

# The Star, and North-Carolina Gazette

No. 18. RALPH, (N. C.) FRIDAY, APRIL 30, 1824.

THE STAR, and North-Carolina Gazette, Published weekly, by BELL & LAWRENCE.

Subscription, three dollars per annum—No paper sent without advertisement, but in the case of the Editors, unless otherwise directed. Advertisements, not exceeding four lines, inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-two cents for each continuance—All letters to the Editors must be post paid.

From the Western Carolinian. Mr. LONG, and the GRAND JURY. Some of the members of Congress who embarked on the "forlorn hope," on the night of the 14th of February, are extremely anxious to justify their conduct to their constituents. They are not content with sending the caucus proclamation to every third man in their respective districts, but must write long letters to the Grand Juries of the several counties, by way of procuring recommendations in favor of Mr. Crawford. We regret to find that Mr. Long, the representative from this district, is playing the same game. He has made a most vigorous effort at the Grand Jury of Rowan. The members of that Jury, however, were not only plain, honest farmers, but were intelligent, independent men. They read his letter with attention; and, in a spirit of becoming courtesy, unanimously returned him an answer, which is marked with good sense and candor—a copy of which we have obtained for publication; & which, with Mr. Long's letter, will be found below.

Mr. Long, in the course of his epistle to the Grand Jury, has condescended to notice us, and our labors. Were we so disposed, we could retort on the gentleman in a manner that might occasion more uneasiness than even the effusions of "A voter;" but we have no wish either to perplex Mr. Long, or to bring him into notice by too great an attention of this kind; it might draw him from his "course in Congress," that he speaks of. We will, however, remark, that if all persons be to be the last to accuse others of "giving only one side of the question." What has his course been? Others may esteem his actions as their judgments dictate; but we have not been so fortunate as to hear of his doing much else than going into the little minority caucus—filling the mails with the caucus address—franking hundreds of the "Washington City Gazette;" and sending out his own epistles, in favor of the caucus nomination. "Cast the beam out of thine own eye"—and then, sir, your optics will be in a fitter condition to discover the mote in mine.

The columns of our paper have always been open to decent and respectable communications, in favor of either of the candidates; communications in favor of Gen. Jackson, Mr. Calhoun, and Mr. Adams, have appeared in our paper—and one or two pieces, written by Mr. Crawford's friends, were sent us, and published; that more have not appeared for Mr. Crawford, only proves that he has but few friends in this section of the Union, who can write for a newspaper—we have refused no communication in favor of Mr. Crawford.

It seems the caucus advocates feel a spirit of proscription towards all who dare differ from them. They are not content with going into caucus to dictate to the nation, but they wish individually to dictate to their districts. It is in this spirit, that Mr. Long affects to be amazed, that *EVEN* in his district there should be some who are so pertacious as to think for themselves, and oppose the caucus candidate. There are hundreds of men in this district, as well informed as Mr. Long; and they would act unworthily the character of freemen, were they to surrender their own opinions, either to the caucus or any one of the caucus-makers.

WASHINGTON CITY, MARCH 29, 1824. To the Grand Jurors of Rowan Superior Court, Spring Term, 1824. It is gratifying to find that the flourishing state of our fiscal concerns is full equal to the most sanguine calculations, as may be seen by the President's Message, as well as the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, (Mr. Crawford). From both of which, it appears that on the first of January last, there was a surplus of near nine million of dollars in the Treasury. So much for radicalism, if you please, for its no matter what we are called, so that we can have a full Treasury, keep up all our valuable institutions, gradually increase our Navy, pay our public debt as fast as it becomes due, and all, without directly taxing the people one cent. I say I am willing to bear the epithet of Radical, or any thing else, (which by the by does not belong to me) that my enemies please to heap upon me, provided I can, as I confidently shall, prove to the satisfaction of my constituents, that my political course is consistent with their interest and welfare of the nation. We could only be permitted to move on in the present course, it is evident we should, in a few years, be free from our public debt, and consequently be prepared for enterprise, and to surmount any difficulty that might occur. But in this I fear we are about to be arrested by vain and idle speculations, which appears from several propositions now before Congress. One to send an agent to inquire into the true situation of the Greeks, another to protect South America, under all circumstances. These, in my opinion, seem like travelling out of our way to meddle with the business of others. I think we are already doing enough for the world; we maintain the independence of our own country; we invite others to come and live with us, where their lives, liberty and property will be protected; but we ought not to set ourselves up as the champions of the world, to fight the battles of others, and thereby endanger our own peace and harmony. Those two propositions are, however, laid on the table at present, where I hope they will remain. We have two other measures before Congress, not less important, and perhaps more ruinous in their nature, (particularly as regards a section of country) if adopted, as is believed they will be. They are strongly advocated by all the Presidential candidates, except Crawford; I mean the gen'l. system of Internal Improvements, and the tariff, as now proposed, both of which are not only inexpedient, but would be unequal in their operation, and consequently unjust; besides, would bear particularly hard on N. C. The first of those measures would be attended with an enormous expense; the second deprives us of the revenue now derived from imported goods; so that between the two we should, instead of getting out of debt (as we may on the present system,) I fear it would not be long before we should have to pay a direct tax to meet the ordinary expenses of gen'l. gov't.

There is considerable speculation here about the next President: no certain calculation can yet be made; but I believe there is but little doubt that it will be either Crawford or Adams; but considerable fears are entertained that the election will not be made by the people, but will go to the house of representatives; that is evidently the wish of many, seeing that their favorite candidate stands no chance before the people; yet they are very clamorous about the people's ticket, in so many places. But I hope the people will take up the subject, and decide for themselves. I think it does not require a great deal of sagacity to discover who it is that wishes the people to have the electing of the President, and who it is that wishes the election to go to Congress—where one man from some of the states, would have more weight than in that important election than thirty from other parts of the union. Does this seem like equality? does it seem like consulting the people? is it what the people wish?

I imagine not. Calhoun is no longer a candidate; he has struck his flag (as it is said and believed) to Gen. Jackson, on condition Jackson's friends would support him to the Vice Presidency; and I understand is endeavoring to transfer his friends throughout the union accordingly. That Mr. Calhoun is taking any ostensible part in this, I do not say; but that it meets his approbation, there is no doubt with me. I hope the people of North Carolina will not submit to be bargained away at the will of a few aspiring partisans. There is no person more willing and ready to acknowledge the worth and services of Gen. Jackson, in his country's cause, than I am; but when it comes to making a President, I beg leave to pause; and insist upon having a moral man, at least, to preside over the destinies of this nation. I am sorry to believe that there are some persons even in my district, that are so much opposed to Mr. Crawford, that they would support almost any man in opposition to him; for I do conscientiously believe that it is the true interest of us, the southern people, to have Crawford for our next President. He is not only capable, but his views and policy are consistent with our interest. Besides, he is opposed to all those vain speculations that are calculated to involve and impoverish the nation. Some of Crawford's friends met and declared their preference for him; if the friends of the other candidates had done likewise, it would have put an end to many contradictory reports and statements in newspapers, respecting the number of the friends of the different candidates; the reason they have not done so, is very evident; for notwithstanding the small number that met in caucus, it is no less certain that neither of the other candidates could have mustered half the number. We that did meet, have expressed a decided preference for Crawford. Our opinions are publicly known to the world; the people are at liberty to acquiesce with us, but certainly not bound to do so.

The Western Carolinian, I am informed, says a great many things against the caucus, but has omitted giving the proceedings of that meeting in detail as they were. I am sorry, inasmuch as the subject is so frequently noticed in that paper, that the readers have not a full and correct statement, to enable them to take an impartial view of the proceedings and object. But it is to be regretted that it is too common for newspapers to give only ONE SIDE of the question; consequently, instead of bringing what they should be, (the source of information,) they frequently only serve to confuse and mislead the unsuspecting, by misrepresentation. I would therefore advise all candid men to reason with themselves, and look to facts. My object is to have myself and others understood, and leave the people to decide, as I know they are capable of doing, correctly.

With all due deference for your wise discretion, I remain your humble servant,  
JOHN LONG, Jr.  
To the Hon. John Long, Jr.  
SIR: The Grand Jury of Rowan have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th March, accompanied by several newspapers, and the Address of the Washington Caucus.

With you, we feel gratified by the flourishing condition of the Treasury; but we are not yet convinced that it is the fruit either of the wisdom of the present Secretary of that department, or of his particular adherents in politics. We have always viewed our admirable system of revenue, as the offspring of the genius of Hamilton, reared and nurtured by the constant care of Congress. Yet admirable as it is, we do not think it perfect; on the contrary, so far from anticipating, with horror, the overwhelming distresses which some have predicted would succeed a revision of the Tariff, we are of opinion that a judicious revision thereof would not only tend to alleviate the present pecuniary distresses of the people, but that it would enhance the revenue of government, and strengthen the fabric of national independence. In this, we have the coincidence of your own favorite Secretary's opinion, which we cannot express better than by quoting his own words. Towards the close of his last annual report, after detailing the situation of Treasury, he says "If it be deemed advisable to give increased extension or activity to the navy, or to aid in objects of internal improvement, it is believed that such additional means as may be required, may be obtained by a judicious revision of the Tariff." Such a measure was recommended in the last annual report, with a view both to the increase of the revenue, and the simplification of its collection; and further reflection and experience have tended to strengthen the opinion then entertained, that its operation, without being onerous to the community, would be advantageous to the revenue, salutary to the commerce, and beneficial to the manufactures of the country."

As to the scheme of internal improvement, which you say is opposed by Mr. Crawford, and advocated by all the other Presidential candidates, but one question suggests itself to our understanding: Is it constitutionally in the power of the general government to appropriate the public money to such purposes? If this be decided in the affirmative, there appears to us no rational doubt as to the expediency of such a measure; and here, too, we are supported by the authority of Mr. Crawford, as already cited; for if the communication between different parts of the country, for the purpose of commerce, &c. in times of peace, and for the transportation of men and munitions in time of war, can be effected without imposing burdens upon the people, the policy and wisdom of our government would certainly be demonstrated by patronizing such improvements, the constitutional doubt being removed.

As regards the Greeks, who are struggling in the sacred cause of liberty, and the Republicans of South America, who are threatened with re-subjection to the impious tyranny of a Spanish despot, we cordially approve the policy recommended in the dignified and energetic message of our venerable President, to the present Congress.

The last, though not least, interesting fact of your letter, only remains to be noticed, respecting the Presidential candidates. It constitutes no part of the duty of this jury, to make either a new nomination of candidates, or to publish an approval or censure of the Washington caucus nomination. We are willing that our fellow-citizens should equally participate in all matters of this nature, and we have no doubt but that the "still small voice" of the people of North Carolina will, in due season, be heard. As to General Jackson and Mr. Calhoun, we feel that the nation is largely indebted to them for their illustrious services in their country's cause; and we believe them to be infinitely above any attempt to baffle for the suffrages of the people; and should any efforts of this kind be made in N. Carolina, from whatever source, we trust it will be met by the same indignant spirit of contempt which was lately manifested in Pennsylvania on a similar occasion.

With you, we deprecate the practice of hoodwinking the people, whether through the medium of newspapers or letters, by exhibiting a partial picture of men and measures. "It is much to be regretted, too, that it is too common for members of Congress to give only one side of the question; consequently, instead of being what they should be, (the source of information,) they frequently only serve to mislead the unsuspecting, by misrepresentation."

We are, sir, respectfully, yours,  
JOHN BEARD, jr. Foreman.  
David Stewart,  
Henry S. Parker,  
Win. Phillips,  
Jeremiah Welman,  
Moses Brown,  
B. Gillespie,  
John P. Hodgens.

the House of Representatives, and he hoped it would not be postponed. It is time enough to postpone them, when we find that we cannot make one that is fit to be adopted. We shall, then, have done our duty to our constituents, as faithful men. But, now, we are about to postpone them, at the very threshold. If there ever was a time when the subject could be met gravely, it is the present. What was the condition of the country, at the time of the difficulty in the election of Jefferson and Burr? Great anxiety was spread from one end of the country to the other. The House of Representatives was young thirty times, without coming to a decision—the most serious alarm pervaded the country. And yet, with this knowledge before us, we are not willing to make provision against similar occurrences. There was a charge of foreign partiality, on each side of the great parties existing at that time. One was accused of fondness for the British, the other, for the French. There is no disposition of that kind now. We have peace, and we have plenty to eat, and thank Heaven the Tariff Bill has not yet passed. Some think that the amendment will produce a consolidation of the government, and that the State lines will be lost. But almost all the States have agreed to it—almost all of them have called for the districting system. Mr. M. said, he did not believe that it would destroy the Constitution. He had heard so much, and so often, of the destruction of the Constitution, that he had almost become an infidel, in respect to it. We have stood a sedition law, and an alien law, and there is not much danger but we may get along with any thing else. We have had these amendments regularly brought before us; and now, all at once, because allusions have been made to another subject, we cannot look at the amendment—we have got into a passion, and we must give them up. Nearly all the states have approved the districting system—and how is it to destroy the Constitution? The liberty of this nation does not, nor does that of any other, depend upon paper. It must have a foundation in the hearts of the people. Let a man depend upon himself, and he is free. If he is dependent on another, black or white, he will not be free. Freedom rests upon our dependence or independence. The people had, at first, a great dread of the President and Senate; but that fear has passed away.

We have, now, more candidates for the Presidency than we ever had before. How are my people to know these men? Why, when I go home, they will ask me whom I think to be the best man; or rather, who will tax them the least? which is the same thing. And, I presume, the same questions are put to other members. I am glad my colleague called for the yeas and nays, on this question, for I hope the subject will not be postponed. In regard to caucuses, I have no confessions to make.—I have gone into caucus as honestly as I go to church. I don't care how many caucuses or how few there are. I care nothing about them. Once, however, about twenty years past, I was taken in by a caucus, and said I would not attend another. I had intended to have given a history of some, on different sides; but it is decided not to be order.

How the choice of Electors, by districts, could possibly prevent an election of President, as has been said, by the gentleman from South Carolina, I cannot possibly perceive. The number of votes given by the districts, would be equal to that now given. I do not understand how it can prevent an election. Every generation has its own notion in politics, as well as in religion. Religions and political ideas are constantly changing. The Book of Judges gives a description of these changes, where it speaks of the departure of the people, after the death of Joshua. So we forget the principles which produced the revolution. My State, happily, is neither a large nor a small one. It enjoys about an equal population, and does not increase much. What benefit can the present provision of the constitution be, if we get no President by it? I hope the Senate will return to the consideration of the proposed amendments.

Monday, March 22.  
Mr. DICKERSON, of N. J. rose to answer to the arguments of the gentleman from S. Carolina, (Mr. Hayne,) on the amendments reported by the Committee. He contended that the advantages of the district system were so great, that to obtain them, the small states ought to be willing to surrender the power of voting for the President, in the House of Representatives, by states—that this surrender would be an equivalent to the large states for their consenting to the district system, and it was only by compromise, and mutual concession that any amendment could be accomplished. In answer to the objection of Mr. Hayne, that the propositions were only calculated to bring the election into Congress, and thus to substitute an election by the National Legislature for one by the Electors, Mr. D. contended that the election of the President by Congress was not liable to the objections urged against it, and that it was a mode of election originally agreed to by the Convention. Mr. D. made some quotations from the journals of the convention, and went into an argument in support of his position. In answer to the argument, that his proposition went to deprive the small states of a great portion of their power without obtaining any substantial benefit for the country, Mr. D. controverted those positions, and insisted that the plan proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina, was liable, in an equal degree, to the same objection. Both plans involved the surrender of the power by the small states, of voting in the House of Representatives by states—a power, which Mr. D. did not consider as essential to their safety. Mr. Dickerson supported his views by an argument of considerable length.

Mr. JOHN TAYLOR, of Carolina, Virginia, said, he was opposed to the district system, because it had a tendency to deprive all the states, great and small, of a portion of their power, and because it interfered with the separate character of the states, as independent sovereignties. He illustrated this view of the subject by several remarks, and then proceeded to state that he concurred in the opinion that had been expressed in debate, that the district system was calculated to bring the election of President into the House

of Representatives.—Mr. Taylor said, he concurred in the views of the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Hayne,) that great evils would arise from the constant interference of Congress in the Presidential election, and that any amendment to the Constitution would be very objectionable, which would have the effect of making that interference more frequent. He said it had been a great object with him for many years, to "effect some amendment to the Constitution, which might secure the election of the President, without troubling Congress with it. He might not live to see that desirable object accomplished, but he hoped the gentleman from South Carolina would.

As to the question of a Congressional caucus for the nomination of candidates for the Presidency, Mr. Taylor said, he never had any doubt that such a nomination was a clear violation of the spirit of the Constitution. On that subject he believed, his sentiments were in print. It appeared to him, in preparing for gentlemen to contend that in making such a nomination they acted in their private capacities. Mr. T. here entered into some arguments to prove that members of Congress could not meet at the seat of government and nominate a candidate for the Presidency, without making it a public business. The people would so regard it, and it would produce the same effect as if the nomination was made by the members in their legislative capacities.

His honorable friend and colleague, (Mr. Barbour,) had stated, that he, (Mr. Taylor,) had been his instructor in respect to caucusing; and that he had introduced him into the first caucus he ever attended. His colleague, if he had received any instructions from him on the subject, had certainly profited greatly by them. He had been a very apt scholar in his lessons, and had far out stripped his master. But his colleague was greatly mistaken. He had never attended a caucus, either in Congress or elsewhere, for the purpose of nominating candidates for office. Such proceedings, he considered, very dangerous and altogether unconstitutional.

The meeting to which the gentleman had alluded was held by some of the members of the Virginia legislature, for the single purpose of preparing resolutions to be proposed in the legislature. Mr. Taylor said, he did not agree with the gentleman on the other side, that informal meetings for preparing bills or resolutions, to be proposed to legislative bodies, had any resemblance to a congressional caucus, intended to transfer from the states their constitutional check and influence in the election of a President to Congress. It had been said, indeed, that a congressional caucus acted only in their private characters. To illustrate this assertion, we have all heard of what is called a bill dance. Suppose sixty or seventy of the gravest and most respectable private citizens should assemble and entertain the spectators with jigs, rigadoons, and hornpipes. Would not their private characters be estimated in contemplating the exhibition? But if the same number of members of Congress should assemble and exhibit a similar scene, would not their public characters be also estimated? So, when assembled for nominating a President, it is their public characters, and those only, which are intended to influence the election, and such an influence destroys that of the states bestowed by the constitution for self-preservation, by transferring to Congress a power conferred in the States. Their characters will follow them into a caucus, either for the purpose of a bill dance, or for nominating a President.

Mr. Taylor said, that he had not previously mentioned the word caucus in this debate, nor should he have done so, had he not been personally called upon; but that, if the resolutions for amending the constitution should be taken up, it would be necessary to consider that subject, as having a tendency towards that consolidated and concentrated form of government, towards which we were verging with awful rapidity. At this juncture, its thorough examination would produce an excitement inconsistent with a discreet consideration of the amendments; and therefore he concurred in the proposed postponement.

Mr. MILLS, of Mass. rose merely to explain the grounds on which he had moved for the indefinite postponement of the resolutions, and stated, that being fully convinced that the Senate was not prepared to act on the subject during the present session, he thought they ought to be postponed.

Mr. KELLY, of Ala. next took the floor, and began with observing, that he would endeavor, so far as it was practicable, to withdraw the subject under debate from the fog which it had been enveloped, and to conform to the rule of debate prescribed by the chair. He remarked, that the whole discussion on this Caucus question, had arisen from a want of forbearance on the part of the gentleman who had advocated that measure. The gentleman from New-York, Mr. King, had been charged with a change of opinion on the subject of the constitutional amendments, and had risen in his defence, and justified his disposition to delay acting on the subject at this crisis, on account of the Central Power which now presumed to select candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States. Whether he actually used the cabalistic and potent word, Caucus, or not, he held it, said Mr. K. immaterial. He certainly spoke of a central power that had arisen in this government, not known to the Constitution, and unfriendly to the liberties of the nation; and whether he called it a Caucus or not, he certainly did, said Mr. K. assure the gentlemen that he had no unfriendly feelings towards any person who differed from him in opinion. Now, said Mr. K. this remark was received with the most extraordinary sensitiveness on the part of these gentlemen—they had with an ultra chivalrous esprit and corps immediately rushed into a contest on the Caucus question, and had entered into arguments in support of that measure. Mr. Kelly repeated, that a very small portion of forbearance in that stage of the debate, would have prevented the discussion altogether; but as gentlemen had thought proper to pursue a different course, he had certainly become necessary that their remarks should be answered and their arguments refuted. This had been done by the

**CONGRESS.**  
SENATE.  
Saturday, March 2.  
Debate on the Amendment to the Constitution. [continued.]  
Mr. MACON of N. C. said that these resolutions had been referred to a select committee; they had been maturely considered and reported upon by that committee, and now, because a certain other subject, not connected with them, had been introduced, no vote was to be taken upon them. What is the question before the Senate? It is upon the indefinite postponement of the resolutions, and not upon their subject matter. Why should not a fair vote be taken on them? Gentlemen who are not entirely devoted on business before the Senate, generally vote for a postponement. He thought no proposition to amend the constitution, that had ever been before the Senate, had so much in favor of it, as the one that had been reported by this Committee. It had, first or last, been recommended by almost every one of the States. And now, after all the time that had been spent about it, after one of the propositions had been discussed at full length, they are all to be thrown by. He well knew, that men would do, in relation to these things, as they thought right. He considered it an extremely unfortunate circumstance, that a subject which had nothing to do with the real question before the Senate, had been introduced, and was about to deprive all chance of considering the amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. M. said, he knew that no amendment could now be made to effect the next election. There must be a concession of opinion somewhere—every body feels the embarrassments we are laboring under; and yet we are not permitted to go on, and discuss the amendments, by which these evils might be remedied. This amendment, he thought, would ensure an election, without going to

The Nat. Intelligencer, & Wash. City Gazette, both advocates of the caucus.—E. Carr.

the House of Representatives, and he hoped it would not be postponed. It is time enough to postpone them, when we find that we cannot make one that is fit to be adopted. We shall, then, have done our duty to our constituents, as faithful men. But, now, we are about to postpone them, at the very threshold. If there ever was a time when the subject could be met gravely, it is the present. What was the condition of the country, at the time of the difficulty in the election of Jefferson and Burr? Great anxiety was spread from one end of the country to the other. The House of Representatives was young thirty times, without coming to a decision—the most serious alarm pervaded the country. And yet, with this knowledge before us, we are not willing to make provision against similar occurrences. There was a charge of foreign partiality, on each side of the great parties existing at that time. One was accused of fondness for the British, the other, for the French. There is no disposition of that kind now. We have peace, and we have plenty to eat, and thank Heaven the Tariff Bill has not yet passed. Some think that the amendment will produce a consolidation of the government, and that the State lines will be lost. But almost all the States have agreed to it—almost all of them have called for the districting system. Mr. M. said, he did not believe that it would destroy the Constitution. He had heard so much, and so often, of the destruction of the Constitution, that he had almost become an infidel, in respect to it. We have stood a sedition law, and an alien law, and there is not much danger but we may get along with any thing else. We have had these amendments regularly brought before us; and now, all at once, because allusions have been made to another subject, we cannot look at the amendment—we have got into a passion, and we must give them up. Nearly all the states have approved the districting system—and how is it to destroy the Constitution? The liberty of this nation does not, nor does that of any other, depend upon paper. It must have a foundation in the hearts of the people. Let a man depend upon himself, and he is free. If he is dependent on another, black or white, he will not be free. Freedom rests upon our dependence or independence. The people had, at first, a great dread of the President and Senate; but that fear has passed away.

We have, now, more candidates for the Presidency than we ever had before. How are my people to know these men? Why, when I go home, they will ask me whom I think to be the best man; or rather, who will tax them the least? which is the same thing. And, I presume, the same questions are put to other members. I am glad my colleague called for the yeas and nays, on this question, for I hope the subject will not be postponed. In regard to caucuses, I have no confessions to make.—I have gone into caucus as honestly as I go to church. I don't care how many caucuses or how few there are. I care nothing about them. Once, however, about twenty years past, I was taken in by a caucus, and said I would not attend another. I had intended to have given a history of some, on different sides; but it is decided not to be order.

How the choice of Electors, by districts, could possibly prevent an election of President, as has been said, by the gentleman from South Carolina, I cannot possibly perceive. The number of votes given by the districts, would be equal to that now given. I do not understand how it can prevent an election. Every generation has its own notion in politics, as well as in religion. Religions and political ideas are constantly changing. The Book of Judges gives a description of these changes, where it speaks of the departure of the people, after the death of Joshua. So we forget the principles which produced the revolution. My State, happily, is neither a large nor a small one. It enjoys about an equal population, and does not increase much. What benefit can the present provision of the constitution be, if we get no President by it? I hope the Senate will return to the consideration of the proposed amendments.

Monday, March 22.  
Mr. DICKERSON, of N. J. rose to answer to the arguments of the gentleman from S. Carolina, (Mr. Hayne,) on the amendments reported by the Committee. He contended that the advantages of the district system were so great, that to obtain them, the small states ought to be willing to surrender the power of voting for the President, in the House of Representatives, by states—that this surrender would be an equivalent to the large states for their consenting to the district system, and it was only by compromise, and mutual concession that any amendment could be accomplished. In answer to the objection of Mr. Hayne, that the propositions were only calculated to bring the election into Congress, and thus to substitute an election by the National Legislature for one by the Electors, Mr. D. contended that the election of the President by Congress was not liable to the objections urged against it, and that it was a mode of election originally agreed to by the Convention. Mr. D. made some quotations from the journals of the convention, and went into an argument in support of his position. In answer to the argument, that his proposition went to deprive the small states of a great portion of their power without obtaining any substantial benefit for the country, Mr. D. controverted those positions, and insisted that the plan proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina, was liable, in an equal degree, to the same objection. Both plans involved the surrender of the power by the small states, of voting in the House of Representatives by states—a power, which Mr. D. did not consider as essential to their safety. Mr. Dickerson supported his views by an argument of considerable length.

Mr. JOHN TAYLOR, of Carolina, Virginia, said, he was opposed to the district system, because it had a tendency to deprive all the states, great and small, of a portion of their power, and because it interfered with the separate character of the states, as independent sovereignties. He illustrated this view of the subject by several remarks, and then proceeded to state that he concurred in the opinion that had been expressed in debate, that the district system was calculated to bring the election of President into the House

of Representatives.—Mr. Taylor said, he concurred in the views of the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Hayne,) that great evils would arise from the constant interference of Congress in the Presidential election, and that any amendment to the Constitution would be very objectionable, which would have the effect of making that interference more frequent. He said it had been a great object with him for many years, to "effect some amendment to the Constitution, which might secure the election of the President, without troubling Congress with it. He might not live to see that desirable object accomplished, but he hoped the gentleman from South Carolina would.

As to the question of a Congressional caucus for the nomination of candidates for the Presidency, Mr. Taylor said, he never had any doubt that such a nomination was a clear violation of the spirit of the Constitution. On that subject he believed, his sentiments were in print. It appeared to him, in preparing for gentlemen to contend that in making such a nomination they acted in their private capacities. Mr. T. here entered into some arguments to prove that members of Congress could not meet at the seat of government and nominate a candidate for the Presidency, without making it a public business. The people would so regard it, and it would produce the same effect as if the nomination was made by the members in their legislative capacities.

His honorable friend and colleague, (Mr. Barbour,) had stated, that he, (Mr. Taylor,) had been his instructor in respect to caucusing; and that he had introduced him into the first caucus he ever attended. His colleague, if he had received any instructions from him on the subject, had certainly profited greatly by them. He had been a very apt scholar in his lessons, and had far out stripped his master. But his colleague was greatly mistaken. He had never attended a caucus, either in Congress or elsewhere, for the purpose of nominating candidates for office. Such proceedings, he considered, very dangerous and altogether unconstitutional.

The meeting to which the gentleman had alluded was held by some of the members of the Virginia legislature, for the single purpose of preparing resolutions to be proposed in the legislature. Mr. Taylor said, he did not agree with the gentleman on the other side, that informal meetings for preparing bills or resolutions, to be proposed to legislative bodies, had any resemblance to a congressional caucus, intended to transfer from the states their constitutional check and influence in the election of a President to Congress. It had been said, indeed, that a congressional caucus acted only in their private characters. To illustrate this assertion, we have all heard of what is called a bill dance. Suppose sixty or seventy of the gravest and most respectable private citizens should assemble and entertain the spectators with jigs, rigadoons, and hornpipes. Would not their private characters be estimated in contemplating the exhibition? But if the same number of members of Congress should assemble and exhibit a similar scene, would not their public characters be also estimated? So, when assembled for nominating a President, it is their public characters, and those only, which are intended to influence the election, and such an influence destroys that of the states bestowed by the constitution for self-preservation, by transferring to Congress a power conferred in the States. Their characters will follow them into a caucus, either for the purpose of a bill dance, or for nominating a President.

Mr. Taylor said, that he had not previously mentioned the word caucus in this debate, nor should he have done so, had he not been personally called upon; but that, if the resolutions for amending the constitution should be taken up, it would be necessary to consider that subject, as having a tendency towards that consolidated and concentrated form of government, towards which we were verging with awful rapidity. At this juncture, its thorough examination would produce an excitement inconsistent with a discreet consideration of the amendments; and therefore he concurred in the proposed postponement.

Mr. MILLS, of Mass. rose merely to explain the grounds on which he had moved for the indefinite postponement of the resolutions, and stated, that being fully convinced that the Senate was not prepared to act on the subject during the present session, he thought they ought to be postponed.

Mr. KELLY, of Ala. next took the floor, and began with observing, that he would endeavor, so far as it was practicable, to withdraw the subject under debate from the fog which it had been enveloped, and to conform to the rule of debate prescribed by the chair. He remarked, that the whole discussion on this Caucus question, had arisen from a want of forbearance on the part of the gentleman who had advocated that measure. The gentleman from New-York, Mr. King, had been charged with a change of opinion on the subject of the constitutional amendments, and had risen in his defence, and justified his disposition to delay acting on the subject at this crisis, on account of the Central Power which now presumed to select candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States. Whether he actually used the cabalistic and potent word, Caucus, or not, he held it, said Mr. K. immaterial. He certainly spoke of a central power that had arisen in this government, not known to the Constitution, and unfriendly to the liberties of the nation; and whether he called it a Caucus or not, he certainly did, said Mr. K. assure the gentlemen that he had no unfriendly feelings towards any person who differed from him in opinion. Now, said Mr. K. this remark was received with the most extraordinary sensitiveness on the part of these gentlemen—they had with an ultra chivalrous esprit and corps immediately rushed into a contest on the Caucus question, and had entered into arguments in support of that measure. Mr. Kelly repeated, that a very small portion of forbearance in that stage of the debate, would have prevented the discussion altogether; but as gentlemen had thought proper to pursue a different course, he had certainly become necessary that their remarks should be answered and their arguments refuted. This had been done by the

[See 4th Page.]