

## **Cassius VI, *Massachusetts Gazette*, 14 December 1787**

To the Inhabitants of this State.

In some former publications, I have confined myself chiefly to pointing out the views of the opposers to the plan of federal government; the reason why I did not enter particularly into the merits of the new constitution is, that I conceived if it was candidly read, and properly attended to, that *alone* would be sufficient to recommend it to the acceptance of every rational and thinking mind that was interested in the happiness of the United States of America. Some babblers of the opposition junto have, however, complained that nothing has been said, except in general terms, in favour of the federal constitution; in consequence of this, incompetent as I am to the undertaking, I have been induced to lay the following remarks before the publick.

Sect, first, of the new constitution, says, "All legislative powers HEREIN GRANTED shall be vested in a congress of the United States." I beg the reader to pay particular attention to the words *herein granted*, as perhaps there may be occasion for me to recur to them more than once in the course of my observations.

The second section of the federal constitution says, that the members of the house of representatives shall be chosen every second year, and the electors shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the state legislature. Some have made objections to the time for which the representatives are to be chosen; but it is to be considered, that the convention, in this particular, meant to accommodate the time for which the representatives should stand elected, to the constitutions of the different states. If it had been provided, that the time should have been of shorter duration, would not a citizen of Maryland or South-Carolina had reason to murmur.

The weakness the anti-federalists discover in insinuating that the federal government will have it in their power to establish a despotick government, must be obvious to every one; for the time for which they are elected is so short, as almost to preclude the possibility of their effecting plans for enslaving so vast an empire as the United States of America, even if they were so base as to hope for any thing of the kind. The representatives of the people would also be conscious, that their good conduct alone, would be the only thing which could influence a free people to continue to bestow on them their suffrages: the representatives of the people, would not, moreover, dare to act contrary to the instructions of their constituents; and if any one can suppose that they would, I would ask them, why such clamour is made about a bill of rights, for securing the liberties of the subject? for if the delegates dared to act contrary to their instructions, would they be afraid to encroach upon a bill of rights? If they determined among themselves to use their efforts to effect the establishment of an aristocratical or despotick government, would a bill of rights be any obstacle to their proceedings? If they were guilty of a breach of trust in one instance, they would be so in another.

The second section also says, no person shall be elected a representative who shall

not have been seven years an inhabitant of the United States. This clause effectually confounds all the assertions of the anti-federalists, respecting the representatives not being sufficiently acquainted with the different local interests of their constituents; for a representative, qualified as the constitution directs, must be a greater numbskull than a *Vox Populi* or an *Agrippa*, not to have a knowledge of the different concerns of the Confederation.

The objection that the representation will not be sufficient, is weak in the highest degree. It is supposed, that there are sufficient inhabitants in the state of Massachusetts, to warrant the sending of six delegates, at least, to the new Congress.— To suppose that three gentlemen, of the first characters and abilities, were inadequate to represent the concerns of this state in a just manner, would be absurd in the highest degree, and contradictory to reason and common sense. The weakness of the anti-federalists, in regard to the point just mentioned, sufficiently shews their delinquency with respect to rational argument. They have done nothing more than barely to assert, that the representation would not be sufficient: it is a true saying, that assertions are often the very reverse of facts. . . .

Cite as: *The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution Digital Edition*, ed. John P. Kaminski, Gaspare J. Saladino, Richard Leffler, Charles H. Schoenleber and Margaret A. Hogan. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009. Original source: Ratification by the States, Volume IV: Massachusetts, No. 1