

MARYLAND GAZETTE.

THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1782.

To JOHN CADWALADER, Esquire.

My former address was not suited to your taste, you will have as little reason to relish this. I claim no merit from drawing to the life, or exposing to view a fury, a monster, or any other production of nature, which seems only calculated to excite wonder, or to perpetrate mischief. The scorpion that rankles in the dark, and wastes his venom on his own support; has a claim to mercy and forbearance; but should he crawl from his obscurity, prepared to sting the heel of every passenger is deservedly lifted up to crush his head. You, Sir, should have experienced that forbearance, had you been content to expend those means on yourself, which were intended for your own support and enjoyment, for I cannot think so hard of Nature, as to believe she bestows such qualities for a different purpose: had your ability to do harm been equal to your disposition, you would in time, according to the ordinary progression of malice and mischief, have become a formidable enemy to society; but though blessed with the latter, you are, happily for us, scantily supplied with the former. Your head counteracts your heart; and disappointment and mortification, as far as they can reach your breast, become the consequence and punishment of your feeble attempts to injure and destroy. When I charged you with endeavouring to ruin the reputation of your fellow-citizen, without even a special presence of his guilt, I charged you with nothing but what you know, and must feel, if you can feel, to be true. I will go farther, and assert, that at the very time you persecuted him with all the virulence of your heart, you were then conscious, that the proofs you had were insufficient to support the charge. I will still go farther, and say, that your reason for not endeavouring to get such information concerning that affair, as it was undoubtedly in your power to obtain, was, because you suspected that such an enquiry would tend to discover his innocence and defeat your malice.

Now, Sir, although I have no opinion of your abilities, yet I do not suppose you so defective in understanding, as to be incapable of judging how to proceed in a case of such a nature, a very moderate share of sense would serve to direct you. You could not possibly be ignorant, that, in order to convict a person of a breach of trust, by violating an injunction imposed on him in consequence of that trust, it was first necessary to ascertain the injunction. You must know, that the circumstances, which were to be adduced to prove the fact of a breach, ought to be subsequent to the proof of the injunction alleged to have been violated. Your head could not so have mistaken the order of things, had not your heart assisted in the arrangement. No, Sir, an attempt of that kind would have frustrated your purpose: you knew that then there would be no room for imposition. You could not confuse the heads, or prejudice the minds of your audience, in a matter so simple, and that admitted of no opposition of opinion and argument. The matter was a fact on record; the records only could declare the reality of it; had they been consulted, and the injunction not appeared, there was an end to the affair. But truth was not your object; therefore your mode of proceeding was not calculated to convince, but to perplex. You were sensible, if you could once divert their attention from the true point, you had then an ample field, in which you might display the fancied powers of your genius, and gratify your most sanguine wishes. Youattered yourself you could lead their prejudices on from supposition to fact, and from fact to supposition, until you had bewildered their understandings, and inflamed their passions; and that these you could manage to the condemnation and destruction of the hated object. This, Sir, is not mere declamation. It is not supposition alone. The imputation is warranted by probable inference from the nature of your conduct and arguments. The assertion (improperly called a charge) made by a member of congress; the private correspondence of the president and his opinion; the publication of Publus, and the address of Mr. Carrell, reciting their suggestions, were sufficient, in your judgment, to condemn the member from the city of a breach of his delegated trust; and that too without further enquiry. As you relied on the opinion of Mr. Marchant and his public charge, as you affected to believe, against Mr. Chase; what motives do you suppose, influenced congress to appoint him posterior to this circumstance to transact business of the first importance, and which required the utmost confidence in his integrity? Can you fancy to yourself a case, in which it can possibly be esteemed for the good of a body in its public capacity, or of the individual members in their private concerns, to place confidence in one, who is likely to betray his trust and their interests? or will you, from their inattention, infer his guilt, and not his innocence? From what principle do you make the inference? Put the question to your heart.

But suppose, Sir, (and the supposition is not very extravagant, perhaps not without foundation in fact) suppose, I say, the assertion, for even yourself cannot call it a charge, was so notoriously absurd, that congress must have sacrificed to the notice of it every pretence even to common understanding; will not this justify their conduct? Suppose, for instance, a member of the Senate, though I think there is none such, should rise, and assert that a member of that body had published to the world, that the Senate had refused their assent to a

measure. I shall say nothing more to this than whatever inward satisfaction she may draw from what she deems a punctilious discharge of her duty, in my opinion she will be but illy employed in a public trust, if her private decisions are to thwart the general determinations to which, if I am not much mistaken, a true sense of her duty will instruct her to conform.

I have not said so much on this point, because I think it very material. Indeed I have said too much considering the nature of it. But, Sir, could it be made out to suit your wishes, and views, remember that the other point, I mean the fact of a violation, is from every thing that has appeared, as deficient of proof as this of common sense. I shall not enter on that matter now, but shall submit, and recommend this, with the rest I have said to your serious consideration. It is time to take my leave of you for the present. At some other opportunity I shall take the liberty to accost you with another address on this subject. Perhaps it may be against the strict rule of manners to wait on you without the formal ceremony of an invitation. Considering the cause and nature of my visit, I can easily believe that I am an unwelcome guest; but I am satisfied no man of sense will think me an impertinent intruder.

You will now, perhaps, give into the curious distinction made by one of the evidences on that enquiry, between those matters which from their nature required secrecy, and ought to be so observed, though there was no injunction to the purpose, and the common ordinary business, which was not improper for, and therefore subject to, the inspection of every eye. This is now your only retreat. Weak and defenceless as it is, you must here make your stand, or entirely quit the field. I confess this distinction, curious as it is, gave me no surprise; for I was prepared to expect, that nothing that the wit of man could devise would be omitted on this occasion. I knew a victim was to be sacrificed; I knew too, if the sacred apparatus could not be procured, that any vile instrument would serve the purpose. The blood was to be offered up with all the ceremonial sanctity of devotion to your idol, whilst the true God was neglected and despised. I will do the gentleman, to whom we are indebted for the distinction, the justice to acknowledge, that I am seriously of opinion he made it agreeable to the words of his oath, "according to the best of his knowledge." I am satisfied it was not done with a view to injure the culprit. It would be a shameful waste of time in me, and but an ill compliment to my readers, to endeavour at disproving what, in my opinion, is too absurd to catch the assent of any one, who is possessed of the most moderate share of reflexion. An obligation founded on such a distinction is idle in theory, and too vague for practice. In a body composed of many members, who, in nature and reason, is authorized to direct the general determinations? Who is to decide on the objects to be pursued, and the mode of pursuing them? It will surely be unnecessary to answer, the collective body. Or is his private confidence alone to be his director, as to the measure and mode of compliance? But this may instruct him to oppose that general sense, as well as to conform to it. It may prompt him to reveal a positive injunction, as well as to conceal what was never intended to be confined to the mere knowledge of its members. Every member of the community has a right to that information in his public concerns, which is not by positive order withheld from him by those, whom he has empowered to manage his public affairs. The general interest may sometimes require, and political prudence ought to direct concealments, but where it should be done, the same prudence will impose that observance by express injunction. She will never submit it to private opinion only, not from the principle alone that such a dependence is too frail in its nature to rest on, being too easily biased by selfish consideration, but that private opinion ought ever to act in conformity with, and never oppose the general decision, and that the only method of obtaining a knowledge of the general sense of the body in its decisions is by an express declaration. The opinions of individuals may differ. This is uniform; it is this that creates the obligation. This is the restraint that every man of sense, and principle, will and ought to submit to; and it is this he engages to submit to by an acceptance of his trust.

I hope, Sir, you will pardon my saying so much on a subject, which I had before declared too absurd to be imposed on any mind, that possessed the most moderate share of discernment. I mean not to insult your understanding, nor to offend your delicacy; though perhaps there is little danger of the latter, whatever you may think of the former. But, Sir, I mean to call on you to declare what inference in your judgment ought to be drawn from the foregoing observations. Will you infer, that congress acted wickedly, or stupidly, in not imposing an injunction on its members? or will it not be more reasonable to conclude, that in their opinion such an injunction was improper or unnecessary? Admitting there was none, and this has been proved, can you by the utmost stretch of deception impose so far on your mind, as to wrest it to the belief that Mr. Chase could violate his trust, by not conducting himself, as if there had been one? We have the strongest reason, that the nature of the case will admit of, to believe that congress did not think an injunction proper or necessary; their not imposing one is a satisfactory proof of this, for would it not be a violation of all the rules of probability and reason to infer the contrary? But still private opinion, or call it if you will by the more solemn name of conscience, is to supply this defect. She is to be the judge of the propriety or necessity of the

measure. I shall say nothing more to this than whatever inward satisfaction she may draw from what she deems a punctilious discharge of her duty, in my opinion she will be but illy employed in a public trust, if her private decisions are to thwart the general determinations to which, if I am not much mistaken, a true sense of her duty will instruct her to conform.

I have not said so much on this point, because I think it very material. Indeed I have said too much considering the nature of it. But, Sir, could it be made out to suit your wishes, and views, remember that the other point, I mean the fact of a violation, is from every thing that has appeared, as deficient of proof as this of common sense. I shall not enter on that matter now, but shall submit, and recommend this, with the rest I have said to your serious consideration. It is time to take my leave of you for the present. At some other opportunity I shall take the liberty to accost you with another address on this subject. Perhaps it may be against the strict rule of manners to wait on you without the formal ceremony of an invitation. Considering the cause and nature of my visit, I can easily believe that I am an unwelcome guest; but I am satisfied no man of sense will think me an impertinent intruder.

A W H I G. Baltimore, March 10, 1782.

R I C H M O N D, March 9.

AN account from Hampton mentions, that one of the enemy's privateers lately took an outward-bound vessel and ran another on shore near that place, but that by the activity of commodore Barron, the one ashore was got off, the other re-taken, and night coming on, proved a favourable opportunity to the privateer for effectually making her escape.

A few days ago arrived here lieut. col. Lee, from the southern army, which he left on the 13th of February, and informs, That gen. Greene, with the main body of the army, continued in a position north of Pon-pon river, within four miles of Jacksonburg; the light troops were stationed on the south side of Ashly river, in the vicinity of Darchester: that the British army remained in their fortified camp at the Quarter-house, preserving posts on James-Island and Haddrell's point; that brig. gen. Marion, with the militia and corps of state troops, was on the north side of Cooper river, for the protection of the inhabitants of that district: that the operating force of the two armies were nearly equal, including irregulars, no reinforcements having arrived at Charles-town, though very powerful bodies of troops were expected in the course of the ensuing month: that desertion prevailed in an uncommon degree in the royal army, the spirit of disaffection was subsiding daily, and the unfortunate inhabitants who had been deluded by the arts of the enemy to oppose their country were throwing themselves on the mercy of government: that the warmest friendship subsisted between the citizens and the army, and the hardships of service were mitigated by the constant and affectionate civility of the inhabitants; and the American troops preserved a perfect fidelity, notwithstanding a complication of wants: that commissioners were appointed by the generals Greene and Leslie, to meet on the 10th of February for the renovation of the cartel, &c. and the mode of warfare was totally changed, humanity having taken place of barbarity, and civility of rudeness: that lieut. col. Thompson, late secretary to lord Germaine, had taken command of the British cavalry: that gen. Wayne had confined the enemy's forces in the state of Georgia to the town of Savannah: and that col. White, at the head of his regiment of cavalry, had routed a body of Indians, making 18 prisoners, and taking 100 horses, with other booty.

Lieut. col. Laurens has succeeded lieut. col. Lee in the command of the light troops; and lieut. col. Harmer is appointed deputy adjutant general to the southern army during the absence of col. Williams, who is on his return to Maryland.

Letters from Cadix of Jan. 7, inform us, that a Spanish fleet composed of 41 ships of the line, sailed from thence on the 3d of the same month, conveying transports with 4000 troops, destined, it was supposed, for the Havana. It was said, they were to cruise in the latitude of Madeira, to await the junction of de Guichen, who sailed from Brest on the 11th of December, with 19 ships of the line, conveying 13,000 troops, which, with a part of the fleet, it was supposed, were likewise destined for the West-Indies. A report prevailed there, that the French fleet had fallen in with a British Squadron under Kempenfeldt, consisting of 13 ships: the result was not known. The reduction of Mahon was not completed, but reports continued to flatter their expectations.

From the public advertiser, printed in London, September 8, 1781.

THE following extraordinary relation has just fallen into our hands. The rev. Mr. Hagamore, of Catthoage, Leicestershire, died the first of January, 1748, possessed of the following effects, viz. 700l. per annum, and 1000l. in money, which (he dying intestate) fell to a ticket porter in London: he kept one servant of each sex, whom he locked up every night. His last employment of an evening was to go round his premises, let loose his dogs and fire his gun. He lost his life as follows: going one morning to let out his servants (the