

For the Maryland Republican.

SINCERITY OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

TO THE DISINTERESTED FEDERALISTS OF AMERICA.

THE circumstance which has long divided us in opinion from our fellow-citizens who call themselves the Republican party, is briefly this: We believe the administration to have evinced a want of sincerity in its negotiations with Great Britain. A decision upon this point has been at all times desirable; because, if it could be shown that we have been correct in that belief, we should stand justified to our own consciences and to the world: and, if it were proved that we had imbibed erroneous impressions, we should be purified of our prejudices, and restored to an union of sentiment with the majority of our countrymen. Recent events have rendered a decision upon this head seriously important. May I be permitted, without offence, to offer to the honest and candid men of my own party, the opinion which I have formed upon this subject after mature deliberation? I presume that I may; and I proceed to state the course of my reasoning, and the tenor of my convictions on the topic. Let it be recollected, that the fact in dispute is the sincerity of the administration in its uniformly avowed disposition to cultivate friendly intercourse with Great Britain.

England objected to an amicable arrangement of differences with the United States, in the first place, because the American government had not resisted the French Berlin decree of November 1806.

To obviate this difficulty, Mr. Pinkney, the minister of the United States at London, was instructed to propose to the British government, the mutual abrogation of the embargo and of the orders in council, as they related to England and to America, and the continuance of the embargo against France. He did accordingly write to Mr. Canning, on the 23d of August 1808, in the following words: "I am authorised to give you this assurance in the most formal manner; that if your orders should be rescinded as to the United States, our embargo will be rescinded as to Great Britain. The effects of these concurrent acts will be, that the commercial intercourse of the two countries will be immediately resumed; while, if France should adhere to maxims and conduct derogatory to the neutral rights of the United States, the embargo continuing as to her, will take the place of your orders, and lead, with an efficacy not only equal to theirs, but probably much greater, to all the consequences that ought to result from them."

To this proposition Mr. Canning replied on the 24th day of September 1808, declaring in his letter to Mr. Pinkney of that date, that his Britannic majesty was determined "to adhere to the principles on which the orders in council of the 7th of January and 11th of November are founded, so long as France adheres to that system by which his majesty's retaliatory measures were occasioned and justified."

Thus, as soon as the first obstacle to the restoration of harmony between the United States and Great Britain was removed by the American government, the English ministry changed its ground, averring that the resistance of the French decrees by America was a matter of indifference; and that the orders in council would be adhered to "so long as France adhered to her system." This was showing neutrals entirely out of the question; and proclaiming to the United States that England would not negotiate at all.

The second objection to an amicable adjustment of differences between the two countries, arose from the umbrage taken by Great Britain at the exclusion of her ships of war from our waters, whilst those of France were admitted.

This obstacle was removed by the tenth Congress of the United States, who, on the first of March 1809, passed a general non-intercourse law, placing France and England on a perfect equality with respect to the in-

terdiction of the American waters: to the vessels and commerce of both nations.

On the 17th of April 1809, Mr. Erskine addressed to Secretary Smith, a note containing professions of a sincere disposition on the part of his Britannic majesty to adjust the differences between America and England; and, as a first step thereto, proposed atonement for the outrage committed on the Frigate Chesapeake.

On the same day Secretary Smith replied to Mr. Erskine's note, reciprocated for the government of the United States the disposition to restore harmony between the two nations, and in the name of the President, accepted the proffered reparation for the violence done to the Chesapeake.

On the 18th of April 1809, Mr. Erskine addressed a second note to Mr. Smith, stating that the king of Great Britain had instructed him to assure the American government that the orders in council should be rescinded, if the President of the United States would, by proclamation, restore commercial intercourse between America and England; declaring also, that it was his majesty's intention to appoint a special minister to negotiate a treaty between the two countries.

The same day Mr. Smith answered, that the President would meet, with a disposition correspondent to that of the British monarch, the appointment of a minister to conclude a treaty; and that a proclamation would be issued as required.

On the 19th of April 1809, Mr. Erskine wrote to Secretary Smith, that the orders in council would be withdrawn on the 10th day of June 1809; and on the 19th day of April 1809, President Madison issued his proclamation, declaring that commercial intercourse would be restored on the said 10th day of June.

To every proposition made by Mr. Erskine in the name of his government, which could lead to the restoration of harmony between America and G. Britain, there was a promptness of acceptance manifested, which tended to hasten the promised accommodation. The delay of a single day was not interposed by the American administration to the progress and consummation of an honourable peace. The British minister plenipotentiary was met fully, fairly, frankly; without quibble, without subterfuge, without evasion.

The news of Mr. Erskine's arrangement reached London. On the 24th of May 1809, the king of England issued an order in council, proclaiming that the formal and unconditional stipulations of his resident minister here, were "such as were not authorised by his majesty's instructions; nor such as his majesty could approve."

Such, disinterested federalists of America, are the undeniable and undisputed incidents of the political transactions between the U. States of America and the kingdom of G. Britain. Suffer me concisely to recapitulate them.

1.—England required America to resist the Berlin decree before she would withdraw her orders in council and permit trade to be free.

2.—The United States conceded in this respect to the dictation of Great Britain; and offered, if the British would rescind their orders, to continue the embargo with respect to France, and to raise it with regard to Great Britain.

3.—The English rejected the submission of the United States to the demands of the court of London.

4.—The ministry of Great Britain complained that France was more favoured than England, because the ships of war of the latter were interdicted, whilst those of the former were permitted to enter our waters; and this was alleged as an insurmountable obstruction to negotiation and revival of commercial operations.

5.—The American Congress passed the non-intercourse law; and France and England were placed upon an equal footing in all respects.

6.—The British minister proposed an accommodation upon certain conditions.

7.—These conditions were unequivocally received, and ratified without alteration.

What, my good friends, do we perceive in all this? We behold G. Britain continually creating doubts and difficulties, whilst the United States are continually smoothing them away; we see England proposing terms for the adjustment of differences, and the instant they are accepted by America, we find the British government denying its own principles and its own propositions.

Federalists! I do not appeal to your passions: I address myself, in the garb of truth, to your understandings. The American administration has acted with SINCERITY: On their part all has been concession and eagerness for conciliation: On the part of England all has been profession, prevarication and delay.

I ask your patience for a few more remarks. Let us suppose the following conversation to have taken place between the king of Great Britain and the President of the United States; the case will be then more clearly comprehended:

FIRST CONVERSATION.

KING. "Mr. President, I will not interrupt your commerce if you will resist the Berlin decree."

PRESIDENT. "Well, I do resist: withdraw your orders in council."

KING. "No, I will not withdraw them. I care nothing about your resistance."

SECOND CONVERSATION.

KING. "Put France, Mr. President, on an equality with me and I will treat with you for peace and friendship."

PRESIDENT. "With all my heart; there, we have done what you wish by our non-intercourse law."

KING. "Very well; I now make you amicable proposals."

PRESIDENT. "I cheerfully accept them."

KING. "You do! Then I will not keep my word. I break off."

Federalists of America! if we do not mean to abandon our beloved country; if we have hearts to feel for her wrongs, and heads to understand her interests—if we are the legitimate inheritors of the sentiments of Washington and his brave associates, we must no longer give countenance to the passions and to the schemes of men who may desire to separate us from our government. We may deceive ourselves; but we cannot deceive foreign nations, nor the keen, sagacious, prying eyes of posterity: the welfare of our children, and our own honor are at hazard; and if in the hour of danger, we do not fortify the just cause of our country, instead of weakening it, we contribute to enslave the first and to tarnish the latter. I am one of you. I conscientiously believe the administration has been truly and invariably SINCERE in its desire for accommodation with England. I have placed the facts which have influenced me before you. Read—reflect—determine.

A FEDERALIST, and formerly a member of the Adams' Administration.

For the Maryland Republican.

TO THE PEOPLE OF MARYLAND.

No. III.

THE desire of the federalists to regain the confidence of the public, and the power which they have been driven from, may be traced to two motives, either of which might be sufficient to call forth all their exertions.

The hope of personal aggrandisement, and the expectation, which is never abandoned, of re-establishing their favorite principles of government, and destroying those of the Republican or Democratic system. To these ends the means are correspondent. The pressure of danger from abroad unites not them at home; or, at least, unites them not to their government.

The difficulties and embarrassments which have been occasioned by the injustice of other nations, are to them matter of exultation and triumph, and the measures of Great Britain obtain from them an approbation which many of her own subjects would hesitate to bestow.

Let us not be told that the Federalists have joined in the indignation which these measures have excited. If they felt indignation it was short lived, as in the case of the Chesapeake,—and as it will be on the dis-

avowal by the British ministry of the agreement made by Mr. Erskine.

The Republican Editors who felicitate their country and themselves on this apparent union of sentiment, will gratify their feelings at the expense of their Judgment; and greatly as I respect the opinions of Mr. Jefferson, I am compelled to believe that so it was with him when he said that we were "all Federalists, and all Republicans."

We may be all Federalists, as living under a Federal Union of the States—and we may be all Republicans, as being Citizens of the Federal and State Republics; our opinions must necessarily conform to those institutions. But, the friends and advocates of monarchy, the supporters of aristocracy, and the enemies to the equal rights of the citizens, are not Republicans.

People of Maryland—you will remember that one of the great objects of their system of government, is to save you from your worst enemies,—yourselves. The friends of kings and nobles, however they may weigh you down with taxes, are tender of placing on your shoulders the burthensome cares of government; or, if forced to let you participate in them, would allow you such a shadow of representation, and such a mockery of the elective franchise, as is imposed on the people of Great-Britain. You will not forget that the right of voting, as fixed by the Constitution, was thought too extensive by the Federal party, and that a further qualification, as to property, was attempted to be established. Now will you be unmindful of those who procured for you the general right of suffrage which you now enjoy.

If the leaders of this party who are so ready to decry the measures of our present rulers, will not inform you what course they would adopt, it is fair to presume that their conduct would be similar to that which they formerly pursued. It will not be unjust to anticipate from them a resort to unnecessary and oppressive tax—an increase of executive power and influence—a restraint of the liberty of the press, though now so much abused by themselves, and such an increase of the energy of Government as may destroy the principles, if not the name, of our republican institutions. We know that before the period for choosing electors of the President, in the year 1800, it was proposed to take the power from the people, and transfer it to the General Assembly;—and, that nothing prevented the carrying of that body for the purpose of altering the law, but a belief that success would be certain without having recourse to so alarming a measure.

The forbearance of the Executive to carry this expedient into actual execution, was, however, of little service to the party. The avowal of the disposition to resort to it, if it had been thought necessary, justly excited the apprehensions of the people, who were not satisfied with the promise that was held out, of restoring to them their rights when the occasion for the temporary sacrifice, or loan of them, should cease.

Men who know and value their rights, know also the necessity of guarding them with vigilance, and the danger of lending or bartering them for any purpose;—and there is reason to believe that the disposition manifested by the Federalists, on this occasion, tended much to sharpen the indignation which dismissed them from the public councils.

The same right which you exercised then, you are certainly at liberty to exercise now, if the occasion should call for it; and the republicans would be the last to question your privileges in this respect.

But it is a right that should be used with caution, and not without a clear understanding of the conduct and views of the two parties.

If in the wisdom, and political tenets of the Federalists, a remedy is to be found for the evils which the state of affairs in Europe has brought upon us, they will be so far entitled to your confidence;—But there is nothing in their conduct, or even in their professions, to convince you that such would be the consequence; nor, though justly incensed at the aggressions of foreign governments, ought you to be urged by them to a desperate expedient in your own.

You may oppose your foreign enemies by war, by non-intercourse, or by such other means as your representatives may devise, but do not let your resentment at the injustice of others drive you to a choice of rulers which may be lastingly injurious to yourselves.

SIDNEY.

For the Maryland Republican.

THE EXAMINER.

(CONTINUED FROM OUR LAST.)

BUT, setting aside the ultimate views of the federal party, and supposing for a moment, that the well intentioned Americans among them would restrain, and in time expel, the spirit of torquism with which the mass is now infected; in a word, that they would not sacrifice our independence, but only administer the government on principles somewhat different from those of our present rulers; what is the essential difference, in point of general character and predominating policy, between the two parties? I will not repeat what has been already said, and still less will I urge what might further be said, concerning those financial, speculating, and monopolizing systems, the offspring of federalism, which, however they may seem to advance the prosperity of a young country, tend in reality to its early decline, through those seeds of disease and corruption which are inevitably produced, as well in the body politic as the body natural, by a forced and accelerated growth. But I shall avert to one striking and fundamental distinction, which is, that the system of the federal party, contrary to the import of the name which it speciously assumes, tends to the consolidation of all power in the General Government, and consequently to the depression, impoverishment, and, in the end, to the abolition of the State Governments. Among other facts supporting this position is the remarkable one, that, not content with the exclusive right of all revenue from maritime commerce, the federal administration, without the pretext of any urgent necessity, laid its hands upon those internal objects of taxation which were left and intended for the support of the State Governments. What, on the contrary, has been the maxim of the republican administration? That the General Government, charged and entrusted by the Constitution with those objects, only, to which the power of individual states, united as these were, could not be applied, such especially as the regulation of war and peace, and of commerce, should draw its revenues from that great external source of which it has the entire control, and which, on this theory, it is urged by its interest to make productive, by the protection and encouragement of trade, instead of that depression and total abandonment of it which has been stupidly inferred from the measure of the embargo, and the confidence given to domestic manufactures, to have been the settled design of the last administration. This then was the object and the source of revenue, specially assigned to the General Government. It is true, that this source of revenue being liable to casualties, the Government has not been absolutely restricted to it, but is empowered to lay other indirect taxes, and, in a prescribed way, direct taxes also. But this was only for emergencies; and, in ordinary cases, the individual states, wholly debared of revenue from commerce, with a trifling exception for the support of their inspection and health laws, and that dependent on the approbation of congress, ought assuredly to have some objects of taxation to resort to for the maintenance of government, and for internal improvements. It is a sound position, then, whatever minute exceptions it may be subject to, that in the distribution of objects of taxation by the Constitution of the United States, every thing general and external was allotted to the General Government, whose province is, in other respects, the management of affairs of that description; and, with exception of emergent occasions, every thing particular and internal was left in the disposal of the individual States. This was Mr. Jefferson's principle, and it may be traced in all his public acts. How far this just, obvious, and constitutional distinction was recognized, either in theory or practice, by the federal administration, I need not, fellow citizens, recal to your recollection.

In other respects what is the difference between the two parties? and once again, of what materials are they respectively composed? The federalists often boast that they have the wealth of the country on their side. It is true, fellow citizens, that we have not on ours a great many men of enormous wealth. You will seldom find such persons on the republican side. They naturally dread the name of a Republic, and of every thing that savours of liberty and