmative, nor have I heard a single voice entitled to regard lifted in the negative.

It is for the purpose, fellow-citizens, of putting this question, at this period, to your consciences, that I now address you; and I call upon you to say "*Is not the country flourishing and happy?*"

I know you are too honest and well informed not to answer in the affirmative. The country is flourishing and happy.

Having answered this question, I call upon you to say what are the sources of our posterity and happiness? What are those sources which peculiarly and pre-eminently elevate us so far above other nations?

Nature is alike prodigal of her favors to other nations. It is not, therefore, to her that we owe our peculiar exemption from their misfortunes.

It is owing to the superiority of our political institutions, to their admirable structure, and to the fidelity and intelli-