

The Edenton Gazette,

AND

NORTH CAROLINA ADVERTISER.

EDENTON: Printed by JAMES WILLS, at 25c. per Annum, if paid within the year; if not, 30c. Distant Subscribers must pay in Advance. ADVERTISEMENTS of no more length than breadth inserted the first week for 5c. and 2c. 6d. for each continuance; larger ones in proportion. No Subscriber can discontinue his paper until he has paid up his arrears.

VOL. III.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 1809.

NUM. 153.

From the Augusta Herald.

A more singular instance of the perversion of language can scarcely be found, than has been furnished in this country, in the misapplication and abuse of the terms federalism and republicanism, which, though originally meaning the same thing and resting on the same foundation, have by artful and designing individuals been represented to the community as conveying very different, if not contrary ideas; and no little pains have been taken to render the former a term of reproach, by many of those whose affected prepossession for the latter, was accompanied with unequivocal evidences of their utter ignorance of the principles of a free government. But much as the public mind has been deluded, by the various misrepresentations and abuses of these expressions, there can be little doubt, but that the great body of the people are in principle and at heart federalists, and this in many instances without their even knowing it themselves. Or to express the same thing in different words; the people generally are friends to their country, are advocates of good order, and are firmly attached to the constitution of the United States. The people too, are generally, admirers of the great principles of the American revolution, they hold in just estimation the worthy characters by which it was achieved, and they are earnestly and zealously desirous of transmitting to future generations, the blessings of liberty & independence. In all these respects therefore, the people are federalists, and in all these respects too, they are republicans, for republicanism and federalism, is in fact, one and the same thing, and no person can possibly be a federalist without being a republican—nor can any other republicanism ever exist in any country for any considerable period of time, but such as is in conformity to federal principles; because no other, so happily and effectually guards against the two extremes of tyranny and licentiousness, each of which is destructive of public liberty. There has indeed, in these latter days arisen a spurious species of principle called republicanism, which conforming no more to the true standard of national freedom, than the disgusting decorations of a Hottentot, conforms to the correct taste displayed in the elegant ornaments of genteel life, has been busily employed in deceiving the unsuspecting part of the community, and leading them into the intricate mazes of inconsistency & folly.—It is to this illegitimate baiting that the community are indebted for those various inquisitions which have divided our citizens against themselves, and induced them to make war upon their own principles under different names, that artful and designing individuals might secure their own elevation, by taking advantage of popular credulity, error and unsuspecting honesty—as will be evident by briefly considering the origin of the two great political parties which at present divide our country.

The American revolution it is well known was planned and accomplished by those who were among the great framers of the present constitution. After our revolutionary conflict was over, it was evident the confederated system was insufficient to secure the blessings which had been nobly obtained, and that a new system was absolutely necessary to save the country from bankruptcy and eventual ruin. The federal constitution was the result of this acknowledged necessity—it was devised by the experience and wisdom of the nation—when submitted to the states for acceptance, it had like other wise and excellent systems, its opposers, and among these too were men of weight and influence. The friends and advocates of the constitution were called federalists, and those who opposed the constitution were called by themselves and others anti-federalists, or enemies of the federal constitution—this is the origin of the present political parties, and here is to be found the origin and true meaning of the term federalist, which it is evident is synonymous with friend of the government. In defiance of all opposition the constitution was adopted & President Washington was called by his fellow-citizens to fill the executive department. Without feeling the influence of a party spirit, and indeed being above such littleness of mind, he was in truth the head of the federalists, and the system which he adopted was the one they approved; and we believe no one, who has any regard to his own reputation will doubt the wisdom, his virtue, or the patriotism of President Washington. If his views were correct and his system right, then the federalists are certainly not wrong. He could not indeed, one could an angel from Heaven had he been sent expressly for the purpose) give satisfaction to those restless spirits who had been opposed to the government in its formation, and who consistently enough with themselves continued to oppose it from the com-

mencement of its operation. After President Washington issued his proclamation of neutrality, and thereby saved our country from the destruction meditated against it by the revolutionary leaders in France, the opposition to him and his measures, assumed a more systematical form, and to the original number of anti-federalists were then added, all those who preferred being enrolled under the banners of Genet, to that of a faithful adherence to the laws of their country. Before Mr. Adams came into office, the anti-federalists sensible of the influence, which mere names often have, and knowing the unfavorable impression against them in consequence of their uniform opposition to the constitution and to all the measures of the government, artfully relinquished the epithet by which they had generally been distinguished, and instead of anti-federalists, they began to call themselves republicans. Those who knew the origin of the parties were not deceived by this change of names, they well knew that those, or the leading individuals of those, who were calling themselves republicans, had in fact, been the opposers of the republican constitution of the U. States, opposers of Gen. Washington, and his measures, and zealous advocates for uniting this country to the interest and cause of France. The federalists however, retained their original name—true to their principles, and to the interests of their country, they never thought of resorting to any pitiful subterfuges, to secure the just ascendancy they had acquired—and believing that the good sense of the people would secure them against imposition, they beheld with a mixture of pity and contempt, the blustering pretensions of these zealous republicans, as they were called, and exclusive friends of the people, many of whom it was well known, had not only recently opposed the constitution, but in days of trouble and difficulty had deserted the standard of Washington, and sought protection and safety under the royal banners of his Britannic Majesty. But the efforts of the opposers of Washington were not slackened by being disregarded, and no pains were spared to increase their party, and accomplish their purposes—By incessant professions of love for the people, and by their constantly extolling their own virtues, and uniformly denouncing their opponents, the people began to forget the origin of the party, and to repose confidence in their sincerity. Many new comers also into our country who knew nothing of the principles of the different political parties here, or how they had arisen, finding a declamatory set constantly boasting of their republican excellence, concluded that those declamatory zealots were in fact the veteran heroes of the land, the founders of both the revolution and the government, and they naturally enough attached themselves to the noisy side; and by thus acquiring additional strength, the original enemies of the constitution succeeded in displacing its friends, and those who had uniformly opposed the government were chosen to administer it.—This change of men, however, was evidently brought about by impositions practised upon the public mind. The great object of the people was to promote the interest, the prosperity, the safety, and happiness of their country—this also was the invariable object of the federalists—and events have incontrovertibly evidenced, that this object could only be obtained by pursuing the federal policy.

With the term of federalist, the people were persuaded to fall out, without their even recollecting its import, or from what it originated, but its meaning, as we have briefly traced it, evidences that it was a term which every friend of his country ought most willingly to have applied to himself. A federalist it is clear, is one who is unalterably attached to the federal constitution as formed by the great fathers of our country—as understood and administered by the immortal leader of the American armies—he is one who is a firm friend to good order, and an enemy to every species of oppression—an advocate for equal rights & equal distribution of justice—one who desires to see his country independent in fact as well as in name—who wishes to witness the prosperity of his fellow citizens and to see every individual happy, and who, extending his views beyond the present period, is anxiously, and earnestly solicitous not only to secure to the present generation the blessings of liberty and independence, but to transmit them unimpaired to the latest posterity. As for those who feel no real attachment to the constitution—who approve illegal oppression and violent outrages upon individual rights when countenanced by high authority—who can consider the seizure and transportation of our citizens by military authority as an ordinary occurrence—who will invite the aggressions of one foreign nation by pusillanimity, and make no preparations to repel the injustice of another—who will put the best

interests of their country at hazard upon a mere experiment, and will strip the people of their property under pretence of securing it, and who in fact, consider national independence as a secondary object when put in competition with their private feelings, or individual popularity—these indeed are no federalists—these are not politicians through whom our country can ever be greatly benefited.—But we feel happy in the belief that few of our citizens, few native Americans are at heart of the latter class—and it is our confident hope and belief, that the great body of the community are beginning to awake to their true interests, and they will return to that correct course, which alone will raise our country from its present depressed and degraded situation to its former dignity, greatness and glory.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Friday, December 30.

Debate on the resolution to raise 50,000 Volunteers.

(CONCLUDED.)

Mr. QUINCY. I agree with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Eppes) that the present is a period, in which it becomes members of this legislature to maintain their independence and not to shrink from responsibility. I agree that it is a time in which all men in places of trust should weigh well the principles, by which they are actuated and the ends at which they aim; and that they should mark both so distinctly as that they may be fully understood by the people. But I hope it is not, and that there never will be a time, in which it becomes the duty of any man or set of men on this floor, under pretence of national exigencies, to concur in an infringement of the limits of the constitution. I trust it is not a time, for a member of such a legislature as this, thoughtlessly to strengthen hands which already hold powers inconsistent with civil liberty, our surrender of authority especially entrusted to us by the people, into the exclusive possession of another department of the government.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Eppes) alleges, that the men, whom he calls federalists, have, for party purposes, represented the Embargo as a permanent measure. He disclaims such an idea, both on his own account and on that of a majority of this house. On this head, I am ready to maintain, that the Embargo law, as it was originally passed, was an abuse of the powers vested in this branch of the legislature, and as it has been subsequently enforced by supplementary laws, is a manifest violation of the constitution, and an assumption of powers vested in the states; and that until I have some satisfaction on these points, I am not disposed to pass a law for raising such an additional military force as this bill contemplates.

Concerning the permanency of the Embargo, about which so much wire-drawn ingenuity has been exercised, this I assert, that so far as relates to the powers of this house, the Embargo is permanent.—That control over commerce, which the constitution has vested in us, we have transferred to the executive. Whether the people shall ever enjoy any commerce again, or whether we shall ever have any power in its regulation, depends not upon the will of this house, but upon the will of the President & of twelve members of the Senate. The manner in which the powers vested in this branch of the legislature has been exercised, I hesitate not to declare a flagrant abuse of those powers, and a violation of the most acknowledged safeguards of civil liberty.

Sir, what is the relation in which this house, in the eye of the constitution, stands to the people? Is it not composed of men, emanating from the mass of the community? Are not our interests peculiarly identified with theirs? Is not this the place in which the people have a right naturally to look for the strongest struggle for our constitutional privileges, and the last surrender of them unconditionally to the executive? Is not the power to regulate commerce, one of the most important of all the trusts reposed in us by the people? Yet how have we exercised this most interesting power? Why, sir, we have so exercised it as not only to annihilate commerce, for the present, but so as that we can never, hereafter, have any commerce to regulate, until the President and twelve senators permit. Gentlemen, when pressed upon the constitutional point resulting from the permanent nature of this Embargo, repeat it, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Eppes) did just now, by a broad denial. "It is not permanent," say they, "it was never intended to be permanent." Yet it has every feature of perma-

nency. It is impossible for terms to give it a more unlimited duration. With respect to intentions, the President and Senate have a right to speak upon that subject. They have a power to permit commerce again to be prosecuted, or to continue its prohibition. But what right have we to talk in this manner? I know that we every day amuse ourselves in making some law about commerce. Sir, this is permitted. It is a part of the delusion by which we practice upon the people, and perhaps upon ourselves. While engaged in debate, we feel as if the power to regulate commerce was yet in this house. But put this matter to the test. Pass a law unanimously to-morrow repealing the Embargo. Let two thirds of the Senate concur. Let the President and twelve men determine not to repeal, I ask, is there any power in this house, to prevent them from continuing this Embargo forever? The fact is undeniable. Let the President and twelve men obstinately persist in adherence to this measure, and in spite of the intentions of this house, the people can alone again obtain their commerce by a revolution. It follows from what I have stated, that those may well enough talk about what they intend, who have the power of fulfilling their intentions. But on that subject, it becomes the members of this house to be silent, since that power which we once possessed has, by our own act, departed. So far as this house can ever hereafter enjoy the opportunity of again regulating commerce, it depends not upon the gift it received from the people, but upon the restoration to us of that power, which the people have entrusted to our care, we have without limitation transferred to the executive.

Yes, sir. The people once had a commerce.—Once, this house possessed the power to regulate it. Of all the grants in the constitution, perhaps this was most highly prized by the people. It was truly the apple of their eye. To their concern for it, the constitution almost owes its existence.—They brought this the object of their choice affections, and delivered it to the custody of this house, as a father would deliver the hope of his declining years, with a trembling solicitude to its selected guardians. And how have we conducted in this sacred trust? Why, delivered it over to twelve dry nurses, concerning whose tempers we know nothing; for whose intentions we cannot vouch; and who, for any thing we know, may some of them have an interest in destroying it.

Yes, sir, the people did entrust us with that great power—the regulation of commerce. It was their most precious jewel. Richer than all the mines of Peru and Gollconda. But we have sported with it, as tho' it were common dust. With a thoughtless indifference, in the dead of the night, not under the cover of the cheering pinions of our eagle, but under the mortal shade of the bat's wing, we surrendered this rich deposit. It is gone. And we have nothing else to do, than to beg back, at the foot-stool of the executive, the people's patrimony. Sir, I know the answer which will, and it is the only one which can be given. "There is no fear of an improper use of this power by the President and Senate. There is no danger in trusting this most excellent man." Why, sir, this is the very slave's gibberish. What other reason could the cross-legged Turk, or the cringing Persian give for that implicit confidence they yield to their sovereigns? except that it is impossible they should abuse their power.

The state of things I mention, does not terminate in mere verbal precision, or constructive distinctions. The very continuance of the measure, has, in my opinion, its root in the situation, which results from this, as I deem it, abuse of our constitutional powers. Does any man believe that if the Embargo had been originally limited, that a bill continuing it, could now be passed through all the branches? I know that gentlemen, who originally voted for this Embargo, and will probably for the enforcement of it, have urged the situation of this house, in relation to it, as a reason for farther adherence. "It is a measure of the executive," say they. "Suppose this house should pass a law repealing it. Should he negative, what effect would result but to show distracted councils. In the present situation of our country, nothing is so desirable as unanimity." I know that, substantially, such arguments have been urged.

Mr. J. G. JACKSON wished the gentleman to name the persons to whom he alluded.

Mr. QUINCY said that he did not deem himself bound to state names connected with facts, by which he had acquired the knowledge of particular dispositions in the house. It was enough for him to state them, and leave the nation to judge if there were, under the circumstances, anything improbable or unnatural in them.