

conduct in Con- republican may be as good a man as our existing mem-  
 a single, solitary ber? If these doctrines are true (and they are the doc-  
*public life*, he has trines of Mr. Seaver's friends) we may as well alter  
*republicans of the* the constitution at once, and make Mr. Seaver a *peer*  
 that commerce, for life. It is of little moment to a republican whether  
 own constituents a man be called "Lord Seaver" and enjoy an heredit-  
 as promoted and ary dignity, or whether he be called plain Mr. Seaver,  
 r prosperity, and still enjoy the same exclusive privileges. For what  
 restrictions down let me again ask, does this argument amount to, short  
 , which was the of this, if when the republicans propose a change of  
 n, which was the one republican for another, they are to be told that  
 Massachusetts, has they are apostates, they are federalists in disguise?

Not contented with thus misrepresenting the views  
 of the friends of peace, they also grossly misrepresent  
 the *facts*. They underrate the *number* of republicans  
 who nominated a Friend to Peace. They state, that  
 all the members of the peace party who nominated Mr.  
 Ruggles were federalists. This is wholly false; not a  
 federalist was present. They state, that we gave un-  
 doubted proofs of our determination to oppose the  
 election of *any republican* candidate. What shameful  
 effrontery and wickedness!! We *oppose* any republi-  
 can candidate when we nominate a decided republi-  
 can!! Is not Mr. Ruggles as decided a republican as  
 Mr. Seaver? He is not, to be sure, a friend *to war*, but  
 he is a friend to peace; and does republicanism mean  
 a *desire for war*? If it does, the County of Norfolk  
 has never been republican; for no County in the State  
 has so uniformly, under all administrations, testified its  
 desire, its ardour, its love for peace.

But it is objected to Mr. Ruggles, that he was *first*  
 nominated in a federal paper. And are the machina-  
 tions and measures of our political opponents thus to  
 deprive us of the man whom we would prefer? How  
 easy in such a case would it be for Mr. Seaver, or any  
 other man, less versed than he is in politicks, to de-  
 stroy a rival by sending a nomination to a federal paper.

All this is done, republicans, with the mean view  
 and intention of exciting your jealousies against Mr.  
 Ruggles. But have you not spirit and sense enough