

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY JONAS GREEN, CHURCH-STREET, ANNAPOLIS.

Price—Three Dollars per Annum.

To the People of Maryland.

The Electoral Election being determined, it will not be improper to suggest what ought to be the conduct of federalists; and, in doing so, to assign the reasons which should influence that conduct.

SHERIFFALTY.

WILLIAM O'HARA.

Having understood that a report is circulating of his having declined being a Candidate for the office of sheriff, takes this opportunity of declaring the same to be unfounded.

JUST PUBLISHED,

AND FOR SALE, AT THIS OFFICE, The Votes & Proceedings of the last session of the Legislature.

Price—\$1 50.

Lots for Sale.

The subscriber will dispose of Several Lots of Ground, Fronting on South-street, twenty-five feet, and running seventy-feet back.

200 Dollars Reward.

RAN AWAY from the subscriber the 5th of this month, two Negro Men, SAMUEL & NACE.

SAM has a very black complexion, hollow eyes, and a little red, high cheek bones, square built, and about five feet four inches high; he had when he went away a pair of boots new bottomed, and a pair of white cotton trousers, one old white hat.

NACE is about 19 years old, tolerable black complexion, round face, on his left cheek a large scar, cut by a kick from a horse.

When he went away had on a blue coat, yellow buttons, white linen shirt, marseilles waistcoat, new ticklenburgh trousers, a blue striped pair, one old, furred hat.

It is probable they are making for the Delaware, as I have reason to believe, Sam crossed the Bay in a skiff, and I have understood has a forged pass for two or three days or weeks.

Whoever secures said fellows in any part, or brings them home, or either of them, shall receive Fifty Dollars for each, and One Hundred Dollars for each, if taken out of the state.

Edw. A. Edmond, North Side of Bevers, near Maryland, August 20, 1851.

should be laid before the people. At this time, Adams and Jefferson were candidates for the presidency.

The state of Virginia determined to change the mode of electing her electors of president and vice-presidents from district elections to that of a general ticket; by which means the only six federal districts in Virginia would be swallowed up and lost.

The federalists of Maryland at once proposed to change the mode of electing the electors from district elections to that of a legislative choice, Maryland having at the time 8 districts, 4 federal and 4 democratic.

The governor (Benj. Ogle) was advised by some to call the legislature and make the change; but Mr. Ogle, by the advice of a large majority of the federalists, considered it most consistent with that true republicanism, and that regard for the sentiments of the people, which characterised federalism, not to call the legislature, but to submit the policy to the consideration of the people, that they might decide whether it would be proper for Maryland to regulate the election of presidential electors, as to counteract the robbery that had been practised against Mr. Adams in Virginia; at least so far as taking from Mr. Jefferson 4 votes, that he would otherwise get in Maryland, would counteract the loss of 6 votes that Mr. Adams had sustained by the change previously adopted in Virginia.

The democrats in Maryland seized at once upon the proposition; pronounced this most patriotic act of Mr. Ogle's to be an attempt to deprive the people of their right of suffrage; pronounced federalists to be enemies of all poor men; and, in support of their assertion, produced that part of the constitution requiring property qualification to voters, and to persons holding offices under the state government, showing the people that this clause had been introduced by federalists at its adoption, and had been practised under ever since; at the same time promising the people, that if they would turn out the federalists and elect democrats, they would put the poor and the rich upon an equality, by giving them universal suffrage; would make the estates of rich men pay for the education of poor men's children, and would alter the constitution as it regarded the election of the senate and judges of the levy court, &c. so as to have them elected immediately by the people, as they elected their delegates to the assembly.

This increase of power, so promised, pleased the people; an overwhelming return of democracy was made, and during the session of 1800, the promises made to the people were to be redeemed; but the old federal senate, being still to serve out that session, was made the excuse for attempting nothing more than a repeal of all such parts of the constitution and form of government, as required property qualification for voters at elections, and for persons holding offices of profit, honour or trust, in or under government; and no attempt was ever made, or thought of, for repealing this section of the constitution, until Tuesday, the 5th Decr 1797, a bill was introduced by Michael Taney, a federal member of the legislature from Calvert county, intitled, "An act to alter all such parts of the constitution and form of government as requires property qualification for voters at elections, and persons holding offices of profit, honour or trust, in or under the government," which was read and ordered to lie on the table.

On Monday, 25th Decr. 1797, it had its second reading, and passed, 30 members voting for it, and 21 against it. On an examination of the names, it will, I believe, be found that there were 8 democrats for it, and only 4 federalists against it. Among the 17 democrats who were against it, we find enrolled some of the most influential men, that have since claimed an exclusive right to the name of republican and friends of the poor people, viz. J. H. Nicholson, afterwards a judge; J. Buchanan, now a judge; Upton Bruce; Daniel Clark, afterwards a judge; Robert Smith; afterwards secretary of the United States; Levi Hollingsworth, afterwards a senator; and 11 others, since held high by democrats.

The bill was rejected by the senate. It was the first time the subject had been introduced; and it is a subject, it was thought, of much importance, to be entered suddenly upon. In 1799, a bill was introduced by Col. John Thomas, of Frederick, for the same purpose, and was again rejected by the senate. It was immediately confined of by those who were favourable to the change; a large majority of whom were federalists; & was determined that the subject

at p. 38, and passed p. 51; passed by the federal senate, with amendments, p. 72, and rejected by the lower house on account of said amendments p. 74.

Nov. session 1801, the senate and lower house being both democratic, leave was again given to introduce a bill to repeal all such parts of the constitution as relates to property qualification for voters; and at p. 34 the bill was so reported, 19 Nov; on the 21st, p. 37, it was recommended for amendment, and at p. 47, it was again reported. Yet still great caution seems to have been taken that no poor man should be allowed to hold an office. At p. 82, it was postponed to p. 90, when we find another amendment was offered with the bill, viz. to vote by ballot, and was sent to the senate, where it was taken up at p. 109, and passed with amendments; which amendments were accepted by the lower house, and the bill was passed into a law. In 1802, p. 29, it was confirmed and made a part of the constitution—so that from Nov-session 1802, a man, not worth 50 l. could vote for a man to be sheriff; provided that man was worth 1000 l. He could vote for his neighbour to be a member of the legislature, provided that neighbour was worth 500 l. Still let a man be ever so worthy of an office, and ever so much in need of it to support a large family, he could not be voted for because of the want of a property qualification. He could not constitutionally hold an office, yet the democrats gave themselves the character of being the poor man's friend, claiming to themselves the credit of giving universal suffrage by what they had done; and so things continued until 1809. The people, in some parts of the state, were persuaded to see how they had been deceived by democrats, who had promised so many things by way of increasing the people's power and rights, and yet had not, for nine years, attempted any thing towards redeeming their promise but what I have already shown, viz. the doing away of the 30 l. qualification from voters.—They determined no longer to be duped by them, and accordingly returned federal members. Among other counties, Frederick sent 4 federalists, viz. John Thomas, Geo. Baer, John H. Thomas, John Schley, to represent them. At Nov. session 1809, p. 20, on motion of John Hanson Thomas, leave was given to bring in a bill intitled "An act to alter and abolish all such parts of the constitution and form of government as require a property qualification in persons to be appointed or holding offices of profit or trust in the state, and in persons to be elected members of the legislature or electors of the senate." Ordered, that Messrs. J. H. Thomas, Herbert, Brent, Grahame and Worthington, be a committee to prepare and bring in the same: the bill was reported, and had its second reading at p. 119; passed and was sent to the senate, where it also passed, p. 123. A confirmatory bill passed in 1810—and then, and not before, were the people given universal suffrage. This, as I have shown, was brought forward by federalists, and but for the federalists to this day, no poor man would have been allowed to hold an office. Thus we find that democrats, though they got into office in 1800, by promising to give the people equal rights, the poor with the rich, yet did they refuse to do so, keeping the door of office shut against poor men for 9 years, without ever mentioning the subject, although during the whole time they held both houses of the legislature, and would no doubt have opposed it when brought forward by federalists, as recited, but for the fear of their popularity; always, nevertheless, falsely claiming the credit of having been the friends of poor people, and of having given them universal suffrage.

At p. 5, of session 1809, on motion, leave was given to bring in a bill to alter the constitution as it regarded voters: and qualification of voters. Messrs. Seth, Archer and Bland were the committee to bring in the bill—which was reported on the 11th Nov. p. 14; read the second time according to the order of the day, on the 12th Decr. p. 68; and on motion of J. H. Thomas, the question was put, that the words "able to bear arms under the militia law,

and all others above 18 years of age," be inserted in the first clause, after the word state, which was determined in the negative. Thus we find Mr. John H. Thomas, one of the leaders of the federal party in the house, and on all occasions supported by his federal friends, here offering to increase the power of the people, so as to allow every man a vote who was liable to be called on to risk his life; and is it not just that a man should have the right to say who should have the right of making war, so soon as he is liable to be called on to fight the battles of his country? And yet a democratic house, for they still had a majority in the house, rejected this right, by rejecting the amendment so offered by J. H. Thomas. At p. 36, session 1809, on motion by C. Dorsey, leave given to bring in a bill to alter the constitution so as to abolish the council and to regulate the powers of the governor; 19 democrats opposed the leave, altho' they pretend now to be in favor of doing away with the council. At p. 45, Mr. C. Dorsey obtained leave to bring in a bill to do away the necessity of a poor man's paying 25 shillings for a licence to marry; and at p. 59, he introduced the bill; when, after several attempts had been made to defeat it, (p. 68 and 69) it passed the lower house, 33 to 17—all of the 17, I believe democrats,—and was rejected by a democratic senate—see p. 74.

Thus did they show their love to poor men, obliging them to pay for licence to get a wife; when they perhaps were scarcely able to pay 25 to the preacher to marry them, or for a blanket to cover them. At p. 50, John H. Thomas delivers a bill, entitled, "An act for the appointment by the people of the justices of the levy courts in the several counties in this state." Passed, page 84; 16 voting against it, and they all democrats of the first water. It was rejected by a democratic senate, page 90. In 1811, votes and proceedings, page 33, leave again obtained to introduce a bill to elect, by the people, the judges of the levy courts, and the bill was introduced by Mr. Frisby—page 52. After some amendments it passed, see page 102 & 103—for it 39, against it 32, and all in the negative, I believe, democrats. It was rejected by a democratic senate, p. 128.

A bill was introduced to tax bank stock, in 1809, November session; and on the second reading of the bill, at page 91, Mr. Archer, from Harford, long honoured by the people as a dear friend to the poor, moved to strike out of the bill the only objects that rendered it desirable, viz. the establishment and support of free schools. Page 92, Mr. Herbert, a federal member, moved that 25 cents be levied on every \$100 worth of stock held in all the different incorporated companies therein enumerated; and after many amendments had been offered by federalists to increase the sum intended to be raised for the benefit of educating poor men's children, directing the judges of the levy courts, &c. to cause as many free schools to be established in each of the counties, as their several portions of the money, so raised, should justify. To prevent all mistake, J. H. Thomas proposed, and the house agreed to reconsider the title of the bill, for the purpose of making it read as follows, to wit: "An act to tax bank stock, & other monied institutions, for the establishment and support of schools for the education of poor people's children." On motion of Mr. Seth, a democrat, that the following be added to the bill, to wit: "And be it enacted, that the children of persons, who are not assessed on the books of the commissioner of the tax, for each county, within the state, to the amount of \$100, shall be considered the children of the poor people, which was rejected, as it would have gone to fill the schools with rich men's children, instead of the children of poor men; and Mr. Bayly, a federal member, moved that the money, so levied and raised, should be equally divided among the counties. Eleven democrats opposed this amendment, wishing to divide it, no doubt, to the benefit of the large counties to the entire exclusion almost of the small counties.

Let us endeavour to form an opinion now from what showed itself to

be the disposition of democracy in 1811, when Mr. Evans, a federal member from Montgomery county, obtained leave to bring in a bill, to repeal the constitution, as it regards the election of the senate; so as to have the senate elected by the people, as they elect their sheriffs—see page 98. The bill was introduced, page 71, read the 2d time, page 138. An amendment was offered by Mr. James L. Donaldson, a member from the city of Baltimore, which was supported by 12 of the most influential democrats—Mr. Donaldson himself being that year the leading democrat in the house; to wit: "Be it enacted, that from and after the 1st Monday in October, 1816, the house of delegates shall be composed of 52 members; whereof one shall be returned by Allegany, 4 by Anne Arundel, 6 by Baltimore county, 5 by the city of Baltimore, 2 by Cecil, 1 by Calvert, 2 by Caroline, 2 by Charles, 3 by Dorchester, 5 by Frederick, 4 by Harford, 2 by Kent, 2 by Prince George's, 2 by Queen Anne's, 1 by Saint Mary's, 2 by Somerset, 2 by Talbot, 3 by Washington, 2 by Worcester counties, and 1 by the city of Annapolis, who shall be elected in the same manner, at the same time, and have the same qualifications that members now have." We find the following members voted for this amendment, viz. Randall, Harryman, Brown, Tyler, Swearingen, T. Jones, Shriver, Sanders, Forwood, Pechin, Donaldson, Berester—12, all democrats. The amendment was lost as it ought to have been; and on the passage of the bill, we find 27 democrats opposed to it, but the bill passed and was rejected by a democratic senate, p. 220. Will any person after reading the foregoing, say that democrats never have attempted, and that they never will attempt to do away the county influence, so as to destroy the small counties, and throw all weight into the hands of Baltimore, joined with a few of the large counties. Again, in 1812, page 29 of the votes and proceedings, Mr. Lecompte, a federal member from Dorchester, obtained leave to bring in a bill to alter the mode of electing the senate. A bill was reported, and on a further consideration of it, Mr. Emory, a democrat, moved to elect by a general ticket, which, had it succeeded, would have given Baltimore, joined to 2 or 3 counties, the entire power over all the rest; and of the senate every man would have been elected against the desire of the people of the other counties, see page 78. This amendment was lost, 17 democrats voting, however, for it. The question was then taken on the bill as introduced, and 13 democrats voted against it, and it was afterwards rejected by a democratic senate, page 104.

Thus, people of Maryland, have I shewn you, by a reference to the votes and proceedings of the different legislatures, what has been the conduct of federalists and democrats. There it is, that you see the conduct of men, which speak intentions, more forcibly than words—a record, that proves, incontrovertibly proves, that federalists have, by their own actions, always shown themselves friends of the people; whereas, on the same records, democrats have proved themselves, in every instance where any attempt was made to increase the advantages of the poor, to be their enemies. It is therefore only necessary to know democracy, to detect it, as emanating from a spirit of deception, and to be, in reality, a wolf in sheep's clothing. Will it, can it be right then, people of Maryland, for those who have marked the destroying footsteps of democracy, to withdraw from all the further watching of it? Certainly not. Let us, if necessary, withdraw from the field of contest, after the October election; if we do not succeed. But if the day be good, I have but little doubt of federal success; through such an exertion, we may the better mark their conduct, and may possibly have the ear of the people better inclined to us; but let us never calculate on any good resulting from democracy. They have wasted the funds of the state, and they have refused to apply the ways and means to prevent further waste. They have said to the people during the present electioneering campaign, that federalists had squandered the people's