

truth, decency, or justice, he endeavours to strike at the character of one of your delegates, and to point him out particularly as unworthy of your confidence and trust, he could not expect to escape without animadversion. If the Citizen intended his address only for the information of the inhabitants of Annapolis, and only to influence their opinion and conduct, he might have made his sentiments known to them by a different conveyance than the public gazette; but his youthful ambition led him to seek public notice, and public fame. The object of his wanton and unprovoked attack is well known, and never merited his malevolence or detraction. If the Citizen should find himself hurt by any remarks on his illiberal and puerile performance, he must remember, that he is the aggressor, and that any strictures on his conduct are well justified by his rash attempt to wound the feelings and reputation of a man who never injured him in any manner.

The motives that influenced the Citizen to make his publication cannot be certainly discovered, but it is not uncharitable to suppose, that he was actuated by other principles than public virtue and public spirit. The vanity and pride, the self conceit, and self impotence of youth; a desire to obtain a literary reputation; the ambition of becoming a legislator; or a prospect of increasing his connexions and influence, might have stimulated the Citizen to hazard the attack. For his own reputation, and a regard to the good opinion of the world, he must wish his conduct to be ascribed to any other cause than a depravity of heart, or personal animosity.

The Citizen, after asserting, that one of your delegates has solicited you to appoint him an elector of the senate, has declared his opinion, that the delegate is an improper person to be appointed to that important trust. It is directly contrary to the fact, and the Citizen is wilfully guilty of a breach of veracity, when he alleges, that your delegate ever solicited a voice, or even expressed an intention of offering himself as an elector of the senate for this city. At the first appointment of electors of that body, the delegate represented this city, and at the last election, Anne-Arundel county. He is under the strongest impression of the necessity of procuring a virtuous and wise senate, and has the vanity to think himself, from his experience and knowledge of your public affairs and embarrassments, and the different characters in the states, qualified to accept the trust, if offered to him. The public and private character of your delegate is well known to you; and his long and faithful services, for above twenty years, cannot be forgot. Necessity, not choice, compels him to remove from among you. For your public confidence, and private esteem and friendship, he is under obligations to you, but for upright, laborious, and disinterested services in the discharge of his duty as your representative, you are under obligations to him. The political relation between you and him is soon to be dissolved from the situation of his private affairs, greatly injured from his attention to the public characters he has sustained from his youth, without any reward. His removal from this city will render him ineligible as your delegate. That he might not disqualify himself from being an elector of the senate he delayed his departure for a few weeks. If requested to represent Anne-Arundel county, or this city he would not refuse, but he thinks it improper to solicit the appointment from the county or the city. Whether this conduct merits censure or disapprobation he submits to the decision of the candid public. He has been entrusted by both county and city as an elector of the senate, and he feels a consciousness of having never forfeited the confidence of either. The removal of your delegate to Baltimore is not made an objection by the Citizen. Unless local interests and prejudices are to influence, this circumstance can have no weight. You ought not to pursue a conduct you would condemn in others.

I shall now proceed to remark on the reasons urged by the Citizen to prove that your delegate is an improper person for you to choose as an elector of the senate. To enable you to form a proper judgement of the solidity of his reasons, his candour, and justice, I will extract and exhibit in one view the substance of his address, which is as follows, "Three questions will be discussed at the next assembly. 1. An emission of paper money. 2. Payment by the state of the depreciated paper money carried into the treasury, agreeably to law, by debtors of British subjects, and stipulated by the treaty to be paid in specie. 3. The revival of the office of an intendant of the revenue, with powers equally extensive with those vested in the late intendant. The opinion of your delegate is well known on these points. He actively endeavoured last session, to procure an emission of paper money; he delivered his opinion in the house of delegates, that the state ought to discharge the debts due to British creditors by those who paid money into the treasury; he supported the conduct of the late intendant of the revenue, and aimed at a continuance of his overgrown powers. And the citizens, almost to a man, condemn the opinion of your delegate as to the exoneration of the British debtors, as above mentioned, and as to the revival of the office of intendant. The very soul of the delegate is bent on the completion of these measures, and he will sacrifice every obstacle to their accomplishment; this temper is natural to man, but more particularly predominant in some characters; the conduct and pro-

cessions of your delegate are pointedly in contradiction to your political sentiments; and his conduct is totally inconsistent with your views; these sentiments are not peculiar to the Citizen, and have been expressed by many of the citizens. The delegate has repeatedly declared that he does not mean to consult your ideas of the public good." These are positive assertions. The Citizen insinuates, "that your delegate entertains prejudices against conspicuous and valuable members of the senate, of independent principles, and who, from a series of judicious and honourable conduct, have gained the applause of an approving public; that the prejudices of the delegate have tainted his mind with ungenerous malevolence, so that he cannot discharge the trust and duty of an elector from a bitterness of heart, that will control the wisdom of his head."

Let us examine these reasons of the Citizen separately. Your delegate is for an emission of paper money, and therefore, says the Citizen, he is not fit to be an elector of the senate. Surely this conclusion does not follow. Such reasoning is only proper for children. The Citizen, if he has any sensibility, must, even in private, blush for drawing this inference from such premises; if known every school boy would laugh at him. Before he can maintain his position that the delegate is unfit to be an elector of the senate, because he is an advocate for an emission, he must prove two things, first, that an emission is inconsistent with the good of the state; and secondly, that your delegate, if an elector of the senate, would not vote for any person to be a senator who would not support an emission of money. If the circumstances of the state require an emission the opinion of your delegate is just. He is an advocate for the measure, from an entire conviction of the propriety and necessity of its adoption. An emission is expedient and necessary, or it is not. If it is, your delegate is justified in his opinion; if not, it remains with the Citizen to prove the negative. If he thinks proper to trouble you again, I request him to be explicit, and to admit or deny the necessity of an emission; and, if he denies, to assign his reasons. If your delegate erred in judgement on this subject he is not liable to censure. Can the Citizen maintain, that your delegate would not vote for any person to be a senator, who is against an emission? Unless he can, his reasoning is defective, and he is reduced to the necessity of proving, that no one, who is for an emission, is proper to be an elector of the senate. The Citizen has published to the world, that he entertains this unjust and dishonourable opinion of your delegate; and he wishes to prevail on you to concur with him in sentiment. It necessarily follows that he is of this opinion, or his reasoning is puerile beyond belief. I would rather impute a defect in his head than his heart, and not draw this conclusion to support his argument, if I was not well justified by the whole complexion and object of his publication, and his insinuation, that your delegate is so far governed by his passions and prejudices, as to disregard all obligations of duty, though bound by the solemn ties of religion. The Citizen surely forgot the oath of an elector, "to elect without favour, affection, partiality, or prejudice, such persons for senators, as the elector, in his judgment and conscience, believes best qualified for the office."

If the objection is allowed, that a man is not proper to elect the senate, because he is an advocate for an emission, the same exception will lie to the man who is opposed to it; and probably include the Citizen, and his connexions, and disqualify them from electing, or being elected. What opinion can be entertained of the understanding of that writer, who, by proving that the delegate is improper to be an elector, must necessarily establish that not one person in the whole state is fit for the office; because there is no one who has not formed an opinion for or against an emission? It remains, therefore, for the Citizen to adduce his evidence to prove, that your delegate is so unprincipled a wretch, in violation of duty and oath, as to vote for or against a man, merely because he coincides, or differs from him in opinion, on certain political questions. Let him appear and adduce his proofs, or stand convicted of the greatest folly, or the vilest slander. The delegate appeals to a long political life to contradict the assertion, and denies the Citizen to produce a single fact to justify his calumny. The delegate is of opinion, that the whole character and conduct of a person proposed for a senator is to be considered and weighed, and not his opinion on particular subjects. It is a wicked and detested principle to vote for or against any man, because he is for or against any political question; unless such question involves the happiness of the state. If there should be good grounds to believe, that any one of the present senate opposed an emission from interested motives, and preferred his own interest to that of the state, the delegate would most certainly consider such person as unworthy of being re-appointed to that body. It is well known that several of the senate were averse from an emission, of whose integrity and honour the delegate entertains the highest opinion, and for whom he should vote with the utmost confidence. The Citizen supposes that the delegate would be governed by principles, which he has reprobated all his life by precept and example; and which he detests and abhors. The imperfections and failings of men he is as liable to as any one, but that he has studiously avoided the suffering his political differences (and none others has he ever

had) to influence his public conduct, he boldly appeals to those who are acquainted with him.

With regard to the second objection, that your delegate is of opinion, that the state ought to exonerate the debtors of British subjects, it may receive the same observations that have been made to the first objection. The Citizen must not only prove, that the opinion is unjust, but that your delegate will reject every man as a senator, who does not concur with him in opinion on this subject. The delegate is of opinion, that the state is bound in justice to pay these debts, because the state, to carry on the war for the benefit and safety of all, compelled its citizens to receive its depreciated paper money in payment of their old debts, at par with specie, and by law authorized those who thus received the paper money to pay it to their British creditors. If the Citizen should venture to appear again in print, I call on him to give his reasons why this opinion of your delegate is ill founded.

The third objection of the Citizen is, that your delegate supported the conduct of the late intendant of the revenue, and aimed at a continuance of his overgrown powers. This article must be divided. It is admitted that the delegate justified the conduct of the late intendant, so far as it was impeached by a committee of the house of delegates; but it is expressly contrary to truth, that the delegate attempted to continue the office of intendant with any powers but such as were necessarily incident to the office, and only proper to secure the collection of the revenue. The proof of this assertion lies on the Citizen but he must be an incorrigible blockhead, or have lost all sense of shame if he attempts to maintain the truth of it. The insinuation that your delegate was for a continuance of the office from a partiality to the officer is illiberal and false. The office of intendant was first proposed by your delegate, and when no one could possibly conjecture who would be appointed to execute the duties of it. The senate, who, in the opinion of the Citizen, have exhibited such striking proofs of political wisdom, (and particularly the conspicuous and most valuable members of that body, for whose continuance the Citizen is under so great anxiety) decidedly and warmly, for some years, supported the office and officer. Your delegate approved the conduct of the intendant in the last year of his appointment; and he still thinks the office necessary. The Citizen, to maintain this third objection, must prove, that the conduct of the intendant, arraigned by the committee, was not justifiable; that the office is not necessary; and that your delegate is so far blinded by his attachment and friendship to the intendant, that he will choose no one for the senate, who will not support the office and the officer. The two first will puzzle him, and the last he dare not attempt; and yet he must do it or there is not an atom of reason or common sense in his objection. The Citizen is pleased to say, that you, almost to a man, condemn the opinion of your delegate, as to the payment by the state of the British debts paid into the treasury, and as to the continuance of the office of an intendant of the revenue. It is the characteristic of youth to be positive and arrogant. I have no reason to believe, that you ever delivered any opinion on either of these subjects. The circle which the Citizen may frequent may entertain these sentiments, but they never reached the ears of your delegate. If admitted, does it follow that a person, who thinks differently from you on these subjects, is improper to be an elector of the senate? This reasoning might have some little weight in the election of a delegate, but is wholly inapplicable to the choice of an elector of the senate.

It would be trespassing too much on your time further to expose the many purities of the Citizen. His attachment to particular members of the senate, is very evident, and he fears they will not be re-appointed at the approaching election, because they were, last session, opposed to an emission of money. His partiality for these conspicuous and most valuable members is such, and he has their continuance in power so much at heart, that he thinks the welfare of the state depends upon it. Who these conspicuous and most valuable members of the senate are, the Citizen has not condescended to discover, and leaves you only to conjecture. It is distressing that he has not favoured us with their names, or some description by which they might be known. I must suspect the public would not concur in opinion with him. If the Citizen's fears are well founded, they ought to extend to all the nine senators who rejected the bill for the emission; but it is not an improbable conjecture that the Citizen's affections, hopes, and fears, are confined to only one of the number. The mere being in favour of, or opposition to, an emission, cannot constitute merit or demerit with any honest sensible man. The principle which influenced any senator to vote against an emission, can only operate against his re-election. It cannot possibly be supposed that all the members of the senate, who voted against an emission, were actuated by unworthy motives; it is a possible case that such an opinion may be entertained of some one or two of them. It is suggested by the Citizen, that the senate were against an emission at last session, "for a defect of system in the plan." What a miserable apologist is the Citizen. If the senate were for an emission on any system, it was their duty to have proposed it; and if the Citizen is well informed, that they objected only to the system proposed by the house of delegates, they did not exhibit any striking

proof of political suggestion, and last session, any system. That he must averse from all were deficient often fall into on subjects they

If the Citizen of his connexions might have received and canvassed the least opportunity intended, and conduct would preference of a tended no man only he attacked integrity and he to him than li no one ever su one ever made

Annapolis,

I TAKE the Sir, that farmers generally for the delivery have just concluded much as 15,000 understand better I tend it to you you will make the American our ports, so speculations acting very sincere obedient servants

To Mr. Jefferson United States.

RESOLUTION

at THE committees respecting formed of the also informed of tobacco, the announced by Mr. Morris, execution of the January 1788, failure of execution conditions of consideration with that of the solutions hereafter 1st. After the Morris, there same kind.

ad. The far gazettes a necessity; which shall be furnished by what he shall 3d. To secure purchase, during Mr. Morris only by trade and to amount of the year, at the rate stipulated with 4th. In case tobacco shall be 1st quality James 2d ditto Patowmack 3d ditto Maryland All the first quality 5th. In case samples shall be determined by a committee have the samples proper. 6th. When tobacco shall not be deducted per net quintal Faithfully tra

WE the undersigned perintendent for America, residing in the Norman the generality of other part, having with each other thousand hogshead weight, of America on viz.

That I Robert 1st. To ship France hereafter risk, until the demand, the sixth space of three for the rate of twenty 2d. I more or less in the One fourth part Patowmack and in Maryland for smocking, France.

3d. I also observed in vessels which that the aforesaid