

[XXXVIIth Year.]

THE

[No. 187.]

MARYLAND GAZETTE.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1782.

To GENERAL CADWALADER.

CHARACTER however insignificant or contemptible, may become conspicuous, and attract the notice of the public. This remark is fully testified by the effects of my late address to you. Your retreat from your native country; your intrusion into our public councils; your advocating the cause and interests of our British and refugee enemies, your attempt to sow discord and division, and to create suspicion of known whigs; immediately became the subject of public conversation. Respect for the opinion of the world, and regard for your own reputation, as a patriot, and a man of honour, will urge you to answer the several facts, which are clearly and distinctly expressed. The charges are not of that vague and general nature, which to be discredited, need only to be denied. The knowledge of the person who accuses you, is not necessary for your vindication. If you can show, to the satisfaction of the public, that the several facts alleged against you, are false, or misrepresented, I will admit that I have traduced you; but if you are silent or cannot controvert them, the public will consider them as confessed, and set the seal of infamy on your character.

You have uniformly opposed the confiscation of British property, and all the Tories and suspected characters in the state (as in the case of the confederacy) united in the opposition. These reptiles act by system, and their conduct ought to be considered as a beacon to the whigs. This circumstance alone ought to have created doubts with a real patriot. In general, whatever they oppose is right, whatever they support is wrong. I believe that some of the opposers of confiscation were influenced by honest and virtuous motives. Your principles suspect, therefore you must not shelter yourself under the conduct and example of men whose judgment, not integrity of heart, on this subject, is questioned. At November session 1780, the senate acceded from their opinion: in the house of delegates, only five could be found to vote against this measure; amongst them you stand recorded. One motive for your dissent I have published to the world, and now call on you to assign your other reasons to the public. When you appear on this subject, be pleased to explain why you voted to strike out of the bill proposed by the house of delegates the reasons assigned for the confiscation of British property. Were the reasons you proposed to expunge unsatisfactory; or did you wish none to appear, that you might, with better grace, vote against the bill? Your conduct on another subject merits the attention of the public, and requires your justification. At June session 1780, the assembly were distressed for money to answer immediate pressing demands. The situation of our public affairs were very alarming; our finances were exhausted, and our credit greatly impaired. In this emergency it was proposed to make use of the money belonging to the state in the bank of England, and for this purpose, to draw bills of exchange to the amount of £. 35,000 sterling on the trustees, to be sold within a limited time; and if not disposed of, that bills of credit should be emitted to the value of £. 50,000 specie. This sum was issued, and expended in the purchase of provisions, and other supplies for the army. At no time, since the war, was our government more embarrassed for the want of resources, and never was there a more seasonable relief, than was afforded by this scheme. You, Sir, gave your negative to the law, and it is expected you will give satisfactory reasons for this your conduct. If it was justifiable in you to reject the law, the same conduct would be proper in others, and the consequences to the state, and to the union, will be apparent, when the situation of America, after the defeat of general Gates, and Camden, is considered. Your true motive was, if the bills were passed, the consequence would be the confiscation of British property. This I suggested to you, or discovered by your own party; and you would see America sink in ruin before you would touch the property of the British refugees, your friends, but our enemies.

I shall consider you as the author of the address to the freemen of Kent county, under the signature of a planter. This piece made its appearance before the last choice of electors of the senate, and was diligently circulated at the election to in-

duce the voters of that county to nominate you to the execution of a trust, for which you have neither abilities or integrity. The universal voice of Kent county gave the honour of the performance to you, and you publicly delivered similar sentiments at the election. I will publish the substance of your address in your own words, that the public may form their judgment of your patriotism, honour, and veracity. 1. On the choice of the electors of the senate depends the peace, happiness and freedom of the whole, and every individual of the state. 2. To a virtuous senate the people were indebted for the preservation of their freedom, for five years past; and on their successors every thing we hold dear depends. 3. As the public were not aware of the designs of a party, who had assumed the title of whigs; you esteemed it your duty to acquaint the people that their liberties were in the utmost danger. 4. That a faction in the house of delegates intended the establishment of an absolute government; and had chosen one of the members of the city of Annapolis their leader. 5. That this leader of the faction declared in the house of delegates, that our government was not equal to the exigency of our affairs; that during the war he would not look into or be directed by the constitution; that a dictator ought to be appointed; and that we could not maintain our freedom without a military government.

If the mere recapitulation of these most infamous aspersions on the representatives of the people, and one of their members in particular, cannot call the blush of shame into your cheeks, you are callous beyond example. Is not your assertion, that the peace, happiness and freedom of the state depends on the senate alone; base and false? Did you publish to the world, that our liberties, for the last five years, have been preserved by the senate, with design to compliment that body at the expence of the honour and integrity of the house of delegates? The senate must despise, and the house of delegates ought to detest you for the attempt. Is it your wish to destroy the confidence of the people in their immediate representatives, and to render them not only contemptible but odious to their constituents? Your third and fourth allegations require the most serious attention of every man in the community. I demand of you, on behalf of the public, to name the men who compose the party, who, under the mask of patriotism have endangered the liberties of this country. Point out the individuals, who constitute the faction in the house of delegates, and meditate the overthrow of our present happy government, to establish an arbitrary power on its ruins. Is it your duty to declare the particular measures or designs, which have put our freedom in danger; and you must be acquainted with the members of the faction, because you charge them with having proceeded so far in their conspiracy as to elect their leader. Prove the fact, and we will drive this Castilian, and his faction, from our country.

The opinion of the delegate of the city, that our present government is not competent to the war, is fully supported by a perusal of the laws passed every session. The different acts to vest extraordinary powers in the governor and council, and the law of last session, for the appointment of the special council on the eastern shore, evince the truth of this assertion beyond the power of contradiction. These laws received your affirmative. One question alone will expose your folly to the height of my wishes. Are these laws agreeable, or repugnant to our constitution, for which you pretend to be so zealous an advocate and supporter? You cannot deny to your constituents in Kent, that you assented to the law, which created the special council; but you may omit to inform them, that you voted to make them subject to the control of the executive. The declaration by the member of the city, that he would not take the constitution, as his rule in the formation of laws, during the war, may be admitted, and cannot be deemed injurious to his understanding or integrity. Necessity in many instances will justify this conduct; and you cannot shew any instance of a greater departure from the constitution by the member of the city, than you committed in voting for the special council. The opinion of the delegate of Annapolis, that a military government is necessary to maintain our liberties, is also true, with the limitations by him expressed, in time of actual invasion, which you purposely omitted. Your assertion, that the member declared, that a dictator ought to be appointed, is contrary to the fact; and though you should pledge your honour as proof, it cannot be received. Amongst the

Romans a dictator was chosen when the republic was in imminent danger. The proposal, therefore, to appoint a dictator, conveys the idea of vesting an absolute power in one man, not only over the property, but the life of any citizen in the state. If the defect of your understanding was alone suspected, I should attribute the assertion to your ignorance; but on this matter I question your veracity, and call on you to prove the fact, or you must submit to the imputation of publishing a malicious slander, with intent to defame the reputation of the delegate for Annapolis.

Your wealth, from whence alone you demand a title to respect, ought to be your silent reproach. You owe your riches to the caprice of fortune, which alone raised you to the rank you now possess. Your property may command the admiration of the ignorant or dependent; but the wise and virtuous will deny, that riches confer honour, dignity, or virtue.

CENSOR.

To the PRINTERS of the MARYLAND GAZETTE.

THE moment I had read the publication in your paper of the 10th instant, signed Censor, and addressed to me, I concluded that Mr. Chase was the author.—There is something so peculiar in his stile and manner of writing, and we have lately seen so many of his performances, that he cannot disguise himself.—His orders to you, not to give up his name, were unnecessary; nor should I have applied to you for it, but in compliance with the usual forms.—His address to me, at this time, was, no doubt, intended to take off the public attention from himself.—When the world reflects, that this is a common practice with culprits, I am persuaded this sentiment will not be thought uncharitable.

The reception his former publications have met with, should have induced him to alter his signature. Disgusted with the indecent attacks made on gentlemen, whose characters are out of the reach of slander, the public view him as a monster let loose upon society.

From the language in which he has expressed himself in his address to me, we may form a judgment of those elegant expressions which you refused to publish.

Conscious of the rectitude of my conduct in private and public life, I shall rest satisfied that the slightest suspicions of my political principles have never been, seriously, entertained by those who know me.

As soon as the business of the session is over and I have leisure to look into the proceedings of former sessions, to which some of Mr. Chase's reflections relate; I shall for a moment claim the attention of the public. A few remarks will easily remove any bad impressions which Mr. Chase's address may have made on those to whom I am not known.

JOHN CADWALADER.

Jan. 1782.

RICHMOND, January 5.
Extract of a letter from a gentleman at St. Thomas's, dated December 4, 1781.

"On the evening of 25th ult. the marquis de Bouille appeared off St. Kittatus; and about 10 o'clock the same night landed about 300 of his chosen men, and secretly marched at the head of them himself near the enemy's out lines. In the morning of the 16th he advanced rapidly to the main works, first took general Cochburn, commander in chief, and then possessed himself of every fort on the island with the loss of 4 men on his side and 2 on the part of the British—took 700 effective men prisoners—sent a detachment over to St. Martin's and took that place—settled the posse of both islands—embarked all his prisoners, and in 4 days after the capture left both islands in perfect peace and tranquillity without distressing a single person. This great man's conduct must do him immortal honour as a gentleman, a man of the greatest humanity, most refined honour, and an accomplished officer."

Extract of a letter from an officer in general Greene's army, dated Camp at Roanoke, South-Carolina.

"The army moved from the high hills of Santee the 19th of November; the enemy were then in possession of Mohr's corner, returned below Goose creek: the post at Dorchester, which was a redoubt strongly picketed with an abatis, they still occupied; this post commanded the country south of the Edisto, and enabled them to draw the resources

Ed. Journal of the house of delegates, November 1780.