

ment of hostility, as far up the Mississippi and the Missouri as our population extends, it is the commanding point of the Gulf of Mexico. See too, how it lies in the very line of our coastwise traffic, intersected in the very highway between New York and New Orleans. Now, sir, who has estimated, or who can estimate, the effect of a change which should place this island in other hands, subject it to new rules of commercial intercourse, or connect it with objects of a different and still more dangerous nature? Sir, I repeat that I feel no disposition to pursue this topic, on the present occasion. My purpose is only to show its importance, and to beg gentlemen not to prejudice any rights of the country by assenting to propositions which perhaps may be necessary to be reviewed.

And here I differ again with the gentleman from Kentucky. He thinks that, in this, as in other cases, we should wait till the event comes, without any previous declaration of our sentiments upon our own rights or own interests. Sir, such declarations are often the appropriate means of preventing that which, if unprevented, it might be difficult to redress. A great object in holding diplomatic intercourse, is frankly to expose the views and objects of nations, and to prevent, by candid explanation, collision and war. In this case, the gentleman has said that we could not assent to the transfer of Cuba to another European State. Can we so assent? Do gentlemen think we can? If not, then it is entirely proper that this intimation should be frankly and seasonably made. Candor required it; and it would have been injustice, as well as folly, to have been silent, while we might suppose the transaction to be contemplated, and then to complain of it afterwards. If we should have a subsequent right to complain, we have a previous right, equally clear, of protesting; and if the evil be one, which, when it comes, would allow us to apply a remedy, it not only allows us, but it makes it our duty, also, to apply prevention.

But sir, while some gentlemen have maintained that on the subject of a transfer to any of the European powers, the President has said too much, others insist that on that of the Islands being occupied by Mexico or Colombia, he has said and done too little. I presume, sir, for my own part, that the strongest language has been directed to the source of greatest danger. Therefore, that danger was, doubtless, greatest, which was apprehended from a voluntary transfer. The other has been met, as it arose; and, thus far, adequately and sufficiently met. And here, sir, I cannot but say that I never knew a more extraordinary argument than we have heard on the conduct of the Executive on this part of the case. The President is charged with inconsistency; a d, in order to make this out, public despatches are read, which it is said, militate with one another.

Sir, what are the facts? This Government saw fit to invite the Emperor of Russia to use his endeavours to bring Spain to treat of peace with her revolted colonies. Russia was addressed on this occasion as the friend of Spain; and, of course, every argument which was thought might have influence, or ought to have influence, either on Russia or Spain, was suggested in the correspondence. Among other things, the probable loss to Spain, of Cuba and Porto Rico, was urged; and the question was asked, how it was, or it could be expected by Spain, that the United States could interfere, to prevent Mexico and Colombia from taking those Islands from her, since she was their enemy in a public war, and since she pertinaciously and unreasonably, as we think, insists on maintaining the war; and since these Islands offered an obvious object of attack? Was not this, sir, a very proper argument to be urged to Spain? A copy of this despatch it seems, was sent to the Senate, in confidence. It has not been published by the Executive. Now the alleged inconsistency is, that notwithstanding this letter, the President has interfered to dissuade Mexico and Colombia from attacking Cuba. That finding, or thinking that those States meditated such a purpose, this Government has urged them to desist from it. Sir, was ever any thing more unreasonably than this charge? Was it not proper, that, to produce the desired result of peace, our Government should address different motives to the different parties in the war? Was it not its business to set before each party its dangers and its difficulties, in pursuing the war? And if, now, by any thing unexpected, these respective correspondences have become public, are these different views, addressed thus to different parties, and with different objects, to be relied on as proof of inconsistency? It is the strangest accusation ever heard of. No Government, not wholly destitute of common sense, would have acted otherwise. We argued the proper motives to both parties. To Spain we urged the probable loss of Cuba; we showed her the danger of its capture by the new States, and we asked her to inform us on what ground it was that we could interfere to prevent such capture, since she was at war with these States, and they had an unquestionable right to attack her in any of her territories; and especially she was asked how she could expect good offices from us, on the occasion, since she fully understood our opinion to be, that she was persisting in the war without or beyond all reason, and with a sort of desperation. This was the appeal made to the good sense of Spain, through Russia. But soon afterwards, having reason to suspect that Colombia and Mexico were actually preparing to attack Cuba, and knowing that such an event would most seriously affect us, our government remonstrated against such meditated attack, and to the present time it has not been made. In all this, who sees any thing either improper or inconsistent. For myself, I confess the course pursued showed a watilful regard to our own interest, and is wholly free from any imputation, either of impropriety or inconsistency.

There are other subjects, sir, in the President's message, which have been discussed in the debate, but on which I shall not detain the committee. It cannot be denied, that from the commencement of our government, it has been its object to improve and simplify the principles of national intercourse. It may well be thought a fit occasion to urge these improved principles, at a moment when so many new States are coming into existence, untrammelled, of course, with previous and long established connections or habits. Some hopes of benefit, connected with these topics, are suggested in the message. The abolition of private war on the ocean, is also among the subjects of possible consideration. This is not the first time that the subject has been mentioned. The late president took occasion to enforce the considerations which he thought recommended it. For one, I am not prepared to say how far such abolition may be practicable, or how far it ought to be pursued; but there are views belonging to the subject, which have not been in any degree, answered nor considered, in this discussion.

Sir, it is not always the party that has the

power of employing the largest military marine, that enjoys the advantage by authorising privateers in war. It is not enough that there are brave and gallant captors; there must be something to be captured. Suppose, sir, a war between ourselves and any one of the new States of South America were now existing, who would lose the most, by the practice of privateering, in such a war? There would be nothing for us to attack, while the means of attacking us would flow to our enemies from every part of the world—capital, ships, and men, would be abundant in all their ports, and our commerce, spread over every sea, would be the destined prey. So, again, if war should unhappily spring up among those States themselves, might it not be for our interest, as being likely to be much connected by intercourse with all parties, that our commerce should be free from the visitation and search of private armed ships; one of the greatest vexations to neutral commerce in time of war? These, sir, are some of the considerations belonging to this subject. I have mentioned them only to show that they well deserve serious attention.

I have not intended to reply to the many observations which have been submitted to us, on the message of the President to this House, or that to the Senate. Certainly I am of opinion, that some of those observations merited an answer, and they have been answered by others. On two points only, will I make a remark. It has been said and often repeated, that the President, in his message to the Senate, has spoken of his own power in regard to missions, in terms which the Constitution does not warrant. If gentlemen will turn to the message of President Washington, relative to the mission to Lisbon, in the 10th vol. of State Papers, they will see almost the exact form of expression used in this case. The other point on which I would make a remark, is the allegation, that an unfair use has been made in the argument of the message of General Washington's Farewell Address. There would be no need, sir, to comment and criticism of this sort, if they were to be pursued. I only observe, that, as it appears to me, the argument of the message, and its use of the Farewell Address, are not fairly understood. It is not attempted to be inferred from the Farewell Address, that according to the opinion of Washington, we ought now to have alliances with Foreign States. No such thing. The Farewell Address, recommends us, to abstain as much as possible from all sorts of political connexion with the State of Europe, alleging, as the reason for this advice, that Europe has a set of primary interests of her own separate from ours, and with which we have no natural connexion. Now the message argues, and argues truly, that the new South American States, not having a set of interests of their own growing out of the balance of power, family alliances, &c., separate from ours, in the same manner, and to the same degree, as the primary interests of Europe were represented to be, this part of the Farewell Address, aimed at those separated interests expressly, did not apply in this case. But does the message infer from this, the propriety of alliances with these new States? Far from it. It infers no such thing. On the contrary, it disclaims all such purpose.

There is one other point, sir, on which common justice requires a word to be said. It has been alleged that there are material differences, as to the papers sent respectively to the two Houses. All this, as it seems to me, may be easily and satisfactorily explained. In the first place, the instructions of May, 1823, which, it is said, were not sent to the Senate, were instructions on which a treaty had been already negotiated; which treaty had been subsequently ratified by the Senate. It may be presumed, that when the treaty was sent to the Senate, the instructions accompanied it; and if so, they were actually before the Senate; and this accounts for one of the alleged differences. In the next place, the letter to Mr. Middleton in Russia, not sent to the House, but now published by the Senate, is such a paper as possibly the President might not think proper to make public. There is evident reason for such an inference. And, lastly, the correspondence of Mr. Brown, sent here, but not to the Senate, appears, from its date, to have been received after the communication to the Senate. Probably when sent to us, it was also sent, by another message, to that body.

These observations, sir, are tedious and uninteresting. I am glad to be through with them. And here I might terminate my remarks, and relieve the patience, now long and heavily taxed, of the committee. But there is one part of the discussion, on which I must ask to be indulged with a few observations.

Pains, Sir, have been taken by the honorable member from Virginia, to prove that the measure now in contemplation, and, indeed, the whole policy of the Government respecting South America, is the unhappy result of the influence of a gentleman formerly filling the chair of this House. To make out this, he has referred to certain speeches of that gentleman delivered here. He charges him with having become effected at an early day with what he is pleased to call the South American fever; and with having infused its baneful influence into the whole councils of the country.

If Sir, it be true, that that gentleman, prompted by an ardent love of civil liberty, felt, earlier than others, a proper sympathy for the struggling colonies of South America; or that, acting on the maxim, that revolutions do not go backward, he had the sagacity to foresee earlier than others the successful termination of those struggles; if, thus feeling, and thus perceiving, it fell to him to lead the willing or unwilling councils of his country, in her manifestations of kindness to the new Governments; and in her seasonable recognitions of their independence; if it be this, which the honorable member imputes to him; if it be by this course of public conduct that he has identified his name with the cause of South American liberty, he ought to be esteemed one of the most fortunate men of the age. If all this be, as is now represented, he has acquired fame enough. It is enough for any man, thus to have connected himself with the greatest events of the age in which he lives, and to have been foremost in measures which reflect high honor on his country, in the judgment of mankind. Sir, it is always with great reluctance that I am drawn to speak,

in my place here, of individuals, but I could not forbear what I have now said, when I hear, in the House of Representatives, and in this land of free spirits, that it is made matter of imputation and of reproach, to have been first to reach forth the hand of welcome and of succour to new-born nations, struggling to obtain, and to enjoy the blessings of liberty.

We are told that the country is deluded and deceived by cabalistic words. Cabalistic words! If we express an emotion of pleasure at the results of this great action of the spirit of political liberty; if we rejoice at the birth of new Republican nations, and express our joy by the common terms of regard and sympathy; if we feel and signify high gratification that, throughout this whole Continent, men are now likely to be blessed by free and popular institutions; and if, in the uttering of these sentiments, we happen to speak of sister Republics of the great American family of nations, or of the political system and forms of government of this Hemisphere, then indeed, it seems, we deal in senseless jargon or impropriety, or in the judgment and feeling of the community by cabalistic words! Sir, what is meant by this? Is it intended that the People of the United States ought to be totally indifferent to the fortunes of these new neighbors? Is no change, in the lights in which we are to view them, to be wrought, by their having thrown off foreign dominion, established independence, and instituted on our very borders, republican governments, essentially after our own example? Sir, I do not wish to overrate, I do not overrate, the progress of these new States in the great work of establishing a well-secured popular liberty. I know that to be a great attainment, and I know that they are but pupils in the school. But, thank God, they are in the school. They are called to meet difficulties, such as neither we nor our fathers encountered. For these, we ought to make large allowances. What have we ever known like the colonial vassalage of these States? When did we, or our ancestors, feel, like them, the weight of a political despotism that presses men to the earth, or of that religious intolerance which would shut up heaven to all but the bigoted? Sir, we sprung from another stock. We belong to another race. We have known nothing—we have felt nothing of the political despotism of Spain, nor of the heat of her fires of intolerance. No rational man expects that the South can run the same rapid career as the North; or that an insurgent province of Spain is in the same condition as the English colonies, when they first asserted their independence.—There is, doubtless, much more to be done, in the first than in the last case.—But on that account the honor of the attempt is not less; and if all difficulties shall be in time surmounted, it will be greater. The work may be more arduous—it is not less noble, because there may be more of ignorance to enlighten; more of bigotry to subdue; more of prejudice to eradicate. If it be a weakness to feel a strong interest in the success of these great revolutions, I confess myself guilty of that weakness. If it be weak to feel that I am an American, to think that recent events have not only opened new modes of intercourse, but have created also new grounds of regard and sympathy between ourselves and our neighbors; if it be weak to feel that the South, in her present state, is somewhat more emphatically part of America, than when she lay obscure, oppressed, and unknown, under the grinding bondage of a foreign power; if it be weak to rejoice, when, even in any corner of the earth, human beings are able to get up from beneath oppression, to erect themselves, and to enjoy the proper happiness of their intelligent nature; if this be weak, it is a weakness from which I claim no exemption.

A day of solemn retribution now visits the once proud monarchy of Spain. The prediction is fulfilled. The spirit of Montezuma and of the Incas might now well say,—"Art thou, too, fallen, Iberia? Do we see
"The robber and the murderer weak as we?
"Thou' that has wasted earth, and dared despise
"Alike the wrath and mercy of the skies.
"Thy pomp is in the grave; thy glory laid
"Low in the pit thine avarice has made."

Mr. Chairman: I will detain you only with one more reflection on this subject. We cannot be so blind—we cannot so shut up our senses, and smother our faculties, as not to see, that in the progress and the establishment of South American liberty, our own example has been among the most stimulating causes. That great light—a light which can never be hid—the light of our own glorious revolution, has shone on the path of the South American patriots, from the beginning of their course. In their emergencies, they have looked to our experience—in their political institutions, they have followed our models.—In their deliberations they have invoked the presiding spirit of our own liberty. They have looked steadily, in every adversity, to the GREAT SOURCE OF LIGHT. In the hour of bloody conflict, they have remembered the fields which have been consecrated by the blood of our own fathers; and when they have fallen, they have wished only to be remembered, with them, as men who had acted their parts bravely, for the cause of liberty in the Western World.

Sir, I have done. If it be weakness to

feel the sympathy of one's nature excited for such men, in such a cause, I am guilty of that weakness. If it be prudence to meet their proffered civility, not with reciprocal kindness, but with coldness or with insult; I choose still to follow where natural impulse leads, and to give up that false and mistaken prudence, for the voluntary sentiments of my heart.

CONGRESS.

WASHINGTON, MAY 17.

In the Senate, almost the whole day was occupied in the consideration of the bill to graduate the price of Public Lands.—Mr. Benton spoke in favor of the bill, and Mr. Barton against it; and it was, finally, laid on the table.

In the House of Representatives, the Judiciary Bill was indefinitely postponed, by a vote of 99 to 89. The bill for the appointment of a Commissioner of the Revenue was then taken up, on motion of Mr. McLane, of Del. and went through Committee of the Whole, and was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time to-day.

MAY 19.—By a reference to the proceedings yesterday, in the Senate, it will be seen that Mr. Holmes of Maine, introduced a series of resolutions, in relation to the expediency of amending the existing rules of the Senate. These resolutions are obviously aimed at the anomalous course which has been pursued in that body by Mr. Randolph. One of the propositions is an inquiry how far it is consistent with the dignity of the Senate to allow a member to address disrespectful language to any gentleman who may be introduced on the floor by a Senator. Another refers to the practice which Mr. Randolph has introduced of charging Executive officers with impeachable offences. Mr. Randolph, it will be seen, introduced counter resolutions, the object of which was to show that there was no necessity for changing the existing rules and practice of the Senate. In the comments introduced by Mr. Randolph, that gentleman remarked that the proposition relative to indecorum to a stranger introduced by a Senator was probably intended to bear upon some observations he had made in relation to the Editor of the Boston Centinel, who was on the floor at the time when the references to him were made. Mr. Randolph avowed that he had intended to attack that gentleman in order "through him to fix the stigma of reprobation upon the Senator who had introduced him on the floor."—To this attack, so unbecoming in its nature, so inconsistent with the dignity, the rules and the usages of the Senate, Mr. Lloyd (who had introduced Mr. Russell) made a spirited, prompt, and efficient remark, which we shall hereafter notice.—In levelling at Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Randolph aimed at an individual too elevated to be within the range of his shot. Mr. Lloyd, in his general conduct, is too generally sustained by the esteem and confidence of the best portion of society; in his particular course, in the introduction of Mr. Russell, he is too well supported by the rules of the Senate, the practice of the Senators, and, more than all, by the highly respectable character of Mr. Russell himself (who is a Senator of Massachusetts), to be injured in the slightest degree, by a stroke of so reckless, so illegitimate, and so random a satirist as Mr. Randolph. As to the resolutions of Mr. Holmes, they do credit to that gentleman. They evidence that, amidst the too prevalent disposition to submit to all breaches of order and decorum, and to become willing witnesses of the prostration of Senatorial character, there still exists a redeeming spirit in that body, in which the people may confidently rely, for the protection of its own dignity, and the character of the nation.

We have deemed it right to give this brief notice of what occurred on this occasion, in order to guard the public against the studied misrepresentations of this affair, which may be sent abroad, to serve the particular purposes of a particular party. We hope to give a more detailed statement hereafter.

In the House of Representatives yesterday, the bill making appropriations for the public buildings, and the bill which authorizes an additional number of Clerks in the different departments, and raises the salary of others, was passed. One of the features in this bill which appeared most acceptable to the House, was the allowance of one thousand dollars a year in addition to his present salary to the Post Master General. The bill for the preservation and repair of the Cumberland Road was passed, by a vote of 92 to 62. An attempt was made, on this occasion, to revive the discussion, on the constitutional power of Congress to erect toll gates, but it is evident, from the course and decision of the House, that the constitutional question is considered as finally decided. About 4 o'clock, the House took a recess until 6 o'clock, in order to send all bills to the Senate which originated in this House, this being the last day allowed for that purpose, and to receive any original bills from the Senate. Several bills were, in the course of the evening, acted on in committee, engrossed, and passed.

MAY 20.—In the Senate, the greater part of yesterday was devoted to the consideration of the report of the Committee of Conference of the Senate on the sub-

ject of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill making appropriations for carrying into effect the Creek treaty. A resolution was finally adopted to agree to the proposition of the Conference of the House of Representatives. A resolution was offered by Mr. Harrison, and passed by a vote of 26 to 14 to prolong the session of Congress until Thursday next, to enable Congress to dispose of the great mass of pressing business that must otherwise remain unacted on for the want of time.

MAY 22.—In the Senate, on Saturday, the Hon. Nathaniel Macon, of North Carolina, was elected President, pro tem, after seventeen ballottings, he having received a majority of two votes on that ballot. A large number of bills was passed, and both Houses continued in session until five o'clock yesterday morning.

In the House of Representatives, on Saturday, no less than four attempts were made to prolong the session.—When the resolution came from the Senate, fixing the day of adjournment for Thursday, the House refused to accede to it. The report of the Committee of Conference on the subject of the disagreeing vote with the Senate relative to the Creek Appropriation Bill was then taken up, discussed, and agreed to. A motion was then made to reconsider the vote by which the resolution of the Senate respecting the prolongation of the session was rejected, but the House refused to entertain the motion. Various bills were then read a third time, and passed; and on motion of Mr. Cook, a joint resolution, suspending the rule which prohibits the sending of bills to the President for signature on the last day of the session, was adopted, and sent to the Senate, which body refused to concur in the resolution. The House then took a recess from 4 to 6 o'clock.

The evening session commenced with a call of the House, there not being a quorum present at half past 6 o'clock. As soon as a quorum was obtained Mr. Everett introduced a joint resolution to prolong the session until Wednesday, but the House refused to consider it. In the course of the evening Mr. Henry made another attempt, but no question was taken on it. The House acted on the various bills from the Senate, which were about thirty in number; of these about twenty were disposed of, the greater part of them being passed. About midnight, there being no quorum, a call of the House took place, which carried so far as to close the doors; after which, two or three members were brought in in the custody of the Sergeant at Arms, and made their personal apologies. The further proceedings were then dispensed with, and the House continued in session until 4 o'clock yesterday morning. For the last three hours there was no quorum, and the motions for adjournment and for a call of the House were almost unintermitted during that time.

MAY 23.—In the Senate, the morning was principally spent in the consideration of Executive business. The resolution offered by Mr. Benton, to continue the business over till the next session, was rejected. Ayes 13, Noes, 18. At 12 o'clock the Senate adjourned, sine die.

The House of Representatives met yesterday at 10 o'clock, when, a quorum being present, the Bill making appropriation for the public buildings was signed by the Speaker. The House then suspended the 18th rule, by a resolution which was concurred in by the Senate, in order to pass two bills—the one to compensate registers and receivers of the Land Office, for extra services under the act of 1821, and the other to compensate registers and receivers of public money for transporting and depositing the same, both of which bills were passed, enrolled, and approved by the President. Various resolutions were then offered, among which will be found one by Mr. Badger of New-York, on the subject of suspending a final settlement with members of the House for their per diem allowance, until the adjournment shall have taken place, which resolution the House refused to consider.

A bill was reported by Mr. Livingston from the Committee on the Judiciary, for the creation of a new Department, to be a branch of the State Department.

After the usual formalities, the House adjourned at about half past 12 o'clock, until the first Monday in December.

Among the most important of the private bills which were acted on, was that for the relief of Mr. Monroe, late President of the United States. His claim for arrears due to him was about \$15,000. As this was due fifteen or sixteen years ago, the Committee which reported the bill, added the interest to the appropriation. This item of interest was stricken out on motion of Mr. Whittlesy, of Ohio, and the bill, by inserting an additional sum of about \$14,000 nearly equivalent to the interest, making the aggregate amount of appropriation somewhat more than \$29,000. The House insisted on its own bill; and the Senate insisted on the amendment, and asked a conference. The House refused to recede, and granted a conference. The Committee of Conference made a report stating the impracticability of coming to an arrangement. A motion was then made to recede, and the House finally adopted the larger sum as inserted by the Senate.—*Nat'l Journal*