

tical opinions; and any inference that might be drawn from the speech favourable to Mr. Adams's re-election vanishes before the single remark that it was before any act of his administration had taken place.

The remarks which were submitted in my last number, shew that general Washington's letter, dated July 13, 1798, when impartially considered must be construed to relate wholly to those measures of administration which regarded our differences with France; and that it could not, by any fair construction, be made to include any particular act of congress. In the letter, speaking of the measures of administration, general Washington says "they ought to inspire universal confidence, and will no doubt, combined with the state of things, call from congress such laws and means as will enable you to meet the full force and extent of the crisis." The crisis alluded to was unquestionably the expected rupture with France. In the hand-bill my worthy friend has omitted the latter part of the sentence, and concluded it with the words "universal confidence."

A most important subject for your consideration, is the right of the people to choose electors of president and vice-president. I speak with deference to the opinions of others; but I consider this an ALL IMPORTANT right. That the right is in the people, to me is plain and evident from the language of the constitution. The words are, "Each state shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, &c."—The constitution, when prescribing the manner in which the senate shall be chosen, has these words, "The senate of the United States shall be composed of two senators from each state, chosen by the legislature thereof, for six years." If it had been intended that the legislatures of the states should choose the electors, the language would have been, as in the case of senators, "the electors from each state shall be chosen by the legislature thereof." The word state means the people of the state in their highest sovereign capacity.

Any doubt which might otherwise exist must vanish when we see the remarks of the members of the convention who framed the constitution, immediately after it was projected. They had then no favourite candidate for the presidency, whose election they meant to oppose;—no party purposes to answer. They were explaining the constitution, in the language of truth, for the consideration of the people. Their remarks are, "It was desirable that the sense of the people should operate in the choice of the person to whom so important a trust was to be confided. This end will be answered by committing the right of making it, not to any pre-established body, but to men chosen by the people for the purpose and at the particular conjuncture."—They have not made the appointment of the president to depend on any pre-existing bodies of men who might be tampered with beforehand to prostitute their votes; but they have referred it in the first instance to an immediate act of the people of AMERICA, to be exerted in the choice of persons for THE TEMPORARY AND SOLE PURPOSE of making the appointment.—Another and no less important desideratum was, that the executive should be independent for his continuance in office of all, but THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES. He might otherwise be tempted to sacrifice his duty to his complaisance for those whose favour was necessary to the duration of his official consequence. This advantage will also be secured, by making his re-election to depend on a SPECIAL BODY of representatives, deputed by the society for the SINGLE PURPOSE of making the important choice.—All these advantages will be happily combined in the plan devised by the constitution, which is, that THE PEOPLE OF EACH STATE shall choose a number of persons as electors, equal to the number of senators and representatives of such state in the national government, who shall assemble within the state and vote for some fit person as president."

I might here pause and ask the question,—Can any man seriously doubt after reading these remarks of two among the most enlightened members of the convention? It is asked in the hand-bill, "in what manner shall the people exercise the right of suffrage?" I answer, in the manner pointed out in the constitution, and not otherwise. If they exercise it in a manner not warranted by that instrument, it is a violation of the constitution, which we are all bound by every tie to support. The friends of Mr. Jefferson and the constitution, will not adopt any mode not warranted by it, regardless of the consequences of the election. The friends of Mr. Adams prefer a choice by the legislature, they say, to counteract the policy of Virginia. How can this be possible when in Virginia the election is to be made by THE PEOPLE?

It is contended in the hand-bill with some plausibility that "you as fully and effectually enjoy and exercise your right of suffrage when you vote for four delegates, who will vote for J. T. Chase, who will vote for John Adams, as if you voted for J. T. Chase, who will vote for John Adams." But, my fellow-citizens, there is nothing solid in the observation; because the choice of electors will not rest with the four delegates of Anne-Arundel county; they will elect in conjunction with seventy-six other delegates from different parts of the state, and the whole jointly with the senate, consisting of fifteen members, some of whom were elected four years ago, and others have been created by that body. The result, therefore, of the election made in this manner may be very different from that of an election by the people. And as by the proposed mode of election you will lose the control over it, it is in effect a surrender of the right, which no man of reflection will ever make. When you choose the electors yourselves, you have as fully and completely a control over the election, as if you voted immediately for the president; and by this mode it will be seen, by the plainest understanding, that

you enjoy the SUBSTANCE of the right of suffrage. In the other you have the SHADOW only.

With what anxious solicitude the enlightened patriots who framed the constitution, with WASHINGTON at their head, have guarded your rights! It remains for you to determine whether you will prostrate every barrier which they have reared to preserve the freedom of election, by transferring the right of suffrage to the legislature of the state, or whether you will preserve it, by exercising it yourselves.

My worthy friend and competitor, in his hand-bill, has not undertaken the defence of those measures of administration which discover a partiality for military establishments,—an indifference about the militia,—measures respecting foreign intercourse,—appointments to office,—an augmentation of the public debt,—an increase of taxes,—and a diminution of our trade. These are left to recommend themselves.

The hand bill contains an extract from the 95th page of the first volume of Mr. Adams's work, to prove that he is not an advocate for monarchical government. It is not from a short extract from a single page that an accurate judgment can be formed of Mr. Adams's political opinions. In my next number, I will undertake to prove, to the satisfaction of all candid men, that in Mr. Adams's opinion, A LIMITED MONARCHY IS THE BEST OF ALL POSSIBLE GOVERNMENTS.

A FEW observations are necessary in answer to Mr. Key's reply to my remarks on his hand-bill, signed "A Friend to Fair Play."

As any altercation between Mr. Key and me, cannot be interesting to the public, I shall only notice his reply, so far as it is connected with my address to you.

Whether I am a weak, a vain, or an ambitious man, will never depend upon his opinion. To be the leader of a party has ever been remote from my wishes; and if I had the inclination, a number of concurring circumstances would form an insurmountable barrier to the undertaking. It is of little consequence to me whether he writes under an assumed signature, or gives his name. The friends of Mr. Jefferson have nothing to apprehend either from the intrinsic merit of his writings, or any celebrity or magic in his name.

It is not easy to discover the intention of his reply, unless it be to keep alive and expose the errors and frailties of youth. For me they might have remained for ever buried in oblivion. When Mr. Key observes, that his former political conduct has never been publicly brought into view until this period, surely he does not mean to insinuate that it was brought into view by me. Let facts determine. At a numerous meeting of the people in the city of Annapolis, in July last, at which several persons from Baltimore and Montgomery counties attended, Mr. Key, in a public harangue, voluntarily gave a history of his conduct during the late revolutionary war. I am told that he had before given the same account of himself at a numerous meeting on Elk Ridge. At the meeting in Annapolis, he avowed himself to be the author of the hand-bill, signed, "A Friend to Fair Play." It was published in several different newspapers of the state—known to be his production, and was answered as such; and it was treated by a writer, who subscribed his publication "An enemy to Fair Play," with freedom and severity. All this happened before I had leisure to notice it.

In my remarks on that hand-bill, the allusions are couched in the most guarded and delicate language. Notwithstanding the personal attack on me by name, I had no wish to wound the feelings of Mr. Key. If he expected that I should remain altogether silent, he deceived himself. He volunteered an opposition to me as a candidate for the trust of elector, although he was not a candidate, and although my friend Mr. Chase was present, and capable of supporting the cause he had undertaken as ably, and with much greater probability of success, than any of his conductors.

The author of the hand-bill, with a view, I presume, to depreciate my opinion, had contrasted it with that of general WASHINGTON. I replied, by shewing that we substantially agreed; reminding Mr. Key at the same time, that general WASHINGTON and he had differed in THE MOST ESSENTIAL POINTS. I might appeal to his friends, nay, to himself in his cooler moments, if there would not have been a difficulty in doing it in a less exceptional manner. No person who did not previously know that he had been in the British army, could conjecture that the allusion was meant to convey that idea. Mr. Key says, he has lived to see his error, and for many years has most seriously repented of it. I hope and believe he has: And all true Americans, millions in number, might have repented in vain, if the event of the war had been reversed.

It was truly said in my remarks, that it had been my study to avoid personalities; but the personal attack made on me by the author of the hand-bill, compelled me to be, in some degree, personal. The observations which I made were in self-defence; and, without being silent, I could not well have said less. It is not said in my remarks, that Mr. Key was for passive obedience and non-resistance. It is admitted that it was contended that the paragraph alluded to inculcated that doctrine. I cannot now discover any substantial difference. In the hand-bill it is intimated, that to contend that an act of congress is unconstitutional, is to claim more constitutional knowledge than is to be found in the three branches of government; and in the reply it is insinuated, that to contend that a law is unconstitutional, is to charge the president and two houses of congress, with ignorance or corruption. Is it possible that these are Mr. Key's sentiments? Does he believe that if a member of congress is not ignorant or corrupt, he must be infallible?

When allusions are general, and when they are made expressly to numbers, an individual cannot with propriety consider himself included, unless he feels the force of the observations. When I mentioned the declaration of Mr. Pitt in the house of commons, and gave my opinion that many of our opponents coincided with him in opinion, I evidently alluded to the opponents of Mr. Jefferson throughout the Union. That among his opponents there are men who coincide with Mr. Pitt;—men of monarchical principles;—men who are for a hereditary chief magistrate, and an hereditary senate, no man can doubt who has read the Gazette of the United States, the pamphlet lately published at New-York by Mr. Fenno, and other authentic documents. These men are the QUIXOTES of the present era; and all true Americans will concur in the sentiment that they would be more suitably employed in building castles in the air, than in the public service of a republican government.

Mr. Key is deceived when he supposes that I am offended at his calling my arguments visionary; but I should feel for the liberties of America if it was within the scale of his talents to grant them so. They are the arguments of those enlightened patriots who framed the constitution; and of those who advocated its adoption in the state conventions. It is to this constitution contended for by me, and the principles inculcated by it, that we owe the Federal compact. As long as they are enforced and maintained, they will preserve our republican form of government in the true character in which it issued from the sovereign authority of the

people. A contrary construction cannot fail to destroy the independence of the states,—to consolidate the state sovereignties,—and to pave the way to monarchy.—And then, farewell to the liberties of America. If there are any disorganizers among us, they should be fought for among those who are for monarchy,—and those who are for a hereditary chief magistrate, and an hereditary senate,—and among the British party in America. Can any man doubt the existence of such a party when he is informed that a formal and regular report was made, in the year 1791, by the lords of the British privy council, to the king of Great-Britain, on the American politics, government and trade; in which those lords expressly declare "that a party in favour of Great-Britain was formed in America." The fate of that man must be to madness who could entertain the opinion that enlightened republicans would wish to disorganize a republican government which they themselves have established.

Mr. Key insists in his reply that the alien act was approved by general Washington, and to prove it has published a broken sentence of his letter. It has been shewn that by a reference to the whole letter, no such conclusion can be drawn. To prove that it met his approbation it is necessary to prove not only that he had seen, but that he had deliberately read, considered and approved. No man can deny that by that act, legislative and judicial powers are not united to those of the executive;—and the sentiment of general Washington that he hoped this country would for ever remain an asylum for the persecuted of all nations, and moreover his opinion above recited, taken from his farewell address contain incontrovertible evidence to the contrary.

Mr. Key may justly believe that I am really in error when I say "as an individual I claim only the right to judge for myself;" but when I was publicly called on to assign reasons for preferring Mr. Jefferson as president of the United States, it became necessary to detail them; to disseminate those reasons, and to enforce them at public meetings; and I am yet to learn that there is even the shadow of an impropriety or inconsistency in any part of my conduct. In this my official character had no share. It is entirely out of the question.—It may not be improper to add that I shall never be deterred by the peevish sneers of any man or body of men, from pursuing a line of conduct which carries with it no other evidence of criminality than an honest disinterested effort to render a service to my fellow-citizens.

It was said in my remarks on the hand-bill that Mr. Key had made a charge of irreligion against Mr. Jefferson. In his reply he supposes me to have charged him with saying that Mr. Jefferson is a deist, and denies the charge; but proceeds to say "it is not the man but his writings that I attack; the tendency of his expression to demoralize the world." To know what the attack really was it is necessary to consult the hand-bill. If the fact which it is to be found in the hand-bill does not amount to a charge of irreligion, I know not the meaning of the word. Extracts from Mr. Jefferson's writings are produced against him; when they are read and understood, they prove him to be a man of pure morality and religion. We are then told that if he wrote the law to establish religious freedom in Virginia, it contains no proof of his individual sentiments. It is presumable that a man's writings contain proof of his opinions; but if they contain no proof of his opinions, why are they produced as evidence against him?

Even the sentence selected in the hand-bill contains self-evident proposition. It is irrefutable. But when mangled and misinterpreted by weak or prejudiced commentators, it is perverted into nonsense. Mr. Jefferson does not say "that such doctrines when advocated and enforced by your neighbours will do us no injury."

Abler and more influential men than Mr. Key have in vain endeavoured to depreciate the character of Mr. Jefferson. The people of the United States will not apply to Mr. Key, or to a disappointed foreign minister who felt the force of his superior talents, for a character of that virtuous patriot. They will read it in the ever memorable DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, which emancipated the American people from the tyranny of Great-Britain and ranked them among the free nations of the earth;—in his eminent services as minister in foreign countries;—in his able and masterly diplomatic correspondence, maintained at the same time with the ministers of France and Great-Britain, vindicating the rights and maintaining the honour of the United States with that superior ability and intelligence which has drawn forth equally the praise and admiration of friends and foes.—They will read it in the history of his public life which has been employed in great, laborious and successful efforts to promote the general liberty and happiness of the human race.

C. DUVAL.

September 29, 1800.

BOSTON, September 19.

THE COMMISSIONERS.

A letter from a gentleman at Paris, dated July 17, received in this town, observes, that the envoys are very secret as to the progress of the negotiation they are conducting; that whatever reports may be current relative to the business they can have no better basis than conjecture; that he should write again by Mr. Tudor, who was to take passage with the envoys in the Portsmouth sloop of war.

PHILADELPHIA, September 23.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman in Charleston, (S.C.) to his friend in this city, dated Sept. 13.

"I have just recovered from a severe attack of the yellow fever. It has been very fatal among the northern people. The principal part of those who have taken it have fallen victims.

"The negroes have rose in arms against the whites in this country, and have killed several. All the troops of light horse are ordered out by the governor, to suppress the insurrection under the penalty of 15 pounds sterling, for every private, and in proportion for the officers. It is expected there will be serious work before they are subdued."

In addition to the above, we learn by a gentleman from Charleston, that this insurrection had caused a very serious alarm in that city. Some reports stated the number of insurgents who were embodied about 30 miles from the city, to be four or five thousand strong, and others decreased their numbers to 7 or 8 hundred. However this may be, the citizens were unfortunately backward in turning out, owing to the sickly state of the surrounding country. Many chose rather to pay the penalty, than run the risk of falling a prey to the fever, which generally attacks the in-