General Advertiser

REPUBLICAN STAR AND

VOL. XXII. EASTON, (Md.) TUESDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 5, 1820. NO. 2....1086.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
Every Tuesday Morning,
BY
Thomas Perrin Smith,
PUBLISHER OF THE
LAWS OF THE UNION.

TERMS OF THE REPUBLICAN STAR.

The terms are *Two Dollars* and *Fifty Cents* per Annum, payable half yearly, in advance.—No paper can be discontinued, until the same is paid for.

Advertisements are inserted three weeks for One Dollar, and continued weekly for Twenty-five Cents per square.

Public Sale.

AT Perry Hall, the residence of the late Col. William B. Smyth, will be offered at public sale, on Thursday the fourteenth day of September next, and (if the sale be not completed) on the next day, the Personal Estate of said deceased (Negroes excepted) consisting of Horses and Mules; one hundred and fifty head of Cattle, among which are several yokes of excellent Oxen and good Milch Cows; a large stock of Hogs and Sheep; several Carriages; Farming Utensils; Household and Kitchen Furniture, with many other articles usually attached to such establishments.

The terms will be nine months credit, upon all sums of ten dollars and upwards; the purchaser to give bond or note with approved security—For all sums under ten dollars the cash will be required—No property to be removed until bonded for or paid.

The sale to begin at 9 o'clock and attendance given by

SAMUEL GROOME, Agent for
ISABELLA SMYTH, Adm'x.

Talbot county, aug 29 3w

Sheriff's sale.

BY virtue of two writs of venditioni exponas to me directed, at the suits of George S. Baker, and Keyser & Sheffer use of George S. Baker, against James B. Ringgold, will be sold on Tuesday the 5th day of September next, all the right and title of the said James B. Ringgold in and to the following negroes, viz: one negro man called Merrick, otherwise Merrick Berry, one boy named Conway, the property of the above James B. Ringgold—taken and sold to satisfy the debt, interest and costs of the above writs. Sale to commence at 12 o'clock on the Court House Green.

ALLEN BOWIE, Shff.

aug 15. 4

Land for sale.

IN pursuance of a decree of the Chancellor of Maryland, the subscriber will offer at public sale, on the 19th of September next, at 3 o'clock P. M. at the Eagle Tavern in Chester Town, part of the Real Estate which heretofore belonged to MARY STUART, deceased, consisting of about three hundred and seventy acres.

This Land lies within five or six miles of Chester Town, and has on it a considerable quantity of valuable wood. It will be sold in parcels or together, as may be found most desirable.

Persons who feel disposed to purchase may acquire further information, and see the Land, by application to either of the following gentlemen living near the premises, to wit: Messrs. Fredk. Wilson, Thomas Wilson, Unit Corse or John Turner.

The purchaser will be required to give bond with approved security for the payment of the purchase money, with interest from the day of sale, in three equal instalments of six, twelve and eighteen months.

E. F. CHAMBERS, Trustee.

Chester Town, aug 22 3w

Seasonable Goods.

THE SUBSCRIBER HAS JUST RETURNED FROM PHILADELPHIA,

With a very handsome assortment of seasonable

GOODS

TOGETHER WITH

CHINA, GLASS, QUEENS-WARE,

GROCERIES, &c.

All which he offers very low for cash. His friends and customers are invited to call and view his assortment.

LAMBERT CLAYLAND.

Easton, may 18 w

Federalsburgh Seminary

NOTICE is hereby given, that an examination of the Scholars in the different departments of their studies, respectively, will be held on Wednesday the sixth day of September next; to which the parents and guardians of the pupils, and the friends of this Seminary, are respectfully solicited to attend. A few persons wishing to study the Mathematical, Geographical or Grammatical departments, could be accommodated with a situation in this seminary, where the price of tuition and boarding would be suited to the pressure of the times.—Persons desirous of obtaining a knowledge of the aforenamed departments, are solicited to avail themselves of this opportunity, as we are conscious that Mr. MORGAN RAWLINS is consummately qualified to instruct with facility and accuracy in the various departments of his profession

By the Board.

ECCLESTON BROWN, Secretary.

aug 22 3q

For Rent,

HACKER'S FARM, lying on Wye river, in Talbot county, and occupied at present by Mr. Turner. This Farm contains nearly four hundred thousand corn hills in a shift; has a good dwelling house and excellent farm buildings, and lies in a pleasant and healthy situation. Persons wishing to rent will please apply to the subscriber, and those at a distance will do well to bring vouchers of their punctuality and good conduct as tenants.

WM. GRAYSON,
near Q. Town.

aug. 1 6w

FROM THE BALTIMORE AMERICAN.

NO. III.

From the persevering manner in which the federalists advocated the rights of the illegal voters, in the House, and still continue to defend them in their publications, and from their uniform disregard in all their decisions of the rights and priviledges of the qualified voters, the inference is conclusive, that the great fundamental principle of the constitution and the election laws of the state, that a majority of the qualified voters should in all cases govern, is denounced by them, and not respected, and must yield to their depraved views, either by being silenced by violence, as in the Allegany and other cases, or be controled and defeated by illegal voters, as they contended, and still do contend for in the Calvert case. But the people of Maryland cannot and will not give their countenance to such flagitious doctrine. The republicans have in every instance of contest as well as in the Calvert election, arrayed themselves on the side of the legal expressed majority controling—the federalists, when wicked views are to be attained, on the opposite side—it is with the people to decide who are in the right.

A great outcry has been made against a rule reported by the committee of elections, and adopted by the House, "that the House had the "power and constitutional right to coerce a "witness first proved not to be a qualified and "legal voter, to give evidence of the persons "for whom he voted." This outcry is an evidence, first of the profligacy of those that make it, and again to the tottering state of the cause they design to prop by it. The federalists themselves, in the case of the Delegates of Annapolis acted upon this rule—they issued process to compel the attendance of the soldiers whose votes had been received, and to testify who they voted for, and they did testify at the bar of the house who they voted for. In the contested case from Calvert, in the convention of electors, process was issued to compel attendance of even *qualified* voters to testify before the convention—they did attend under the compulsory process and did testify who they voted for—and the present chief judge of the Court of Appeals was a member of the convention and present. Here then are two instances of the practical constructions of the power of the House in such cases, one furnished by the federalists in the House of Delegates, and the other by a convention of electors—and if the House had the power, it is not of great moment whether they declared it or not—they had in either case, the same authority to exercise it, and we see, it has been exercised in two instances. The doctrine which the federalists contend for, that is, that the illegal voter has rights, and that the House has no power to coerce an illegal voter to give evidence as to the persons for whom he voted, strikes at the very vitals of pure representation secured by the constitution and the laws, by taking away the right of the House to purge the polls by a scrutiny of the legal and illegal voters. By the 9th article of the constitution "the House of Delegates shall "*judge of the elections* and the qualification of Delegates"—and by the 2d article of the constitution, upon the final casting up of the polls, the four persons who shall appear to have the *greatest* number of *legal votes* shall be declared and returned duly elected for the respective County, and the election laws are in conformity with the constitution. Thus we see, that for the purpose of securing the people of Maryland against a misrepresentation, the persons having the greatest number of *legal votes* shall be declared and returned Delegates, and that the House is the sole *judge of the election* of Delegates—None are to be admitted as Delegates in the House but those who have the greatest number of *legal votes*, but the judges in some or all or in one (as in the case of Calvert,) of the election districts receive illegal votes—these are added in the mass of votes given—four of the contending candidates on one side have one or two of a majority of legal votes—two or more illegal votes are given for the other party—the judges of the election return the candidates having the greatest number of legal and illegal votes; their seats are contested upon the ground, that the memorialists have the greatest number of legal votes—the case is carefully examined—the illegal voters ascertained, no proof to be obtained as to the persons for whom they voted—the House have a right agreeably to the federal doctrine, to issue subpoenas to compel their attendance, and when they attend, these illegal voters have sacred and inviolable rights—the House have no power to coerce the illegal voter to declare who he voted for—and better, much better will it be that the fair sense of the greatest number of the legal voters in the county should not be represented on the floor of the House, than that the delicate and sacred rights of the illegal voter should be disturbed or violated. Thus non-residents, minors, &c. not the legal voters of the county, are to be represented in the House, in direct violation of the constitution and the laws. The federalists admit, the House has a right to examine testimony to qualify a voter, but when the voter is qualified the House has no right to coerce the voter to give evidence as to whom he voted for—What! the House the constitutional judges of the elections of Delegates, and have partial powers only which can lead to no final result—and no complete powers by which they can arrive at a just and full result; the rule as I have always understood it to be, is, that where a general power is given, it includes all subordinate & incidental powers necessary to carry the general power into complete & full effect; otherwise how absurd and idle the power given the House to judge of the elections of Delegates, if they are to be stopped half way, and are not invested with the power to coerce evidence as to the disqualification of voters as well as for whom the disqualified voter voted—the one power is nugatory without the other. Farther the power of the judges of the elections to question and examine a voter as to his qualifications even upon oath, if necessary, will not be denied—the House being the constitutional judges of the elections of Delegates, have all the powers of the judges of the election in the counties, and this among the others, to examine the voter as to his qualifications—and strange! after the voter is thus ascertained to be disqualified that the House have no power to examine him touching his vote besides an authenticated copy of the books of the polls, containing the names of the voters, is directed by law to be lodged in the Council Chamber—one of the objects within the meaning of the law, certainly was to furnish facilities to the House in any scrutiny that should take place before it, into legal and illegal voters—in fact, furnishing the names of the voters could apply to no other object—but this requisition of the law is unnecessary and useless, if after the voter whose name is entered upon the book, and ascertained to be disqualified—the House has no power to coerce him to answer touching his vote. The House is furnished from the record of the polls with the name of the voter, it is in proof he was a non-resident, a minor, &c. and as such an illegal voter—it is in proof that he voted—the House is acting as judges of the elections of the Delegates whose seats are contested and bound by the constitution to admit those to seats who have the greatest number of *legal votes*, and *those only*; and with all this preliminary proof—according to federal doctrine, it is to stop the enquiry at this stage—for why? because the rights and privileges of the illegal voter are involved, and rather than intrench upon them, the House must, in violation of the constitution, the law and their bounden duty, admit to seats persons who have *not* the greatest number of legal votes. This is the absurd extent for which the federalists contend—the evils arising out of it, with a view to the constitutional purity and freedom of representation, are so flagrant, and at the same time so easily to be decerned, that an enumeration of them is unnecessary—any man of reflection may see them, and they are only to be looked at, for this mischievous doctrine to be reprobated by all good men. Should this doctrine be sanctioned, which it is humbly presumed it never will be by the people—the noble feature in the constitution, "that the persons having the greatest number of legal votes in the county shall be declared duly elected," is disfigured and annihilated, and the disgusting feature substituted that the legal votes in a county shall be controuled and defeated by the illegal votes—the rights, the lives and the liberties of the people of Maryland by this federal principle are completely transferred into the hands, and subjected to the wills of judges of elections, let them be ever so corrupt. No, the free people of Maryland will scout this new fangled and dangerous doctrine, and must be surprized and astonished at the hardihood of those who advocated it—but there is an old adage, "drowning men will catch at straws."—The rule therefore reported by the committee of elections, against which there is so much federal outcry, is but declaratory of the power vested in the house by the constitution and the laws with a view of forming the House of Delegates of persons having the greatest number of legal votes—it is salutary, as it affects this great national and constitutional object—it is harmless in its exercise, as it subjects no individual to punishment, to infamy or mischief—the stigma attaches to the voter when he has been ascertained to be disqualified, and illegally interfering with the rights and privileges of others, when his character is thus fixed. No disgrace can possibly follow, growing out of the simple act of declaring whom he voted for—but the contrary, as by so doing, he evidences a willingness to make reparation for the injury he has mischievously committed—disgrace may indeed be added to the stigma, when being legally called upon to state the fact, he refuses and persists in refusing—nay, tenfold disgrace, when not only being legally called upon, but having solemnly taken an oath to testify for whom he voted, he afterwards partinaciously refuses, and the man, senator as he may be, who drilled him thus to act, is in the eye of reason and common sense, equally implicated in the disgrace.

'76.

FROM THE BALTIMORE AMERICAN.

NO. I.

The editorial article in the Federal Republican of Tuesday morning, is made up of such gross misrepresentation, that it is strongly suspected it appeared without the knowledge or consent Col. Edes, the editor of the paper. The facts are so opposite to what is there stated as relates to the political parties in Maryland, that none but "a bankrupt in politics" could have ventured at this time before the public with round assertions so easily corrected, and so easily put down. But the writer no doubt presumed contradiction in the columns of the Federal Republican would be indismissible; that his object would be answered, whether the assertions were true or not. To the point.

The writer observes, "at the time of the Declaration of War, and the disorders of the mob, (had this critic any hand in creating that mob?) there existed a complete democratic controul in all the branches of government EXCEPT THE SENATE. There was not a federalist in the Senate of Maryland from the expiration of the Senatorial term that ended September 1801, to the election of the present Senate of Maryland, September 1816. The Senate of Maryland, was not federal "at the time of the Declaration of War," nor at any time during the war, or eighteen months after the war So much for assertion by the "Bankrupt in Politics."

Again, he observes,

"Here certainly it is seen that the democratic growth was so feeble and unsubstantial, that before these two occurrences intervened it had been overpowered by federal strength. It is equally apparent that after a temporary privation of the office of the Governor and House of Delegates—the federalists not only regained these branches but the Senate also, of which they had been longer dispossessed (they had the House of Delegates in 1808, the republicans regained their ascendency in 1809; they had been dispossessed of their Senate in 1801, regained in 1816) since then they have uninterruptedly held all THREE branches during seven years of annual elections of the House and Governor till last winter"—The federalists have had all three branches of the government for the last twenty years but two; the democratic party ten; and for eight years the political complexion of the two Houses was different. At December session 1816 and 1817, the federalists had the excutive and both branches of the legislature—but at no period since 1799, had they the excutive and both branches of the legislature, a period of twenty years. Reader, have pity on the politican, who thinks it necessary for the support of his party, to publish such barefaced misrepresentations, and endeavours to pass them on his readers as facts.

Again—this writer says—"To see it argued as we do, that because generally one more democrat is elected to Congress from the district of Maryland than there are federalists, is a mockery of patience. The forms of those districts were especially contrived by the democrats nearly 20 years ago (1802) to ensure the election of as many of their party as the most ingenious and dissolute political chess could give them." In the election for members of the third Congress (if not the second) this state was laid off into eight election districts, for the purpose of choosing eight members to Congress, and each district to elect one. The Legislature of 1799, long before the rise of parties by the denomination of Federal and Democratic, classed the districts precisely as they are now classed. By the Census of 1800, the State of Maryland became entitled in the eighth Congress to nine members. By the returns of the Marshal, (see Niles's Register,) the only section of the state whose population had increased in any magnitude, was the part of the state composed of the city and county of Baltimore, which formed one district by act of the Legislature of 1793. The Legislature of Maryland at November Session 1802, passed a distinct law dividing the state precisely as it was before, and that the Baltimore district should send two instead of one as heretofore done, making up the additional Representative—and certainly this was a favorite measure with the Federalists—for though both branches of the Legislature were Democratic, in the House of Delegates on this section of the district law, so far as regards members of Congress, every Federal member present voted for the law! Yes, reader this very law that is so much complained off by the writer in the Federal Republican.—From the eighth Congress, Maryland has been entitled to nine members, six of whom have been Republicans—four Federalists—in the latter five Federalists and four Republicans. The writer of this has no expectation that the author of the piece in Tuesday's Federal Republican will consent, as an honest politician would do, and correct his own mistatements, but, as truth is the only object of the writer of this article, he is desirous that it should be promulgated to the extent of the circulation of your useful journal.

A BY-STANDER.

NO. II.

The misrepresentations of the state of parties for the last twenty years, made by a writer in the Federal Republican of Tuesday last, was corrected in the first number of A By-stander, which appears to have given such offence, as induces the same writer to profess or believe not to understand the meaning of A By-stander. He will be more explicit.

The writer alluded to wishes to make an impression on his readers, that the ascendancy of the democrats in Maryland, whenever this ascendancy took place, was more the effect of chance or accident, than of the will of the people. A By-stander points out his error in stating for a period of 20 years back, the democratic party had of that period the three branches of the government for ten years. The federalists (1816 and 1817) two years; and the remaining eight years the political complexion of the two houses were different. With these facts before that writer, without giving himself the trouble to examine into the correctness of this statement, or if he did, he wilfully in this morning's Federal Republican denies a part; at least he expressly declares that the republican party had no majority in the House of Delegates except last year, for the last seven years.—At October election 1818, the political complexion of the House of Delegates was, democratic 45, federal 35, and at the meeting of the legislature on the first Monday in December, James Brown, a democratic delegate of Queen-Ann's was elected speaker, John Brewer of Annapolis, clerk. At the election in October 1819, the political complexion of the House of Delegates was 51 democrats, 29 federalists; and at the meeting of the Legislature on the first Monday in December, Gen. Stansbury, a delegate from Baltimore county, was elected speaker, and John Brewer re-elected clerk. If the writer in the Federal Republican (who no doubt has become a resident of Maryland since these events took place) has any regard for truth, these facts will be stated in the same paper that prevented the facts.

A BY-STANDER.

Baltimore, Aug. 13.

FROM THE BALTIMORE PATRIOT.

LETTER V.

From a Republican in the Country, to a Federalist in Baltimore.

——— COUNTY, AUG. 12, 1820.

My Dear Sir—

In my last I gave you a short sketch of the Allegany Election; and as much has been said about the decision of the House of Delegates at the last session, in the case of the Calvert Election, and as the Republican party have been accused of infringing the rights of the people in their exercise of one of their most important privileges, I shall endeavor to present you with a plain statement of facts, which will speak for themselves; and will also, I think, convince you that the Republicans in the House of Delegates did their duty on that occasion.

It appears from the Votes and Proceedings, that on the third day of the session a memorial was presented from Messrs. Kent and Beckett, claiming their seats as Delegates for Calvert County, and complaining that several *illegal* votes were received by the judges of the Election in favor of the sitting members, Messrs. Blake and Reynolds, over whom Messrs. Kent and Beckett, contended, that they had a majority of legal votes.

The Election in Calvert County had been warmly and closely contested; Messrs. Blake and Reynolds, had each 378 votes, and Messrs. Kent and Beckett, each 377. The judges of the election were (I believe) all Federalists, and a considerable excitement had taken place in Calvert County, on the occasion; and it was alledged generally by the memorialists, that in some of the districts, the Election was conducted with the most "*direct and palpable prejudice*" against them; one instance which they specified, and which was not denied, was allowing one man to vote *twice*;—although, after reflection the judges did not count the second ticket, which had been marked to designate it.

By our system of ballotting at Elections it is a difficult matter to purge the polls of *illegal* votes;—and if we once *concede* that the polls cannot be purged, then our most important Elections may be decided by persons who have no right to vote at all, one single illegal vote may give a Delegate, Governor and Council, a Senator or Representative to Congress; nay, even may elect a President and Vice President of the United States; and any party who have the judges on their side may have every election determined as they please, and this was surely not the intention of our Election Laws—this is surely not the wish of the people of Maryland.

The Committee of Elections in their report, noticed this case very fully, and recommended the adoption of a resolution, which was amended and passed on the 15th December, viz. Resolved, that the house have the power, and the constitutional right to *coerce* a witness, first proved by other testimony, not to be a *qualified* and *legal* voter, to give evidence of the persons, for whom he voted at the said elections. All of the Republican members voted for the resolution, as did Mr. Lecompte, of Dorchester, a leading Federalist, and his colleagues Messrs. Lucas, Griffith, and Jackson, and one or two others of their party.

In deciding this question in the affirmative, what object could the Republicans have had in view but justice and preserving the purity of Elections? It was not power, (as was the case in the Allegany Election) for they had already elected a Governor and Council, and two U. S. Senators, and of course they did not stand in need of additional votes on a joint ballot of both Houses. It could not be popularity;—for meeting such a question in a fair and manly way was likely to render them unpopular—The chances were, that their opponents would make an electioneering handle of the decision, and endeavor to alarm the people, as they have attempted to do with a cry of *violated* rights: nay, they have even descended so low as to make this question, which is one of a most important nature, a matter of mere dollars and cents—and the Republicans were no doubt well aware of the advantages the Federalists would endeavor to make of the Calvert case at the next campaign—but they met the case like men, and like Legislators, who prefered the public good and the cause of justice, to power and popularity.

And here I might ask whose rights have been violated? Has the honest—the legal, the qualified voter—he who is of full age, and resided the short space of one year in the State and six months in the county in which he voted, been even asked to say for whom he did vote? No—He is protected by the Constitution, and by the very law which Republicans made—and I have yet to learn that illegal voters have any rights in this case, which have been, or that can be violated. They were mere intruders—their conduct, had no investigation taken place in the House of Delegates, would have put the people of Calvert County to the expence of a new election. Justice to the people of Calvert, therefore, required that those illegal voters should tell for whom they did vote—and even granting that they had voted ignorantly, and without any evil intention, it was no more than justice for them to have come forward, and made due reparation for their fault, by telling the truth.—They would thus have done themselves honor and the people of Maryland, and of Calvert County, that justice which was due to them.

And as the expenses attending the investigation, I am authorised in saying that they were much increased by the obstinate perverseness of the Federal members in the House of Delegates whose object appeared to be to increase the costs as much as possible, by making long speeches, and by motions for adjournment, and by calling the yeas and nays again and again, on those simple and unimportant motions, so as to lengthen the session. In proof of this, there is personal and record evidence in abundance.

I will pass over the attempt made by the Federal members to make an excessive allowance to the witnesses from Calvert, one item of which was to give them four dollars per day for their attendence, and refer you to the course they pursued when the question was before the House on the 25th January, (Votes and Proceedings, page 76) Mr. Lecompte moved to adjourn; determined in the negative.—A motion was soon after made by Mr. Forrest of Montgomery, that the House adjourn—on this very important question the yeas and nays were called for, and it was determined in the negative, 38 to 29. No sooner were the yeas and nays taken than the same Mr. Forrest again moved that the House adjourn, and the yeas and nays were again called for, and it was again determined in the negative, 39 to 31. Mr. Blackiston, of St. Mary's, then moved to adjourn, which was determined in the negative. On the next day it appears that Mr. Forrest again moved to adjourn for one hour—it was determined in the negative; from this it seems that the Republicans wished to act and the Federalists to procrastinate. Mr. Lecompte made a motion that as it was nearly 6 o'clock, that the House adjourn—it was determined in the negative, and again were the yeas and nays required on this all important motion—and no sooner were they taken than Mr. Stonestreet moved to adjourn, and the yeas and nays were called for.—Some short time after Mr. Jenifer moved to adjourn—it was determined in the negative: and the yeas and nays were again called for—but the Republicans were not to be affected by the manœuvres—they stood to their posts until they had finished what they had intended to do on each day, and then adjourned, and they might have adjourned at an early hour on each day, but for an obstinacy on the part of the Federalists, which was at last overcome by an energetic course of proceedings.

What shall I say here of a proposition, made by Mr. Lecompte, of Dorchester, who had voted that the House had the power and the right to *coerce* an illegal voter to give evidence for whom he voted. "*And it shall be in their discretion*, (the illegal voters) *whether they will give the information or not.*" Mr. Lecompte you know is a lawyer of no mean talents and understanding, and that he should have submitted such a proposition, was really strange, it was passing strange—yet, every Federalist almost in the House voted for it, even his colleagues, Messrs. Lucas and Jackson, who had formerly voted that the House had the right and the power to *coerce* a witness, now voted for this very *discreet* proposition.

I may again advert to the Calvert Election; for let it be fully and fairly examined, and I am sure that the people of Calvert, and the people of Maryland will sustain the decision and approve of the conduct of the Republicans in that occasion.

I am very sincerely yours,

———

Notice.

I FORWARN all persons from breaking the soil of the farm I purchased of John Goldsborough, Esq. trustee of the heirs of William Lowe, deceased; as I am determined to put the law in force against any person or persons so offending. BENJAMIN ROBERTS.

aug 29 3w

Notice.

THOSE persons who put mares to my horse Messenger, last spring, are respectfully requested to pay their respective accounts to Thomas P. Smith, Esquire, of Easton, who is hereby authorised to settle the same for

WM. R. STUART.

Queen-Ann's county, july 25 w

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc3923_scm2842-0152.jpg