

abler republicans than Mr. Seaver, from every part of the union, opposed the war in Congress. In the Senate, there are but seven federalists; and yet, out of 34 members, there was only a majority of six in favour of the war.

Now, if republicans are not allowed to think and agree with *federalists* on this subject, I know no law that prevents them from thinking with other *republicans*.

I do not know why they should not agree with Mr. Pope and M. Bradley, two distinguished *republican senators*, or with Mr. Tallman, a *republican* representative from this State, as well as Mr. Seaver; unless, indeed, it is established law, that constituents are not only bound by the *laws*, but by the *opinions* of their own immediate representative. I think in that case their servitude is not the most honourable, nor the most safe.

Is it understood, fellow republicans, that when we choose a representative we mean to adopt all his opinions, whether right or wrong, beneficial or ruinous? If such be the understanding, we ought to be a little more careful hereafter in our *choice of the man*.

We have said, that the people have expressed a *decided opinion* against the war; we have said they never, on any occasion, expressed so decided an one.

We proceed to the proofs. In the first place, the loan opened by government was not *half filled*; money is most abundant; deprived of their trade on the ocean, the merchants are compelled to keep their money inactive on hand. Why not loan it to government? Because they *disapproved the war*. But we are told this is a *federal scheme*! This is too weak. What! did the federalists prevent the republicans from loaning? or will the republicans countenance the boastings of federalists, by saying, that *the money* is held wholly by federalists?

It is not true; the republicans of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Virginia, and Charleston are richer than the federalists, and yet they would not loan. Why? Because they disapproved of the war.