

BOSTON GAZETTE.....EXTRA.

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1812.

WORCESTER COUNTY.



ESSEX COUNTY.



EXPLANATIONS.

The above representation has been procured to show, so far as can be shown by the instances of two Counties only, in what mode the present ruling party have directed the Commonwealth; not "carved members," we trust that those who have done this deed will receive their well-merited reward—in the sentiments of an injured people.

In the plan of Worcester, the single dotted line describes the former division of the County into Congressional Districts. The double dotted line describes the late division into Senatorial Districts. These two lines correspond, or form one line, for the distance between the North West corner of Shrewsbury, and the North East corner of Leicester; and again between the North West corner of Leicester and the West.

The County of Essex has been divided into Districts, described by the dotted lines, to which the ingenious carvers have been unwilling to assign names. The District, of which the extremes are Salisbury, on the North side of the Merrimack River, and Chelsea (which last was cut off from Suffolk to prevent that District from sending six Senators) may be properly called by the name which children give to a letter in the alphabet, "Crooked S," or one District may be denominated *conceal*, and the other *corner*, as none of them fits into the other, very much as the half of a small egg may be put into half the shell of a larger egg.

For a full display of the character of the bill for districting the Commonwealth, we would refer the reader to the debates in the House of Representatives upon that subject, for the preservation of which, the public is indebted to a gentleman, whose zeal and ability in the cause of order and good government are beyond our power of commendation. So far as relates to the counties of Worcester and Essex, however, it is as a dish fit for the Gods, but "leaven it as a carcass fit for hounds."

In Worcester, the average federal majority of late years has been about 1750; in Essex about 1100, and by the new division it is expected, by the democratic legislators, that Worcester South District will send two senators of their party to the next legislature, and that three of the same description will be returned from the semicircular, crooked S, conceal, or egg-shell district in Essex. If such should be the result, these counties, containing an immense federal majority of more than two thousand eight hundred electors, would exhibit the strange spectacle of being represented by four federalists and five democrats in the first branch of the legislature. But we confide in the spirit, the intelligence, and the virtue of the good people of these districts of defeat this attempt to control the constitutional rights of suffrage.

FROM THE BOSTON WEEKLY MESSENGER,
MARCH 9.

The Senatorial Districts.

By the Constitution of this Commonwealth, the counties were made Districts for the choice of 40 Counsellors and Senators. The General Court are directed once in every 10 years, to apportion these forty between the several Districts, according to the taxes paid by each, with power, when they shall determine it necessary, to alter the said Districts. No alteration in the Districts formed by the old counties has heretofore been determined to be necessary; of course none has been made. The county of Essex, which has heretofore always chosen six, is, by the late valuation, entitled to but five Senators; and the county of Worcester, which has sometimes chosen five, is now entitled to four only. The Legislature, by their late act, apportioning the Counsellors and Senators, have seen fit to divide these two counties, and the county of Hampshire, into two Districts each. We are clearly of opinion, that the division of these counties for forming new Senatorial Districts, was an unnecessary alteration; of course that the law is unconstitutional. For the apportionment on this subject we refer our readers to the legislative debates. But on the supposition, that the alteration of these two districts was a constitutional act, was it expedient and proper? Certainly not, unless some public advantage be derived by the alteration. Men do not perform the most indifferent action without motives—much less do legislators make laws without proposing any benefit from them. But here the act of our legislature, so far from being indif-

ferent, is an illustration of an important constitutional provision, not only without the expectation of any benefit, but with the certainty of disadvantage and inconvenience in changing a long-established usage, in which the inhabitants of a whole county have participated.

Perhaps it will be said, that these districts, if not divided, would be too large. No complaint of remoteness of this kind was ever made by the inhabitants of either of these counties. Besides, they are now each of them less in proportion to the rest of the state, than they were at the time when they were expressly made districts by the constitution. But if it had ever been pretended that these counties are too large for Senatorial Districts, it is certain that the legislature could not have acted upon a belief of that fact; for by the same act by which they made this division, they joined into one district Norfolk and Bristol, which together had the same number of Senators with Worcester, and are nearer each other in the valuation of their property than the two parts of Worcester, as now divided. If we believe that they divided Worcester into two districts because it was too large for one, we must believe that they joined Norfolk and Bristol for the purpose of making a district too large out of five, which, on their principles, were just large enough. If the district which they have made by the junction of two counties, be not too large already Hampshire, which is a third less, is not so large as to create a necessity for dividing it.

But if we admit, that it is not only constitutional, but expedient and even necessary that these counties should be divided, where will every man of plain sense say that the line of division ought to

be drawn? We have exhibited, on our first page, a plan of the counties of Worcester and Essex, with the partition lines as described in the districting bill, that our readers may judge whether the divisions adopted are the most proper which could be made, and that they may have the means of ascertaining the principle which governed the legislature in passing the bill. We are persuaded that there is not a man in the Commonwealth of so wayward a fancy, that he could for a moment imagine so whimsical a partition as that established by law, to be a proper one, unless his mind was influenced by the framers of this act.

The most natural and proper division of the county of Worcester, if a division must be made, would have been the one proposed and urged with great force in both branches of the legislature, and distinguished by the single dotted line on our plan. The reasons in favor of this line are, that it divides the county in almost a circle as the boundaries of towns will permit; that it is already known, and is unknown and arbitrary. And leaves a difference in the valuation of the two districts, of six dollars and sixty-three cents—a sum which represents a capital of about \$65,000 dollars, and is more than one fourth of the sum which gives a right to a Senator. Yet the constitution declares that the General Court, in apportioning the Senators, shall govern themselves by the proportion of public taxes paid by the said districts.

The majority in our legislature would not have divided these constitutional districts, much less would they have separated them into such ill-shaped and inconvenient sections, without strong reasons for so doing the only proper and liberal mode of division. Those who have read the debates upon the subject, will have observed, that no such reasons have been assigned by the advocates of the bill. Yet there is a reason, and one only, which will go the full length, of accounting for this strange division. It is pitiful to believe, that 278 members of one branch of our legislature, and 21 of the other, could so far forget their duty to the community at large, and their solemn oath of office, as with one accord to pass a law for the sole benefit of a political party. We are sensible that such motives have been repeatedly declared by the Speakers of the House, and acknowledged by all parties to be most unprincipled and corrupt. Yet we believe there is not a man in the community, who has taken any pains to examine this subject, and has compared the division of these two counties with the state of parties in the several towns, which constitute the new districts, who is not fully persuaded that the sole object of the Legislature in making such a division as they have made, was to secure the election of three democratic senators in Essex, and two in Worcester; although there is an immense majority of federal voters in each of those counties. If there is a man who doubts on this subject, let him examine the maps of those counties, and if he can assign any other possible motive for the strange partition which they have made, or if he does not find that this is the only partition which could possibly have been devised,

so as to make that object as secure as it is now thought to be, we will admit that our argument is not conclusive. If the dividing line of Worcester was not run for the express purpose of forming a democratic district in the southern part, how happens it, that on following that line in all its windings, sometimes approaching the southern and sometimes the northern extremity of the county, we find uniformly on the north side of it a federal town, and on the south side of it a democratic town? when in any other possible direction this would not have been the case. We say confidently, that this could not have happened by accident; for if it had, the line would have been altered when sufficient reasons were offered for an alteration; especially when the framers of the bill found that furnished so strong presumptive grounds that they had been determined by political motives. The framers of that bill are not even so delicate in sagacity, that they would expose themselves to strong suspicions of corrupt views, without intending to reap the fruit of the suspicious measure.

The crooked district in Essex, which is authorized to send three senators, includes every democratic town in the county, and is computed to contain a majority of about 400 democratic votes. The other district, which is allowed but two senators, contains the majority of more than 1500 federal voters. Now is it possible for any man, knowing these facts, to cast his eye upon the map of that county, and say, that the division were framed without regard to these facts? We hope it to the common sense of every man, acquainted with the motives which usually govern human conduct, to judge.

Selected Text From the *Boston Gazette*'s "Explanations" (on the previous page):

In the plan of Worcester, the *single dotted* line describes the former division of the county into congressional districts. The *double dotted* line describes the late division into Senatorial districts. These two lines correspond, or form one line, for the distance between the northwest corner of Shrewsbury, and the northeast corner of Leicester; and again between the northwest corner of Leicester and the western extremity of Oakham. It will be seen that Leicester is in the North, and Petersham is in the South District for the choice of Senators!!!

The county of Essex has been divided into districts, described by the dotted lines, to which the ingenious carvers have been unwilling to assign names. The District, of which the extremes are Salisbury on the North side of the Merrimack River, and Chelsea (which last was cut off from Suffolk to prevent that District from sending six senators) may properly be called by the name which children give to a letter in the alphabet, "*Crooked S*"

Source Analysis Questions:

1. What is this source?
2. Compare the date of this source to the date of "The Gerrymander" you saw previously.
3. Describe what you see in the source.
4. Summarize what the editors of the *Boston Gazette* telling you about the district lines in the two counties.
 - a. Worcester County –
 - b. Essex County –
5. What else do you wonder about in this source? Do you have any questions about who the editors are, the time period, or the purpose of this source?