

Secondly. The President was authorised to accept of 50,000 volunteers, and to raise 20,000 regulars besides, the whole cost of whom would, if called into service, be twenty eight millions of dollars in one year, which would double the whole national debt in two years, and would be 56 times as great as the whole state debt of this great commonwealth.

But he has not raised, nor could he raise more than 5000 men as a standing army, nor have more than that number of volunteers offered in all the United States. Not one seventh part of the force has been raised.

Why has this happened? Can this also be charged to the federalists? If they *hold the money*, they surely do not hold the men. The republicans constitute three-fourths of all the population of the United States, and yet the republicans will neither enlist or volunteer. Why? Because they dislike the WAR.

Again: the State of Maryland is decidedly republican, the State of North Carolina is decidedly republican; yet these two great States without changing their republican character have come out in unequivocal opposition to the war. I am then authorized in stating, that the republicans are as much or more opposed to the war than the federalists. Shall we then be told, that we cannot adopt opinions on this subject without being charged with apostacy? We are not to be deterred by threats of this sort, until there is a law enforced by military power, making Mr. Seaver's anti-commercial, anti-New-England votes, the standard of every man's opinions.

It is admitted by Mr. Seaver's friend, the author of the pamphlet circulated to cause the re-election of this war gentleman, that there were but two causes of war;

IMPRESSMENTS, AND THE ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

We say nothing about the gross exaggerations in putting down 6000, the whole number impressed for 20 years, when government admitted in the same paper, that all but 900 had been restored. We say nothing about our personal experience of the few *native* seamen who