

the Federalist,
—EXTRA—

WILESBURGH, October 8, 1808.

REPLY

OF THE CORRESPONDING COMMITTEE
APPOINTED TO PROMOTE THE ELEC-
TION OF JAMES ROSS, TO THE DE-
MOCRATIC ADDRESS, SIGN. BY BEN-
JAMIN NEWBURY.

BENJAMIN NEWBURY, Esquire.
SIR,

The Democratic Address has at length appeared, and behold to give weight to the production, it is signed with the name of BENJAMIN NEWBURY!! We acquit you, Sir, of having written that address, although as a literary production it does not rise to mediocrity, yet those who know you, will readily absolve you from either the honor or the disgrace of taking any part in its authorship, you signed your name and fathered the wretched offspring of another. Having done you this justice, we are bewildered in conjecture; we are at a loss to determine whether you are most blamable for your wickedness or your vanity and ignorance. Either you knew and understood what the address contained, or you did not. If you knew and understood the matter, then would the depravity of your mind be the chief subject of detestation—if you did not understand its contents, then we confess we should despise you somewhat less, and pity would be mingled with our contempt.

Assuming the fact, in charity to yourself, that you did not comprehend the contents of the address, we will explain to you so much as, if you have a spark of honesty in your composition, shall suffice your cheek with the blush of shame and contrition. You charge James Ross with being an *Atheist*. It is an awful charge. What proof have you to sustain it? An extract is made from the Constitution, which you assert James Ross voted against, in the convention.

Why did you not tell us where the journal of the convention might be seen, that we might judge for ourselves?

Even if it were true, (and we sincerely believe it false, notwithstanding your assertion) Does it prove Mr. Ross an *Atheist*? You ought, Sir, before you consented to sign that paw of the monkey who put you to bed, to have learnt, that in the old constitution a religious test existed, and that many of the most pious among our citizens wished it abolished, and for this plain reason, it was of no sort of service. The man who did believe, could with perfect safety and clear conscience subscribe to those who disbelieved in a God or a future state of punishment, what would deter them from confessing to any thing, whether they believed it to be true or false, that would promote their interest? A test would be no check upon the infidel, for if he lied, he feared no punishment hereafter, and who in this world could read the sentiments of his heart?

Nor in the convention was it considered as proof of infidelity, to be opposed to a religious test. If James Ross was considered an *Atheist*—if he was considered as having entered that opinion on record—do you believe he would have been twice elected by the Legislature of Pennsylvania, to the Senate of the United States? It is not possible that you can believe so.

Sir, have you not seen the Correspondence of his neighbors, who were his old and a new

date, that vouch for his uniform reverence for Religion. How could you then, have the hardihood to lend your name to stamp on a fellow man the awful charge of *Atheism*?

You profess to be a disciple of a Divine Master, where Sir, in the sacred page, did you find your commission to sit in judgment, and on such testimony to condemn any man? The command of the sacred volume, "Judge not that ye be not judged," and "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," ought to have had more influence with you, than the little pride of presiding in a meeting often, and ten such as were at the meeting over which you had the honor to be chairman.

But Mr. Newbury, if no sense of moral rectitude could deter you, if no apprehension of offending the laws of Heaven could prevent you from giving currency to so detestable a slander—as you are a candidate for the suffrages of the people, we should have supposed that some sense of consistency of character would have staved off from you the infamy into which you affect to go against James Ross is, a man on your side of the United States, he and avowedly an *Atheist*, and your inconsistency.

The next charge is that in the Senate of the United States, you advocated among other things, the Sedition Law, the Naturalization Law, and the Eight per cent Loan, &c. Now Mr. Newbury it has been published long since, and proved to the satisfaction of every candid mind that Mr. Ross had left the Senate before these laws were introduced and did not return until they were passed—that he could not therefore there have supported them. We will not charge you with falsehood, it is a base and detestable vice. The world may draw their own conclusion, and you must bear the infamy.

You charge Mr. Ross with voting for Jay's Treaty.—We do not deny it. But you ascribe effects to that Treaty which you cannot but know it never produced.—Thus speaks the address. "In consequence of the ratification of this Treaty, thousands of our countrymen, the free born sons of America, are now groaning in the most abject slavery." We unhesitatingly deny the assertion. That the British have cruelly and unwarrantably impressed many of our seamen, we admit, but that a single man was impressed or kept in slavery in consequence of that Treaty, all who know the history of the times, can bear witness is untrue. Did you ever read that Treaty, Mr. Newbury? Do you know one single provision of it? Was there a man present at your meeting who ever read one article of it? Why force us to expose you?

That was a Commercial Treaty, and was ratified in 1794, and was limited to 12 years, and expired therefore in 1806.

In 1793 our revenue from commerce amounted to only \$ 4,225,306.

In 1803 the year before it expired that revenue amounted to \$ 12,000,000!

In 1793 the whole tonnage of the United States, amounted to 627,671 tons.

In 1805 our tonnage amounted to 1,400,000 tons!

So you will perceive that under this Treaty, Sir, our commerce, so far from being borne down with oppression, increased with astonishing rapidity. The good sense of the people will judge whether James Ross is censurable for voting for a treaty approved by many of the Democrats themselves, ratified by Washington, and under which our commerce so eminently flourished.

The next objection to Mr. Ross is, that the Federal Administration had an Army

and Mr. Ross sanctioned the measure, his vote. An Army was raised and no necessity existed for it at that time, then exists for it now. The people however, disapproved of the Army, and it was disbanded. But you Benjamin Newbury, Esquire, with your limited news-paper studies, might have known that an Army is now raising by the Administration which you and Mr. Snyder approve.

How mildly do you proceed. "May Heaven in its wrath never give us James Ross", for Governor, says your address.—We respond, "May Heaven preserve us from canting hypocrites."

But James Ross is a lawyer, and the person whom you employed to draft your address has indulged himself in drawing a heinous character of lawyers.—He must have mistaken James Ross and not himself for the picture. The likeness is not a bad one....But really though suchrodomontade might do in the foul columns of the meanest democratic prints, where ignorance, law, and consequent perfect understanding of the law, does not disqualify a man to administer the law. Are not James Sul-

ivan and Daniel D. Tompkins, Democratic Governors of Massachusetts and New York, both lawyers? Were not Jefferson and Mr. Madison lawyers? Was not Gov. McKean whom you supported years ago, and who bountifully made you a Justice, a lawyer? Perhaps you judge that a lawyer would make improper appointments, and adduce the appointment of yourself, in confirmation of the opinion. But to be more serious, we take the liberty to inform you that among the most useful, patriotic, and ardent Whigs in our glorious revolution, many lawyers were conspicuous, and their names will be read with gratitude and rapture by an admiring posterity.

The next thing in order, is the character of Mr. Snyder. Although some things of a very suspicious nature are circulating against him, yet we wish not to injure the public opinion of his private honesty. He may be about home a good man enough. But to endeavor to prove him a man of talents, was an Herculean task. The Poet has said (we would mention his name, but he would be an equal stranger to you).—A Poet has said that,

"Optic's sharp it needs I ween,
To see what ne'er was to be seen."

So Sir, to make people believe that which all know does not exist, will require ingenuity of intellectual power which neither your friends nor your enemies suspect you to possess.

You speak of Laws which Mr. Snyder has penned and advocated. That he supported by his vote every law calculated to oppress the suffering people of Luzerne, is apparent from the journals.—But what law did he ever pen? It will not avail you to say he copied a law, and we defy you to show a single law that he ever drafted! We defy you to show a single sentence that he ever uttered in debate. Where then, during the course of a long public life of which you speak is there to be found one solitary exhibition of talent—one, even the minutest ray of fancy, or a single evidence of wisdom except his *uniform silence*.

You triumphantly ask, "Has it ever been laid to the charge of Mr. Snyder, that he has erred for want of judgment, or through passion or party spirit? Has he not selected the Committees without regard to party?"

We refer you to the journals for an ar-

answer.—In the session of 1806-7, a proposition was made to enquire into the official conduct of the Governor. A committee was appointed by Mr. Snyder as speaker, and who do you suppose were selected?—candid men, not violent in their politics, not personal enemies to the governor, but taken indiscriminately from all parties? No Sir. Michael Leib, who was the most bitter—the most inveterate foe of the governor, who had declared that he would pursue him to his grave, was appointed chairman of that Committee. This would be a sufficient answer. But we can go further and be supported by the journal. Of five who were appointed on that committee, four were the warm party or personal enemies to the Governor. Was there no party spirit in this? And when it is recollected that Snyder had been the rival of Governor McKean, will it not prove that he was actuated by a little unmanly spirit that a noble magnanimity would have scorned to entertain? Where now will you hide your head from the contempt of the people of the country whom you have thus lent your name to defend?

There you will find that the subject of appointing a committee to enquire into the conduct of the Governor who was on a bed of sickness, was all the rules that govern assemblies. You will find that the man who had sworn to persecute to the grave—he grossly violated of order. A majority is requisite to carry every question. The House were equally divided, on suffering the resolution to lie on the table. There not being a majority it was of course lost, but Mr. Snyder declared it should lie on the table!! Now with what face will you declare to the insulted citizens of Luzerne—that you defy any one “to point out a single instance in which he has erred.”

Of the Embargo you most modestly observe “that it has been made use of by knaves and fools as a cant word to bully well meaning men out of all just notions of government.” &c. You speak of those who have assigned this oppressive measure as a reason why different men should be placed in the administration, as having seized on a body that “will precipitate them down the sluggish waters of insignificance, till they are buried in merited infamy and contempt.”—Without remarking upon the elegance and correctness of the figure, “to precipitate down sluggish waters,” we shall observe, that the people who feel the evils of this wicked and oppressive measure, which is fraught with so much injury to ourselves and does no good, will not be deterred from complaining, although they are stigmatized by the gross epithets that you have applied to them. For even your name “Squire Newbury,” is not yet so powerful, as to frighten the people out of the right of complaining.

“This measure of our government, you say when the cause which induced it, are perfectly understood, will appear and must be acknowledged to be a measure of the greatest wisdom, and of the most extensive efficacy.” &c. If Sir, you have in your possession the “cause” which induced the measure, why do you not lay them before the public that the people may see the “great wisdom” of the Embargo.

We propound to you Mr. Newbury two questions. We wish the people would ask them to every person who advocates the Embargo, that if they can be answered, we might know the reply.

1. Why does the embargo, if it is not intended to favor France, prohibit traders

from other nations, to come and take away our produce that is rotting on our hands, when they would pay their cash for it at the time of purchase, and we should incur no risk?

2. Why are our citizens on the lines, forbid to take their produce across to market, when it would sell at a good price and there is no risk?

We defy the advocates of the Embargo to answer satisfactorily these questions.—They come home to the marrow of the matter. The people see and feel that they are unnecessarily oppressed, and they will submit to your imposition no longer than in a constitutional way they can free themselves from their oppressors.

The attack on the Chesapeake—the violation of our rights by the British, and by the French, we unhesitatingly condemn.—Nor do we approve that system of irresolution—timidity and effeminacy on the part of our administration, that has invited these villainous aggressions. Had Washington, or a disciple of Washington presided, we should not have been thus degraded, and thus oppressed.

You conclude by a formal vote of thanks to the gross revolutionaries who know too well the character of the man who is not to be well assured that he will be led to vote for Mr. Newbury’s resolutions, in favor of such men. We must however confess that it was a proper resolution for such a meeting, with such a chairman to adopt.

Having refuted clearly every material part of your address, we now Mr. Newbury declare, that we regret the necessity that has impelled us to treat you thus harshly. Had you not interrupted the “noiseless tenor of your way,” by thus lending your name to this infamous production, you might still have continued in that obscurity, which has so long shielded you from the public contempt.

LORD BUTLER,
EBENEZER BOWMAN,
THOMAS DYER,
CHARLES MINER,
COMMITTEE.

October 8, 1808.

Mr. Miner,
FROM conduct at past Elections, we have a right to suspect at this time, that the moment of Election will, by many be made use of, to gain their points,—that Communications will be forwarded for publication, too late to be answered, before they may have their intended effect—either attacking character, or representing, that the person they may name, has declined standing as a candidate for the Office to which he or they have been nominated.—I am authorized to say, should any such deception be attempted as it respects the election of Colonel HENRI ARNDT, RANCE, and Mr. JOHN P. ARNDT, that it is totally unfounded.

Z. BUTLER.

Wilkesbarre, October 8.

Mrs. MARIE!

Statement of Gen. Wilkins.

The facts relative to the purchase made by Mr. Ross of John Marie, are these.

When Mr. Ross purchased and paid two thousand dollars in hand, and gave his bonds for the remainder, he knew nothing of Marie’s intention of going to France, or of any private agreement (if any there was) between him and his wife—the price he gave was a high one, and more than Marie could get from any other person—after Marie went to France, there was no person to whom Mr. Ross could pay the remainder of the money, none but him a title. Soon

after Marie arrived in France he sent over a power of attorney (the authenticity of which he now and always has acknowledged) by virtue of which power the attorneys of Marie took possession. In this transaction Mr. Ross had no agency nor was he present; it was carried into effect by the attorneys of Marie, two of whom were Mr. Ross’s most violent political opponents.—When Marie returned to this country, and perfected the title, Mr. Ross without hesitation paid the remainder of the purchase money and interest. Mr. Ross having purchased of Marie, who had a right to sell, and having the moment the title was perfected paid the whole purchase money and interest, he certainly had nothing to do with nor could he take any part in the private agreements (if any there were) between Marie and his wife.

In Pittsburgh where the circumstances are well known, the story will not operate in the smallest degree to the prejudice of Mr. Ross; indeed his political opponents there have not attempted to publish or make use of this transaction against him.

The character of Mrs. Marie, in Pittsburgh, and wherever she is known, is so exalted, that no one will give her credit. No reliance is to be placed on any assertion she has or may make on the subject.

JOHN WILKINS, Junr.

I do hereby certify that I lived in Frankford about four months, during the year eighteen hundred and five, in the same house with Mrs. Jane Marie, during which time she behaved in a most drunken, disorderly manner. JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. Duval, comptroller, says in a letter that the \$2,000,000 have not been drawn out of the treasury. We will set this matter right next week.

Duane & Snyder!

Duane published in his *Jurors* on the day that WASHINGTON retired from the Presidency—the following among other unsuitable slanders.

“The name of Washington from this day ceases to give currency to Political Iniquity, and to legalize Corruption.”

It is a FACT—The 441 page of the journal will show it—that SIMON SNYDER did vote for DUANE for the office of Bank Director last winter!!

Ye Whigs of the Revolution!—Ye who fought with our beloved Washington!—Can you give your votes to a man who would use his authority to raise to office the revilers of your old friend and Father?

FEDERALISM has triumphed—gloriously triumphed—in Connecticut.—The majority in the House of Representatives is AN HUNDRED!!

A letter is in town from the south which says Maryland will be right.

Vermont has come forth in her strength, Tichenor is elected.

New-Hampshire and Rhode-Island have set us glorious examples.—To the Polls! To the Polls! Citizens.—All ye who are on Pennsylvania.—Hasten to the election, and ROSS—LIBERTY—and the CONSTITUTION will be ours.