

THE RALEIGH M

RALEIGH, N. C.—PUBLISHED (WEEKLY) BY LUCAS AND

THREE DOLLARS PER YEAR.

VOL. 16.

FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1811.

Political.

MR. PICKERING'S ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES. NO. XIV.

Fellow Citizens,
In my last number I mentioned the declaration of Mr. John Quincy Adams, while a senator in Congress, that the British orders in council, of Nov. 11, 1807, were not only a cause, but a principal cause, of the embargo. His words are, that they "stand in front of the real causes of the embargo." And again he says, "These orders, and the subsequent retaliating decrees of France and Spain, [Bonaparte's Milan decree of Dec. 17, 1807, and that of Spain, its echo, bearing date the 3d of January following] have furnished the only reasons upon which I have acquiesced in its continuance to this day."—Here I pray it may be observed that Mr. Adams, the advocate for the embargo, has confirmed my statement, that the four papers communicated by Mr. Jefferson, when he recommended the embargo, did not furnish sufficient ground for its adoption by Congress—or rather that they furnished no ground at all. For the British orders in council, and the Milan decree and the corresponding decree of Spain furnished the only reasons for his acquiescence in the continuance of the embargo. Now as Mr. Jefferson's four papers remained in force precisely as when he communicated them, and yet furnished no reason for continuing the embargo, they could have furnished no reason for originally imposing it. For recollect that it was "the great and increasing dangers to our vessels, sea-board and merchandize" shown in those papers on which Mr. Jefferson professed to recommend the embargo. And those dangers, whatever they were, continued the same.

But to return to the British Orders in council, as Mr. Adams has asserted, they stood "in front of the real causes of the embargo," who has witnessed the promptitude and eagerness, with which Mr. Jefferson has always seized every fact and circumstance to awaken and aggravate the public irritations, against Great Britain, will believe that he would have been silent respecting those orders? But, says Mr. Adams, they have not been officially received; and this he offers as a reason why Mr. Jefferson did not mention them. I ask, then, why he communicated the British king's proclamation of Oct. 16, 1807? Had that been officially received?—No. Mr. Jefferson had seen it—in the common newspapers—from which he cut two copies, and sent one to each house of Congress, with his other busy pretences for an embargo. If the mind of Mr. Jefferson was impressed with an idea of the dangerous nature of those orders, though resting only on newspaper report; if the apprehension of them really influenced his mind as Mr. Adams says they influence his, more than all the communicated causes of the embargo: why should he by his silence, withhold their influence from Congress? Was it unlawful or improper that their minds should be influenced by a consideration which powerfully impressed his own? If the orders in council were at all in his contemplation, and really constituted a motive for the embargo, what objection could exist to his informing Congress, that such were the intimations in newspapers, and expressing his opinion that they furnished an additional reason for laying an embargo?—The truth is, those newspaper intimations if they had been seen by the President, were entirely disregarded when he recommended the embargo. His attention was arrested by the communications he had received four days before from France; and his thoughts were busily employed in preparing for the adoption of an embargo—an embargo upon a novel principle—to change a temporary detention of our vessels at home which was the universal understanding of the nature of an embargo, into an unlimited suspension, or interdiction of all foreign commerce! in reality a permanent embargo! a thing never before heard of; but which under the simple name of embargo, contributed to deceive the people into a belief that it was but a temporary measure; and so to induce their acquiescence. Even Mr. Adams admits that to have been the impression on his own mind. In his letter to Mr. Otis he says—"I have indeed been myself of opinion that the embargo must in its nature be a temporary expedient." Yes: and only twenty days, from the passing of the embargo law had elapsed, when Mr. Adams offered a resolution for the appointment of a committee to enquire at what period the embargo might, consistently with the public interest, be removed. "But (says he) my resolution met no encouragement." No: a new convert, and still in his novitiate, he was not let into all the secrets of the cabinet, from whose views nothing was more remote than a simple embargo, a temporary suspension of commerce.—And as in voting for the embargo he reposed himself, with entire confidence, on the recommendation and superior information of the president; so afterwards, when his proposition in the senate for fixing the time at which the embargo should have an end, and similar attempts, in the house

of Representatives, were rejected or passed by with silent contempt, he, with becoming humility, acquiesced; reposing himself now on the superior wisdom of the majorities of the two houses of Congress. Yes: when he saw that the embargo had changed its nature; that what had been enacted under the name of an embargo was not an embargo—but a total, unlimited interdiction of all commerce with foreign nations.—still his candid and elevated mind would not descend to entertain suspicions of sinister views in the executive and his leaders in the two houses; The men who had uniformly opposed all the measures deemed by his own father to be necessary for the safety, honor and interests of our country, as well during Washington's administration as his own; and a series of artifices perseveringly practised, by which the people were deceived, had finally overturned the federal administration of our government; these men, it seems, had exhibited so much wisdom, so much patriotism, and had shewn themselves so unambitious, so pure so disinterested in their opposition, that to suspect them, now, of sinister unfair views, would be improper and dishonourable! Yet Mr. Adams admits "that vigilant observation is at all times and suspicion may occasionally become necessary, upon the conduct of men in power." And of all men suspicion should have attached to those who ascended to power by the steps to which I have so often alluded, and of which he could not have been ignorant.

I presume it has been satisfactorily shown, that the rumoured British orders in council did not enter into Mr. Jefferson's views in recommending the embargo. Perhaps it will also appear that they were not in the contemplation of Mr. Adams when he gave his zealous assent to it; although he says those orders "formed to his understanding a powerful motive for assenting to the embargo!" and in another place, as I have already remarked, that "they stand in front of the real causes for the embargo." Nay, he goes further, and represents all the other causes as amounting to nothing. His words are—"To argue upon the subject of our disputes with Britain, or upon the motives for the embargo, and keep them [the orders in council] out of sight, is like laying your finger over the unit before a series of noughts, and then arithmetically proving that they amount to nothing."—Keeping in mind these various assertions of Mr. Adams, concerning the British orders in council, and their powerful influence on his mind, to induce him to vote for the embargo; I pray every reader to go back with me to view the original scene of passing the embargo bill in the senate. This scene was represented three years ago, in my correspondence with governor Sullivan; who having stated to me, that he had a letter from my colleague, Mr. Adams, "who voted for the embargo, and still considered it a wise measure and a necessary one."—I was constrained, in my own justification, to detail his conduct on that occasion. I thus wrote to the governor: "In my first letter, I informed your excellency of the haste with which the embargo bill was passed in the Senate. I also informed you that "a little more time was repeatedly asked, to obtain further information, and to consider a measure of such moment, of such universal concern; but that these requests were denied;" and I must now add, by no one more zealously than by Mr. Adams, my colleague. Hear his words.—But even your excellency's strong faith in the president's supreme wisdom may pause, while independent men will be shocked at the answer of my colleague to those requests. "The president (said he) "has recommended the measure on his high responsibility: I would not consider—I would not deliberate: I would act. Doubtless the president possesses such further information as will "justify the measure!" On this extraordinary declaration I made the following remarks: "Need I give to your excellency any other proof (though other proofs abound) of blind confidence in our rulers? Need I give further evidence of the dangerous extent of executive influence?"

"When the people of Massachusetts see a man of Mr. Adams's acknowledged abilities and learning advancing such sentiments: when they see a man of his knowledge of the nature of all governments, and of his intimate acquaintance with our own free republican government, and of the rights and duties of the legislature; especially too of their right and duty to consider, to deliberate, and according to their own judgment, independently of executive pleasure to decide on every public measure:—When, I say, the people of Massachusetts see this: will they wonder if a majority in congress should be overwhelmed by the authority of executive recommendation? And had I not reason to be alarmed at the dangerous extent of executive influence, which to me appeared to be leading the public mind, by its blind confidence, to public ruin?"

Such were my reflections in April 1808. The subject now requires some additional observations.

Universal experience, as well as the highest authority, assures us, that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." If as Mr. Adams represents, the rumoured British orders in council were so strongly impressed on his mind as to constitute the most powerful motive for the embargo, is it conceivable—can man believe—that he (as well as the president and every other member of the Senate) could have been absolutely silent concerning them? When the embargo-advocates in the Senate were urged to consent to a little delay for the purpose of obtaining "further information"—how could they, with

Mr. Adams at their impressions, if they were in council? The orders on newspaper reports; yet Mr. Adams them were of all the and impartial examination the embargo act when it not one word was uttered, moreover, that offering the reports in council as grounds for the embargo bill, that he even disclaimed the knowledge of any facts other than those which the president had communicated, and the decision on his recommendations and the further information which Mr. Adams suggested, the president might possess.—The inevitable conclusion from these details is, that the British orders in council were not even in the contemplation of Mr. Adams himself, when he gave his zealous assent to the embargo. And without imputing to him a palpable violation of truth, his contrary assertion may be accounted for, by the subsequent actual appearance of the orders in council, which the administration and its partisans artfully blended with the original pretences for imposing the embargo: and the wrath of Mr. Adams's passions, and his prejudices, resentments and hatred towards Great Britain, led him also to confound them with his original motives for advocating and voting for the embargo.

But I must again recur to the extraordinary declaration of Mr. Adams, of the ground on which he voted for the embargo. "The President (says he) has recommended the measure on his high responsibility; I would not consider—I would not deliberate; I would act. Doubtless the President possesses such further information as will justify the measure."—The French Emperor has a legislative body; but they frame no laws; these are prepared by his ministers, according to his will; and his legislators have the honor of giving their assent to them. In what does this practice of a despot and his slaves differ from the principles or sentiments formally expressed by Mr. Adams in the Senate? It shocked even democracy itself in that body. "However I may vote (said a democratic member) that is too much for me to say." And for my own part I view the sentiment as so abhorrent to the principles of a free government; so derogatory to the character of a member of congress; and so disgraceful to a citizen and a man; that I am incapable of conceiving of any counterbalance in official honors and emoluments. An embassy, a judgeship, the presidency or a throne, to an honourable and independent mind, would in the comparison be "as a drop in the bucket—and the small dust to the balance." Upon the principle advanced by Mr. Adams, what becomes of "the checks and balances" which are the main pillars of his father's "great work" on the American Constitutions? By the constitution of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives were intended as checks on the acts of each other, and both as checks on the acts of the President. The sentiment expressed by Mr. Adams resolves the whole business of legislation into the will of the Executive. I have been simple enough to suppose it to be the duty of every member of a legislative body, in a free government, to deliberate upon the matters recommended by the Executive; to consider whether the measures proposed were supported by sufficient reasons, and were necessary or expedient for the welfare of the state. I still entertain this opinion; and that an implicit reliance on the Executive—a blind adoption of his measures, would be a relinquishment of my independence—a violation of my duty—and a surrender of the rights of the people. But such old notions are now much out of fashion. Whoever would obtain favour with the ruling power must renounce them. "There is no getting along, or being any thing, without popularity"—was a sentiment once expressed. Mr. Adams will not have forgotten it.—And while every thing which Mr. Jefferson did, pleased a majority of the people—the sure way to obtain popularity and executive favour at the same time, was to please the President, and support his measures.

TIMOTHY PICKERING.
June 3, 1811.
* Letter to H. G. Otis, Esq.

NEW HAVEN, June 13.
Interesting.—The committee, appointed to prefer a petition to the president of the U. States, on the subject of the distressing and oppressive operation of the present existing non importation law, have received Mr. Madison's answer.—With the usual avidity, we gratify the publick with the earliest possible publication of the sentiments and expressions of the executive.

TO JAMES MADISON,
President of the United States of America.
The petition of the inhabitants of the town of New Haven in Connecticut, in legal town meeting convened,
Respectfully Sheweth—

That your petitioners are in general either directly engaged in mercantile pursuits or in the occupations connected with them; in those pursuits they have embarked their fortunes, and from them they have not only derived a subsistence for themselves and families, but have furnished employment for great numbers of persons; to the mechanic they have opened a market for the productions of his labour and skill; to the farmer for the products of his fields; and at the same time

of Representatives, were rejected or passed by with silent contempt, he, with becoming humility, acquiesced; reposing himself now on the superior wisdom of the majorities of the two houses of Congress. Yes: when he saw that the embargo had changed its nature; that what had been enacted under the name of an embargo was not an embargo—but a total, unlimited interdiction of all commerce with foreign nations.—still his candid and elevated mind would not descend to entertain suspicions of sinister views in the executive and his leaders in the two houses; The men who had uniformly opposed all the measures deemed by his own father to be necessary for the safety, honor and interests of our country, as well during Washington's administration as his own; and a series of artifices perseveringly practised, by which the people were deceived, had finally overturned the federal administration of our government; these men, it seems, had exhibited so much wisdom, so much patriotism, and had shewn themselves so unambitious, so pure so disinterested in their opposition, that to suspect them, now, of sinister unfair views, would be improper and dishonourable! Yet Mr. Adams admits "that vigilant observation is at all times and suspicion may occasionally become necessary, upon the conduct of men in power." And of all men suspicion should have attached to those who ascended to power by the steps to which I have so often alluded, and of which he could not have been ignorant.

I presume it has been satisfactorily shown, that the rumoured British orders in council did not enter into Mr. Jefferson's views in recommending the embargo. Perhaps it will also appear that they were not in the contemplation of Mr. Adams when he gave his zealous assent to it; although he says those orders "formed to his understanding a powerful motive for assenting to the embargo!" and in another place, as I have already remarked, that "they stand in front of the real causes for the embargo." Nay, he goes further, and represents all the other causes as amounting to nothing. His words are—"To argue upon the subject of our disputes with Britain, or upon the motives for the embargo, and keep them [the orders in council] out of sight, is like laying your finger over the unit before a series of noughts, and then arithmetically proving that they amount to nothing."—Keeping in mind these various assertions of Mr. Adams, concerning the British orders in council, and their powerful influence on his mind, to induce him to vote for the embargo; I pray every reader to go back with me to view the original scene of passing the embargo bill in the senate. This scene was represented three years ago, in my correspondence with governor Sullivan; who having stated to me, that he had a letter from my colleague, Mr. Adams, "who voted for the embargo, and still considered it a wise measure and a necessary one."—I was constrained, in my own justification, to detail his conduct on that occasion. I thus wrote to the governor: "In my first letter, I informed your excellency of the haste with which the embargo bill was passed in the Senate. I also informed you that "a little more time was repeatedly asked, to obtain further information, and to consider a measure of such moment, of such universal concern; but that these requests were denied;" and I must now add, by no one more zealously than by Mr. Adams, my colleague. Hear his words.—But even your excellency's strong faith in the president's supreme wisdom may pause, while independent men will be shocked at the answer of my colleague to those requests. "The president (said he) "has recommended the measure on his high responsibility: I would not consider—I would not deliberate: I would act. Doubtless the president possesses such further information as will "justify the measure!" On this extraordinary declaration I made the following remarks: "Need I give to your excellency any other proof (though other proofs abound) of blind confidence in our rulers? Need I give further evidence of the dangerous extent of executive influence?"

"When the people of Massachusetts see a man of Mr. Adams's acknowledged abilities and learning advancing such sentiments: when they see a man of his knowledge of the nature of all governments, and of his intimate acquaintance with our own free republican government, and of the rights and duties of the legislature; especially too of their right and duty to consider, to deliberate, and according to their own judgment, independently of executive pleasure to decide on every public measure:—When, I say, the people of Massachusetts see this: will they wonder if a majority in congress should be overwhelmed by the authority of executive recommendation? And had I not reason to be alarmed at the dangerous extent of executive influence, which to me appeared to be leading the public mind, by its blind confidence, to public ruin?"

Such were my reflections in April 1808. The subject now requires some additional observations.

Universal experience, as well as the highest authority, assures us, that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." If as Mr. Adams represents, the rumoured British orders in council were so strongly impressed on his mind as to constitute the most powerful motive for the embargo, is it conceivable—can man believe—that he (as well as the president and every other member of the Senate) could have been absolutely silent concerning them? When the embargo-advocates in the Senate were urged to consent to a little delay for the purpose of obtaining "further information"—how could they, with

Mr. Adams at their impressions, if they were in council? The orders on newspaper reports; yet Mr. Adams them were of all the and impartial examination the embargo act when it not one word was uttered, moreover, that offering the reports in council as grounds for the embargo bill, that he even disclaimed the knowledge of any facts other than those which the president had communicated, and the decision on his recommendations and the further information which Mr. Adams suggested, the president might possess.—The inevitable conclusion from these details is, that the British orders in council were not even in the contemplation of Mr. Adams himself, when he gave his zealous assent to the embargo. And without imputing to him a palpable violation of truth, his contrary assertion may be accounted for, by the subsequent actual appearance of the orders in council, which the administration and its partisans artfully blended with the original pretences for imposing the embargo: and the wrath of Mr. Adams's passions, and his prejudices, resentments and hatred towards Great Britain, led him also to confound them with his original motives for advocating and voting for the embargo.

But I must again recur to the extraordinary declaration of Mr. Adams, of the ground on which he voted for the embargo. "The President (says he) has recommended the measure on his high responsibility; I would not consider—I would not deliberate; I would act. Doubtless the President possesses such further information as will justify the measure."—The French Emperor has a legislative body; but they frame no laws; these are prepared by his ministers, according to his will; and his legislators have the honor of giving their assent to them. In what does this practice of a despot and his slaves differ from the principles or sentiments formally expressed by Mr. Adams in the Senate? It shocked even democracy itself in that body. "However I may vote (said a democratic member) that is too much for me to say." And for my own part I view the sentiment as so abhorrent to the principles of a free government; so derogatory to the character of a member of congress; and so disgraceful to a citizen and a man; that I am incapable of conceiving of any counterbalance in official honors and emoluments. An embassy, a judgeship, the presidency or a throne, to an honourable and independent mind, would in the comparison be "as a drop in the bucket—and the small dust to the balance." Upon the principle advanced by Mr. Adams, what becomes of "the checks and balances" which are the main pillars of his father's "great work" on the American Constitutions? By the constitution of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives were intended as checks on the acts of each other, and both as checks on the acts of the President. The sentiment expressed by Mr. Adams resolves the whole business of legislation into the will of the Executive. I have been simple enough to suppose it to be the duty of every member of a legislative body, in a free government, to deliberate upon the matters recommended by the Executive; to consider whether the measures proposed were supported by sufficient reasons, and were necessary or expedient for the welfare of the state. I still entertain this opinion; and that an implicit reliance on the Executive—a blind adoption of his measures, would be a relinquishment of my independence—a violation of my duty—and a surrender of the rights of the people. But such old notions are now much out of fashion. Whoever would obtain favour with the ruling power must renounce them. "There is no getting along, or being any thing, without popularity"—was a sentiment once expressed. Mr. Adams will not have forgotten it.—And while every thing which Mr. Jefferson did, pleased a majority of the people—the sure way to obtain popularity and executive favour at the same time, was to please the President, and support his measures.

TIMOTHY PICKERING.
June 3, 1811.
* Letter to H. G. Otis, Esq.

NEW HAVEN, June 13.
Interesting.—The committee, appointed to prefer a petition to the president of the U. States, on the subject of the distressing and oppressive operation of the present existing non importation law, have received Mr. Madison's answer.—With the usual avidity, we gratify the publick with the earliest possible publication of the sentiments and expressions of the executive.

TO JAMES MADISON,
President of the United States of America.
The petition of the inhabitants of the town of New Haven in Connecticut, in legal town meeting convened,
Respectfully Sheweth—

That your petitioners are in general either directly engaged in mercantile pursuits or in the occupations connected with them; in those pursuits they have embarked their fortunes, and from them they have not only derived a subsistence for themselves and families, but have furnished employment for great numbers of persons; to the mechanic they have opened a market for the productions of his labour and skill; to the farmer for the products of his fields; and at the same time

of Representatives, were rejected or passed by with silent contempt, he, with becoming humility, acquiesced; reposing himself now on the superior wisdom of the majorities of the two houses of Congress. Yes: when he saw that the embargo had changed its nature; that what had been enacted under the name of an embargo was not an embargo—but a total, unlimited interdiction of all commerce with foreign nations.—still his candid and elevated mind would not descend to entertain suspicions of sinister views in the executive and his leaders in the two houses; The men who had uniformly opposed all the measures deemed by his own father to be necessary for the safety, honor and interests of our country, as well during Washington's administration as his own; and a series of artifices perseveringly practised, by which the people were deceived, had finally overturned the federal administration of our government; these men, it seems, had exhibited so much wisdom, so much patriotism, and had shewn themselves so unambitious, so pure so disinterested in their opposition, that to suspect them, now, of sinister unfair views, would be improper and dishonourable! Yet Mr. Adams admits "that vigilant observation is at all times and suspicion may occasionally become necessary, upon the conduct of men in power." And of all men suspicion should have attached to those who ascended to power by the steps to which I have so often alluded, and of which he could not have been ignorant.

I presume it has been satisfactorily shown, that the rumoured British orders in council did not enter into Mr. Jefferson's views in recommending the embargo. Perhaps it will also appear that they were not in the contemplation of Mr. Adams when he gave his zealous assent to it; although he says those orders "formed to his understanding a powerful motive for assenting to the embargo!" and in another place, as I have already remarked, that "they stand in front of the real causes for the embargo." Nay, he goes further, and represents all the other causes as amounting to nothing. His words are—"To argue upon the subject of our disputes with Britain, or upon the motives for the embargo, and keep them [the orders in council] out of sight, is like laying your finger over the unit before a series of noughts, and then arithmetically proving that they amount to nothing."—Keeping in mind these various assertions of Mr. Adams, concerning the British orders in council, and their powerful influence on his mind, to induce him to vote for the embargo; I pray every reader to go back with me to view the original scene of passing the embargo bill in the senate. This scene was represented three years ago, in my correspondence with governor Sullivan; who having stated to me, that he had a letter from my colleague, Mr. Adams, "who voted for the embargo, and still considered it a wise measure and a necessary one."—I was constrained, in my own justification, to detail his conduct on that occasion. I thus wrote to the governor: "In my first letter, I informed your excellency of the haste with which the embargo bill was passed in the Senate. I also informed you that "a little more time was repeatedly asked, to obtain further information, and to consider a measure of such moment, of such universal concern; but that these requests were denied;" and I must now add, by no one more zealously than by Mr. Adams, my colleague. Hear his words.—But even your excellency's strong faith in the president's supreme wisdom may pause, while independent men will be shocked at the answer of my colleague to those requests. "The president (said he) "has recommended the measure on his high responsibility: I would not consider—I would not deliberate: I would act. Doubtless the president possesses such further information as will "justify the measure!" On this extraordinary declaration I made the following remarks: "Need I give to your excellency any other proof (though other proofs abound) of blind confidence in our rulers? Need I give further evidence of the dangerous extent of executive influence?"

"When the people of Massachusetts see a man of Mr. Adams's acknowledged abilities and learning advancing such sentiments: when they see a man of his knowledge of the nature of all governments, and of his intimate acquaintance with our own free republican government, and of the rights and duties of the legislature; especially too of their right and duty to consider, to deliberate, and according to their own judgment, independently of executive pleasure to decide on every public measure:—When, I say, the people of Massachusetts see this: will they wonder if a majority in congress should be overwhelmed by the authority of executive recommendation? And had I not reason to be alarmed at the dangerous extent of executive influence, which to me appeared to be leading the public mind, by its blind confidence, to public ruin?"

Such were my reflections in April 1808. The subject now requires some additional observations.

Universal experience, as well as the highest authority, assures us, that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." If as Mr. Adams represents, the rumoured British orders in council were so strongly impressed on his mind as to constitute the most powerful motive for the embargo, is it conceivable—can man believe—that he (as well as the president and every other member of the Senate) could have been absolutely silent concerning them? When the embargo-advocates in the Senate were urged to consent to a little delay for the purpose of obtaining "further information"—how could they, with

Mr. Adams at their impressions, if they were in council? The orders on newspaper reports; yet Mr. Adams them were of all the and impartial examination the embargo act when it not one word was uttered, moreover, that offering the reports in council as grounds for the embargo bill, that he even disclaimed the knowledge of any facts other than those which the president had communicated, and the decision on his recommendations and the further information which Mr. Adams suggested, the president might possess.—The inevitable conclusion from these details is, that the British orders in council were not even in the contemplation of Mr. Adams himself, when he gave his zealous assent to the embargo. And without imputing to him a palpable violation of truth, his contrary assertion may be accounted for, by the subsequent actual appearance of the orders in council, which the administration and its partisans artfully blended with the original pretences for imposing the embargo: and the wrath of Mr. Adams's passions, and his prejudices, resentments and hatred towards Great Britain, led him also to confound them with his original motives for advocating and voting for the embargo.

But I must again recur to the extraordinary declaration of Mr. Adams, of the ground on which he voted for the embargo. "The President (says he) has recommended the measure on his high responsibility; I would not consider—I would not deliberate; I would act. Doubtless the President possesses such further information as will justify the measure."—The French Emperor has a legislative body; but they frame no laws; these are prepared by his ministers, according to his will; and his legislators have the honor of giving their assent to them. In what does this practice of a despot and his slaves differ from the principles or sentiments formally expressed by Mr. Adams in the Senate? It shocked even democracy itself in that body. "However I may vote (said a democratic member) that is too much for me to say." And for my own part I view the sentiment as so abhorrent to the principles of a free government; so derogatory to the character of a member of congress; and so disgraceful to a citizen and a man; that I am incapable of conceiving of any counterbalance in official honors and emoluments. An embassy, a judgeship, the presidency or a throne, to an honourable and independent mind, would in the comparison be "as a drop in the bucket—and the small dust to the balance." Upon the principle advanced by Mr. Adams, what becomes of "the checks and balances" which are the main pillars of his father's "great work" on the American Constitutions? By the constitution of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives were intended as checks on the acts of each other, and both as checks on the acts of the President. The sentiment expressed by Mr. Adams resolves the whole business of legislation into the will of the Executive. I have been simple enough to suppose it to be the duty of every member of a legislative body, in a free government, to deliberate upon the matters recommended by the Executive; to consider whether the measures proposed were supported by sufficient reasons, and were necessary or expedient for the welfare of the state. I still entertain this opinion; and that an implicit reliance on the Executive—a blind adoption of his measures, would be a relinquishment of my independence—a violation of my duty—and a surrender of the rights of the people. But such old notions are now much out of fashion. Whoever would obtain favour with the ruling power must renounce them. "There is no getting along, or being any thing, without popularity"—was a sentiment once expressed. Mr. Adams will not have forgotten it.—And while every thing which Mr. Jefferson did, pleased a majority of the people—the sure way to obtain popularity and executive favour at the same time, was to please the President, and support his measures.

TIMOTHY PICKERING.
June 3, 1811.
* Letter to H. G. Otis, Esq.

NEW HAVEN, June 13.
Interesting.—The committee, appointed to prefer a petition to the president of the U. States, on the subject of the distressing and oppressive operation of the present existing non importation law, have received Mr. Madison's answer.—With the usual avidity, we gratify the publick with the earliest possible publication of the sentiments and expressions of the executive.

TO JAMES MADISON,
President of the United States of America.
The petition of the inhabitants of the town of New Haven in Connecticut, in legal town meeting convened,
Respectfully Sheweth—

That your petitioners are in general either directly engaged in mercantile pursuits or in the occupations connected with them; in those pursuits they have embarked their fortunes, and from them they have not only derived a subsistence for themselves and families, but have furnished employment for great numbers of persons; to the mechanic they have opened a market for the productions of his labour and skill; to the farmer for the products of his fields; and at the same time

of Representatives, were rejected or passed by with silent contempt, he, with becoming humility, acquiesced; reposing himself now on the superior wisdom of the majorities of the two houses of Congress. Yes: when he saw that the embargo had changed its nature; that what had been enacted under the name of an embargo was not an embargo—but a total, unlimited interdiction of all commerce with foreign nations.—still his candid and elevated mind would not descend to entertain suspicions of sinister views in the executive and his leaders in the two houses; The men who had uniformly opposed all the measures deemed by his own father to be necessary for the safety, honor and interests of our country, as well during Washington's administration as his own; and a series of artifices perseveringly practised, by which the people were deceived, had finally overturned the federal administration of our government; these men, it seems, had exhibited so much wisdom, so much patriotism, and had shewn themselves so unambitious, so pure so disinterested in their opposition, that to suspect them, now, of sinister unfair views, would be improper and dishonourable! Yet Mr. Adams admits "that vigilant observation is at all times and suspicion may occasionally become necessary, upon the conduct of men in power." And of all men suspicion should have attached to those who ascended to power by the steps to which I have so often alluded, and of which he could not have been ignorant.