

Now I ask you, my republican brethren, whether this is not a fair view of this argument against Mr. Ruggles?

And let me appeal to your good sense, whether the merit or demerit of the war ought not to be decided *without any regard* to the opinions of *federalists*, and whether we ought to admit ourselves to be such weather-cocks as to place ourselves, right or wrong, on the most important and vital questions, in opposition to what the federalists may *happen* to think? If we do adopt such conduct, there is an end to argument, and to all hopes of future union or peace in our country.

We do not mean now to enter into the justice or expediency of the war. It is too broad a ground, and the people have decided upon it. They have, we say with confidence, decided *against the war*. To be sure, like citizens, they submit, but they rely upon their national remedies, the elections. These remedies applying as fast as the opportunity presents.

Now, is there a case in a free country in which public opinion was so *clearly* expressed. Shall a few republicans oppose themselves to the whole national opinion, in complaisance to Mr. Seaver? *We will not*.

This is not a party question. It is a national one. It is a vital one. Men *ought not* to be, men *cannot* be, men *never will* be, bound down to little party divisions, when their lives and fortunes, their farms, their wives, and children, are in jeopardy.

This is not the *first* time that a *rash war spirit* has broken up all party distinctions, and *united* all the republicans and reasonable federalists in an universal clamour for peace.

Mr. Seaver's pamphlet in favour of war has made some most unfortunate and imprudent allusions on this point. In order to convict the federalists of inconsistency, he has reminded them of their rash zeal *for war* under President Adams's reign of terror. Be it so. Be it, that the federalists are inconsistent; we agree to it if they please. But how stands the argument as it respects *us republicans*?