

FED. REPUBLICAN TICKET.

FOR THE CITY OF ANNAPOLIS,
Lewis Neth, Jr.
Lewis Gassaway.

FOR ANNE-ARUNDEL COUNTY,
Brice J. Worthington
Colonel Thomas Hood
Doctor Richard Hopkins
Virgil Maxcey

KRIST COUNTY,
Capt. Frederick Boyer
Joseph Brown, 4th
Major Matthew Tilghman
Col. William Spencer

CECIL COUNTY,
Lambert 3rd
George Davidson
Abraham D. Mitchell
Robert Evans

CAROLINE COUNTY,
Col. William P. ter,
Matthew Driver,
Richard Hugglett,
William McDonald.

TALBOT COUNTY,
Jabez Caldwell,
Edward N. Hambleton,
John Seth,
Alexander Hands.

FREDERICK COUNTY,
Col. John Thomas,
Joseph Taney,
Joseph Howard,
James Johnson.

WORCESTER COUNTY,
Ephraim K. Willson,
Thomas N. Williams,
Littleton Quinton,
Isaac Mitchell.

DORCHESTER COUNTY,
Edward Griffith,
Robert Hart,
Col. Thomas Pitt,
Benjamin W. Lecompte.

ALLEGANY COUNTY,
William M. Mahon,
William Hillery,
Joseph Tomlinson,
James Prather, jun.

WASHINGTON COUNTY,
Upton Lawrence,
John Blackford,
John Hershey,
John Irwin.

FOR QUEEN ANN'S COUNTY,
James Massey,
John Tilghman,
Samuel M. Keene,
Nathaniel Cacy.

Mr. Green,
I had heard so much respecting a letter said to have been written by Maj. Gen. Harper, of Baltimore, long before I had an opportunity of seeing it, that I was really afraid he had fallen into some indiscreet act; but when a paper was handed me which contained it, I was as much at a loss to discover what particular parts of it were so very exceptionable. He has advanced no sentiments that I have not often advanced, as well as many others, and nothing that is not warranted by fact. He has said that the war was declared for objects which were abandoned in the treaty—and this every one knows. It was said by one of the commissioners sent to Ghent, that peace would never be made until the British had abandoned those maritime principles they had endeavoured for centuries to maintain, or until its terms were dictated by our victorious army from the walls of Quebec—but yet this practical ambassador signed a treaty which included not one single object for which the war was declared, and continued for nearly three years. This it was predicted by Gen. Harper, as well as by many others, would be the case, and no sooner did the treaty arrive than it was signed by president Madison. Did he not then swallow his words? did he not abandon those principles which he had endeavoured to maintain by the sword? Gen. Harper might have been wrong in one respect, for he as well as many others, and in fact the whole country, had a right to calculate on a different result; but however great the mortification of our president was, he seems to have put his signature to the treaty without kicking or squalling. Considering the situation to which his folly and stupidity had reduced the country, he was glad to have an opportunity, of concluding a peace almost upon any terms,

which he did, without taking into his calculations one single object for which he had declared a war, which involved the country in so much misery and distress. Upon this subject does Gen. Harper write in the letter which was stolen from his pocket, and published. He says nothing more than what is the truth, and what very many in the community, of any candour, will come forward and establish by the most incontrovertible testimony.—That "free trade and sailor's rights" were abandoned by our administration upon the conclusion of a peace, no one can deny, even should there be a disposition for it, for the facts stand too strongly recorded to want any further evidence.

It is one thing to be a demagogue, and another a scientific politician. Those who clamour against the letter of Harper, are of the former class, and stick at nothing to accomplish their particular ends; while the others, more modest, and disposed at all times to be governed by the most austere rules of propriety, play the rake, and debauchee, and applied the firmness of the president with all the vociferation of a Stentor. These things I do not like, for at all times I should be pleased to see every man rewarded with what his merits demand—but in the case of Gen. Harper, the democrats, some of the pickpocket order, have seized a letter of his, and published it as one among the most criminal acts, which requires the rigid severity of the law. If they could be ascertained I have no doubt they would be punished, and I would now ask, by way of information, whether the receiver is not as bad as the thief, and whether the publishers of the letter ought not to be taken up and prosecuted for—? what you very well know.

INDEX.

For the Maryland Gazette.

Who are the Friends of the People's Rights?

Let Facts, which cannot like empty assertions and professions lead astray, decide.

The constitution of Maryland originally required voters and holders of office to possess property.

Who first proposed and voted to repeal this part of the constitution and to give the poor as well as the rich the right of voting and holding office?

Answer. The FEDERAL REPUBLICANS in the House of Delegates, in the year 1797.

Who opposed the People's Rights, and voted that no person without property should either vote or hold office?

Answer. The leading Democrats of the state.

In proof of these things see Votes and Proceedings of the House of Delegates in the year 1797, pages 30 and 96.

What did the Democrats, whose leading men had opposed the people's rights in 1797, when the Federal Republicans were in power, do in the year 1800, when they had a majority?

Answer. The Democrats, in order then to get the popularity of a measure which they had opposed when the Federal Republicans first proposed it, bring forward a law in 1800 permitting people, who had no property, to vote but not to enjoy office.

Were the Federal Republicans narrow-minded enough to endeavour to prevent the democrats from getting popularity by opposing, when in the minority, a measure, which when in the majority, they had themselves proposed and advocated?

Answer. NO. So true to principle, and so much attached to the people's rights were the Federal Republicans in 1800, that more than two thirds of them magnanimously voted for the measure, though they knew at the time, as the democrats had a majority in the house, they would get all the credit of it. In proof of this see Votes and Proceedings of the House of Delegates in 1800, pages 51 and 52.

The Federal Republican proposition in 1797 then, it appears, was, that the poor should not only have the right to vote, but also to ENJOY OFFICE: The Democratic proposition in 1800 permitted the poor to vote, but compelled them to vote for rich men.

Did not the Democrats, who have boasted so much of being friends of the people, during the long period of nine years, from 1800, to 1809, when they had a majority, propose to repeal that part of the constitution, which excluded poor men, however meritorious, from holding office?

Answer. NO. The proposition was first made by the Federal Republicans, in the year 1797, as was before stated, and afterwards, when they obtained a majority in the House of Delegates in the year 1809. See Votes and proceedings of the House of Delegates in 1809, pages 119 and 120.

The Federal Republicans then were the first who proposed that the poor man should vote, and also that the poor man of merit might be elected to the highest office in the state.

From the above facts, proved by the records of the General Assembly, let the people themselves decide, who are the friends of the people's rights.

Who are the Friends of Free Trade and Sailor's Rights?

The Federal Republicans built a navy and passed laws to protect them both.

The Democrats destroyed the Navy, and substituted gun-boats, which at length fell into such utter contempt, that they were directed to be sold under the hammer of the auctioneer.

The Democratic party in Congress passed the embargo, and other laws of a like nature, which destroyed all free trade, and drove sailors from the ocean, leaving them no right but the right of starving for want of employment.

Who are the Friends of Peace and the Prosperity of the Country?

The FEDERAL REPUBLICANS, who voted against the Declaration of War; whereas the Democrats destroyed the prosperity of the country by declaring war unprepared, under pretence of protecting Free Trade and Sailor's Rights, and after sacrificing thousands of valuable lives, and squandering millions on millions of treasure, surrendered both Free Trade and Sailor's Rights by a Treaty of Peace which made no mention of either.

Who are the Friends of Economy?

The Democratic Party, in the last years of the Federal Republican administration, made profession that they, and not the Federal Republicans, were the Friends of Economy. They persuaded the people to believe them, they gained their confidence, and obtained power by ousting the friends and successors of Washington.

The tree is known by its Fruit and not by the promise of its gaudy blossom.

Let Acts, therefore, and not Professions, Decide.

From the year 1789 to 1800, inclusive, during the twelve years in which WASHINGTON and his immediate successors and friends were at the head of government, the expenditures of the Federal government amounted only to \$66,922,781 04.

From the year 1803 to the year 1815, twelve years during which the Democratic Party have had the power, the administration has spent the enormous sum of \$ 145,189,934 95. That is to say—during 12 years the Federal Republican Administration spent upwards of ONE HUNDRED MILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF THE PEOPLE'S MONEY less than the Democratic Administration in the same time.

In other words, THE DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION have spent in the last twelve years more than THREE TIMES AS MUCH AS WAS SPENT BY THE FEDERAL REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION in the same length of time.

And in ONE YEAR, that is 1814, the present DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION spent upwards of FIFTY MILLIONS OF DOLLARS! being more than the FEDERAL REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION spent during the whole of the TWELVE YEARS they were in power!! See reports of the different Secretaries of the Treasury, but particularly Mr. Dallas's in January last.

To pay the interest and principal of the enormous sums thus wastefully squandered by the democratic self-styled Friends of Economy, the people are burdened with taxes, not only on lands and houses, but on almost every article of convenience or necessity which they buy and use. THE TAX-GATHERER has not yet got his rounds in the counties where the fate of the ensuing election is supposed to be doubtful, lest it might give the Voters too sensibly a proof of the burdens laid upon them—but let the people mark it!! AS SOON AS THE ELECTION IS OVER, THEY WILL RECEIVE A VISIT FROM THE TAX-GATHERER.

Who then are the True Friends of the People's Rights?

Who are the friends of Free Trade and Sailor's Rights?

Who are the Friends of Peace and the Prosperity of the Country?

Who are the True Friends of Economy?

THE FEDERAL REPUBLICANS, OR DEMOCRATS?

Let the Free and Independent Voters of this state put away all prejudice, passion, and party feeling; let them calmly reflect upon the above FACTS, not only stated but proved, and then by their votes on the first Monday in October next, DECIDE.

From the Baltimore Telegraph.

COMMUNICATION.

One of the electioneering accusations most frequently urged against the federalists, is, that they always opposed the right of universal suffrage; that is, always contended for a property qualification for voters. The following statement and references, which every person may verify by consulting the votes and proceedings, will prove this accusation, like all the others, proceeding from the same quarter, to be utterly void of foundation; and that the federalists themselves, were the first movers and authors of the universal suffrage, while it was opposed by some of the most influential democrats.

The proposition to repeal that part of the constitution of Maryland, which required a property qualification for voters and for persons holding places of profit, honour or trust, in or under government, was first brought forward by Michael Taney, a well known federalist of Calvert county, in the year 1797. A committee of five, four of whom were federalists, were appointed to report a bill for the repeal.

Wide Votes and Proceedings of the House of Delegates, for 1797, page 30.

When the vote was taken on the second reading of the bill, there were yeas 30—of which 19 were federal and 11 democratic. Nays 21—of which 10 were federal, 10 democratic, and 1 of no party.

Amongst the democrats in the negative, were Judge Nicholson, of Baltimore, Judge John Buchanan, of Washington county, Judge Clarke, of Prince George's county, Robert Smith, late secretary of state, Levi Hollingsworth now of the senate, and Upton Bruce of Allegany, also of the senate.

See Votes and Proceedings for 1797, page 95.

The bill was rejected by the senate.

The subject was brought forward again in the year 1798, but was postponed to the next legislature.

On the question of postponement a majority of the federal party voted in the negative.

In the year 1800, Mr. Lloyd made a motion to bring in a bill for the repeal of such parts of the constitution as required property as a qualification of voters (excluding office holders) Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Chapman and Mr. Edmondson (1 democrat & 2 federalists) were the committee who reported the bill.

See Votes and Proceedings, for 1800, page 23.

On the passage of the bill, there were yeas 57—of which 23 were federalists and 34 democratic—and nays 11—of which 10 were federalists and one democratic.

See Votes and Proceedings, for 1800, page 51.

The bill was rejected by the senate.

In the year 1801, a similar bill was brought forward in the House of Delegates, when a majority of the federalists voted against it, because the mode of voting was changed by that bill from *viva voce* to "ballot," as appears by a motion made immediately previous to the final passage of the bill, to insert the words "by ballot," in which almost all the federal party voted in the negative.

In the year 1802, when the confirming law was passed, the federal party were almost equally divided (notwithstanding the ballot) 13 voting in the affirmative, and 12 in the negative.

It is to be remarked, that the federal proposition in 1797, was to remove the property qualification of holders of office as well as of voters. The democratic proposition, in 1800 and 1801, was to remove the property qualification of voters only.

As a party of pick-pockets were looking over the contents of a pocket book, which they had stolen from a man who crossed a letter which they had the liberty of opening. They had proceeded far before they found some passages in which they saw characters were handled pretty severely. They all exclaimed, with a loud agitation, "that it was an insult to the whole club."

This actually occurred, not long ago, in this city. When I heard the exclamation, I could not but recollect the anecdote of the man who peeped over a gentleman's shoulder while he was writing a letter. The writer immediately closed the letter with this remark, "I will say more, but that a long time the Irishman is looking over my shoulder the self convicted blunderer. I have not seen one word that I have written."

From the Baltimore Telegraph.

A Case stated for the opinion of the Bar.

We will suppose that a trunk in the mail stage, should have been stolen by an unknown person. The perpetrator of this act should be enquired, and the trunk and its contents are given up by the carrier as irrecoverably lost.—We will suppose, that a man appears in public, wearing an hat which was stolen from the trunk in which the trunk the owner was written.

We will suppose that the owner reclaims his property, and asks the man how it came into his possession. He replies that he found it in a public highway. We ask, whether this would not, in the eyes of the law, make such a man responsible for every article of property contained in that trunk.—We would ask, whether the detention of such property for a single hour, would not be such an individual liable for the whole. If this doctrine is true, when a trunk is broke it is equally true in the case of a pocket book.

The Democrats are now respectfully invited to publish every paper contained in the stolen pocket book, because a very little more evidence will be wanting to lead to a criminal detection and punishment. Let them ransack the papers in their possession, and find a few more letters obnoxious to their cause, which they sealed, or unsealed, we presume will make no difference, and open on, until the pocket book is empty we can but indulge the hope (perhaps a chimerical one) that after the election is over, the pocket book will be returned. We beg to know, if we have presumed too far upon democratic honesty, but in the intention of the pocket book and its papers for ten months, we suppose, would be a term of sufficient for all purposes, which electioneering or felicitous shew that they are acquainted with the contents of Mr. Harper's pocket book, and however patriotic they may be, they ought certainly to turn the envelope.

NEWBERN, (N. C.) Sept. 21.

DREADFUL STORM.

On Sunday night and Monday morning last, the town was visited by one of the most destructive gales, ever experienced in this part of the country. The wind was most violent about 3 o'clock on Monday morning and at day light the sea and wharves presented a scene which beggars all description. The streets were rendered impassable by trees lying in every direction. Most of the small wooden buildings in the North East part of the town were carried away by the violence of the wind and were the tide having risen nearly seven feet above common high water mark. The garden fences in many places were removed, and the streets posts entirely under water. Several vessels were on the wharves and in the streets, others of the marshes and some in the woods. The South West of the town on Monday morning several of the houses and stores were blown away by the mercy of the angry elements—their valuable contents many instances entirely lost, and who had property on the wharves sustained more or less injury. Water in many shops being raised to 7 feet above the ground.

Many succeeded on Saturday in removing a part of their property from the scene of danger and to the safety of their lives—others, however, were from the lower to the upper shelves. But notwithstanding the exertion and precaution, the

property is immense. We dare venture to risk a calculation as to the amount destroyed. Some of it might be formed from the mass of ruins which every where presented themselves in the streets at the water from one extremity of the town to the other; but it would fall infinitely short of the truth. It is remarkable that no lives were lost on this distressing occasion; but if proper precautions had been taken—if water is suffered to remain in cellars, and vegetables and other substances liable to putrefaction, to continue in the streets and stores, perhaps disease and death may yet be traced to the storm as its primary cause.

In the lower part of the country, as far as we have heard from, we learn that the effects of the storm were truly distressing. Many farmers have lost nearly all their fodder. Their crops, particularly late corn and peas, are greatly injured; while their forward corn is blown down, and from the continuance of wet weather is sprouting in the ear. The roads in every direction are almost entirely blocked up with fallen trees.

properly is immense. We dare venture to risk a calculation as to the amount destroyed. Some of it might be formed from the mass of ruins which every where presented themselves in the streets at the water from one extremity of the town to the other; but it would fall infinitely short of the truth. It is remarkable that no lives were lost on this distressing occasion; but if proper precautions had been taken—if water is suffered to remain in cellars, and vegetables and other substances liable to putrefaction, to continue in the streets and stores, perhaps disease and death may yet be traced to the storm as its primary cause.

In the lower part of the country, as far as we have heard from, we learn that the effects of the storm were truly distressing. Many farmers have lost nearly all their fodder. Their crops, particularly late corn and peas, are greatly injured; while their forward corn is blown down, and from the continuance of wet weather is sprouting in the ear. The roads in every direction are almost entirely blocked up with fallen trees.

In the lower part of the country, as far as we have heard from, we learn that the effects of the storm were truly distressing. Many farmers have lost nearly all their fodder. Their crops, particularly late corn and peas, are greatly injured; while their forward corn is blown down, and from the continuance of wet weather is sprouting in the ear. The roads in every direction are almost entirely blocked up with fallen trees.

SHOCKING OCCURRENCE!

On Thursday afternoon last, as a gentleman was hunting squirrels, he pursued one into a thicket, a distance of thirty yards from the turnpike road between this and Bridge-town, and about six miles from this city, where shocking to relate, he discovered the skeleton of a human being! From the appearance, must have lain in this situation several months, as the head had fallen from the body, and the flesh adhered from the bones; a decayed shirt, pantaloons, and boots were the apparel visible; marks of violence appeared on the skull as fractured and perforated by a sharp instrument. A coroner's inquest was called, but we have not yet ascertained the verdict.

Since the above discovery, several circumstances have come to light, such as the finding a black coat of satin vest and a beaver hat, a little girl, sometime previous to the late harvest, in a field near the thicket where the deceased was found; the hat, she says, contained a paper which she carelessly threw away. It may serve the cause of humanity, and perhaps lead to the detection of the diabolical perpetrator or perpetrators of this deed of horror, if our brother printers will generally notice this; as from the circumstance of no person having been missed, to our knowledge in this part of the state, the deceased may have been a traveller from a distance. We are told no vestige of any thing appeared on him by which his name could be ascertained.

Further Particulars.

Since the above was put in type, we have been furnished by the coroner who attended, with the following additional particulars. The next report, that the circumstances and evidence before them indicate the deceased to have been a gentleman travelling, who was detected and dragged off the road or about the first of July last—about that period the cry of murder was heard in the direction several times at midnight; on the 6th of July was found, a few rods distant, a beaver hat, and florentine vest much torn and soiled, with remains was found a pair of shoes, short and buttoned up the heels and the parts of the shirt served are fine and ruffled up the collar; his hair was dark brown. Our request above is added that the coroner and others, that the contents of news papers will generally notice this circumstance.

From Bell's Weekly Messenger of July 31.

"His Majesty's ship Bellepophon, July 24. I observed his person [Buona-] particularly, and can describe him thus:—He is about 3 feet 6 inches in height, very strong and well proportioned; very dark and deep chest; legs and