

to this action established by the joint resolution of March 31, 1819.

When this amendment came to the House for concurrence Mr. D. had voted against it. The bill was returned with the non-concurrence of the House in that amendment, which a Committee of Conference was requested; and at ten o'clock at night, while that important bill was still pending, Mr. D. had submitted as one of the committee on the part of the House, and after discussion in the committee, he had at length reluctantly given up his assent to the amendment. He had done so in order to save the bill, which must otherwise have been lost. He felt great reluctance and misgiving at the time he believed he was not doing right, but then he reflected that the loss of so important a bill would have a still greater evil than the restoration of the 20 per cent. on the public printing. Supposing, however, that he was wrong in giving such a vote, and he now admitted that he was wrong, doing so, did that justify the opposition of the gentleman now, when the same exigencies did not exist? A measure intended to effect the same thing even a greater saving than would then have been effected! It had been introduced on the floor of the other House that in all party conflicts, till the visitors belonged to a party. Mr. D. had not understood the honorable gentleman as giving his adhesion to that most infamous and partial sentiment. Until within ten or fifteen years past such a doctrine never had been heard of and who had introduced it—yes, who had introduced it? Not the Whigs. They might justly use the challenge of Michael to Bago's ghost, "Slaughters thy poor looks at me; thou dost not say I did it." Who did? The "Democracy." It was they who had introduced the strenuous motion; and it was they who were responsible for the consequences of its subsequent adoption by both parties. It was this deplorable motion that had proved the fruitful source of wide and ever-spreading corruption.

Yes, it might have been a principle which, reduced to practical action, was calculated to save the very foundations of our civil polity and overrun the Government and Constitution. It was this principle that split up.

Now, (said Mr. D.) what will you do?

Will you still elect the editor of the "Union,"

and give him \$25,000 to \$50,000 profit on a single job? What do these humble practical mechanics tell you?—that they can, even at the rate they offer, make more money by the public printing in a single session than in ten years' hard labor as journeymen. Now, gentleman Democrats, what say you? Will you, before the American people, vote to give the editor of the Union more money in one single session of Congress than ten years' hard earnings of one of the laboring people? Will you? If you do, you may indeed call yourselves Democrats, but be assured the country never will.

One or two cases of the Small Pox have appeared at Hillsborough, in this State, recently. The town authorities have taken every precaution to prevent its spread.

The Charlotte Journal says the Wheat crop in that section looks unusually promising.

Governor Graham has made appointments for the Eastern part of the State, reaching to the 7th day of May. We presume he intends to canvass the State thoroughly. We shall endeavor to keep our readers apprised of the moves on the political board.

Thursday the 16th inst., was fixed upon by the Senate to decide the Oregon controversy. We have not yet learned the result of the vote upon the Resolution.

The Sub-Treasury.—According to a paragraph in the New York Journal of Commerce, a caucus of the dominant party in the Senate has been held in Washington, at which it was resolved to pass the Sub-Treasury Bill as it came from the House.

The N. Y. Express speaking of the money market, says: Stocks continue to decline owing to the alarm created by the passage of the Sub-Treasury.

There is quite a sensitiveness in the money market.

The Journal of Commerce says there is a real panic on account of the Sub-Treasury. Even the Oregon war has lost its terrors in comparison with the monster with iron chest. Stocks have still further declined, and the tendency is quite in favor of further decline.

Bowing's History of Romania.—By the kindness of the publisher, Mr. E. Walker, 114 Fulton street, New York, we have been furnished with the most distinguished Protestant Clergyman in the country, we are not left in uncertainty as to its character.

We did not want a politician for our printer.

Congress wanted a practical mechanic, skilful and trustworthy, who would do the work with accuracy and despatch, and for a reasonable compensation. They did not want a "veteran editor," whether of high or of low degree. They did not want a partisan to stimulate his party venom by paying for bitterness and falsehood.

And then, as to the saving of public money which would result from the adoption of his amendment, Mr. D. had in his mind the offer of practical printers to do the work on terms much lower than those now allowed. [Mr. D. here read a printed proposal from Jelton & Co., offering, if rightly heard, to print the entire bill at a reduction of 20 per cent. below the price now allowed by law.]

Mr. D. here went into a calculation as to the profit that would result to the editor of the Union, should he obtain the printing of the Executive Message only, with the accompanying documents. He cited the number of copies ordered by each House, and went on to show that from the 1st to the 7th of April, giving him the net sum of \$34,000 profit on the printing of a single document—

Applying the offer of these printers to the same work, he calculated the saving on the Message to be \$14,400 to the Treasury—

Now, the gentleman professed democracy; why, he went for an economical administration of the Government. He was for purifying the public press, by divorcing it from Governmental patronage.

Well; and how did he prove it?

Was it by bringing all the way from Richmond to this editor, and letting him, on the first go-off, run his arm into the public Treasury up to the shoulder, in exacting his first job of printing? The gentleman did himself about before this House that such patronage did, in some degree, prostitute the public press, and he wished to avoid so great an evil. How did he show it?

The press was like religion; neither could be preserved pure if once the Government ex-

tended the polluted and polluting mantle of its patronage over it. Both must be left uncorrupted and distinct from all Govern-

ment action, to the spontaneous action of the people.

Mr. D.'s proposition went at least one step towards attaining such a state of things! Why did the gentleman oppose it?

He would offer the gentleman his choice between the systems. If he would vote for this amendment now, Mr. D. would then offer him two practical printers, hard fisted operatives, honest, competent, skillful, and respectable who would do the work for \$20,000 less than his friend.

He challenged him to stand up in his place, with such a proposal openly made in the face of the country, and let a political editor do the same work at a higher price.

Let the people be witness of his choice. He told the gentleman that such profigate and undignified extravagance would wake the nation up; and when once that lion waked, we to him and we to the trust that people had put in his hands.

This was Mr. D.'s principle in the matter; pay the public offices their price, and let us have a little of the spoils principle as possible.

Some intrusion of such a principle was inevitable; but let us cut it off wherever it could be reached.

The purity of the Government demanded this—the interest of the people demanded it.

He put it to the gentleman to say whether this work could not be done cheaper than it would be given to his friend of the Union?

It could; and no man could wish so hard as to shut his eyes to the fact.

The gentleman claimed to be a purist; so did Mr.

highly-damned friend of the Richmond Enquirer.

Had the gentleman forgotten these moments

once possessed by him, wherein

most unchaste of all politicians?

Who was it that said,

"We cannot consent to send

a lung toward the election of such a man as Andrew Jackson?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who declared that it "would decimate his

election as a curse upon our country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would contort the whole

country into one great camp,

and reduce almost every thing under martial law?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who had, once

said, "we can command General Jackson's

admirable services

in the Senate and the

House?"

Andrew Jackson would restore the

printing office

to its former

condition,

and the

people

would

be

as

they

were

before

the

Revolution?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our

country?" The Richmond Enquirer.

Who was it that said,

"Andrew Jackson would be a curse upon our