



JOSEPH W. HAMPTON,

"The powers granted under the Constitution, being derived from the People of the United States, may be resumed by them, whenever perverted to their injury or oppression."—Madison.

Editor and Publisher.

VOLUME I,}

CHARLOTTE, N. C., SEPTEMBER 21, 1841.

{NUMBER 28.

TERMS:

The "Mecklenburg Jeffersonian" is published weekly, at Two Dollars and Fifty Cents, if paid in advance; or Three Dollars, if not paid before the expiration of THREE MONTHS from the time of subscribing. Any person who will procure subscribers and become responsible for their subscriptions, shall have a copy of the paper gratis;—or, a club of ten subscribers may have the paper one year for Twenty Dollars in advance.

No paper will be discontinued while the subscriber owes anything, if he is able to pay;—and a failure to notify the Editor of a wish to discontinue at least one month before the expiration of the time paid for, will be considered a new engagement.

Original Subscribers will not be allowed to discontinue the paper before the expiration of the first year without paying for a full year's subscription.

Advertisements will be conspicuously and correctly inserted at One Dollar per square for the first insertion, and Thirteen Cents for each continuation—except Court and other judicial advertisements, which will be charged twenty-five per cent. higher than the above rates, (owing to the delay, generally, attendant upon collections). A liberal discount will be made to those who advertise by the year. Advertisements sent in for publication, must be marked with the number of insertions desired, or they will be published until forbid and charged accordingly.

Letters to the Editor, unless containing money in sums of Five Dollars, or over, must come free of postage, or the amount paid at the office here will be charged to the writer, in every instance, and collected as other accounts.

Weekly Almanac for September, 1841.

DAYS	RISE	SET	MOON'S PHASES
21 Tuesday	58 5	02 6	D. H. M.
22 Wednesday	59 5	01 6	Last Quarter, 8 9 57 M.
23 Thursday	00 6	00 6	New Moon, 15 0 46 M.
24 Friday	01 6	59 5	First Quarter, 22 8 16 M.
25 Saturday	02 6	58 5	Full Moon, 30 11 3 M.
26 Sunday	03 6	57 5	
27 Monday	04 6	56 5	

PROSPECTUS OF The Lincoln Republican.

It was the intention of the undersigned to issue a Prospectus some time previous to the commencement of the present (the 5th) Volume of this paper; but some arrangements becoming necessary, and which could not be effected at an earlier day, this Prospectus was unavoidably delayed until the present time.

The undersigned has now the gratification of being able to assure the friends of the paper, and of the cause in which it is engaged, that the Lincoln Republican is now placed on a sure foundation; and that nothing is wanting to ensure its long continuation, but the exertions of its friends; and he would take this occasion to call upon them to bestir themselves in its behalf.

He cannot deem it necessary to say more than that the Lincoln Republican will continue to pursue the course it has heretofore marked out. Its doctrines are, and will be, the doctrines of the Republican School of '95 & '99; and it will, as heretofore, endeavor to show, that every departure from them, in the administration of the affairs of the Government, is subversive of the rights of the States and of the liberties of the people; and therefore, it is only by a strict adherence to them, that those rights and those liberties can be preserved. These are the opinions of the undersigned; and so long as the paper remains under his control, such shall be the doctrines it will endeavor to inculcate.

Though not personally interested, the undersigned cannot refrain from calling on the opponents of a National Bank, a high and ruinous Tariff, a Distribution of the proceeds of the Public Lands, an assumption of the State Debts by the General Government, and of Abolitionism and all its horrors—on the friends of State Rights Republicanism, the uncompromising opponents of all the dangerous doctrines of Federalism, to rally around and sustain the Republican presses of the country. For, it is obvious, that to the supineness of the Democracy in this respect, and to the vigilance of the Federalists, may be traced the defeat of the Republican party at the late elections; and in a change of conduct, and that only, may the Democracy hope for a change of power.

TERMS.—TWO DOLLARS and FIFTY CENTS, if paid in advance; three dollars if payment be withheld three months.

No paper will be discontinued until all arrearages are paid. A failure to order a discontinuance, will be considered a new engagement.

POSTAGE in all cases must be paid. ROBT. WILLIAMSON, Jr., Editor. Lincoln, July 14, 1841.

William Hagar & Co.

Type and Stereotype Foundry, 74 Fulton, Corner of Gold Street, New-York.

THE Subscribers take this method of announcing to their friends and the public generally, that, having purchased the extensive and well known

Type Foundry,

formerly owned by Messrs. Conner and Cooke, they have removed the same to their present central position. Having made extensive revisions, additions, and alterations, they are now prepared to execute orders of any magnitude they may be favored with, with promptness, and on as favorable terms as at any other Foundry in America. To their new Specimen Book, which has been recently extensively circulated, they would respectfully refer.

All articles manufactured by them shall be of a material equal, if not superior to any manufactured in this country—and undergo a thorough examination as to appearance, ranging, dressing, and properly assorting. All articles exhibited in the Specimen Book, formerly issued by Conner and Cooke, together with sorts to Fonts sold by them, can now be furnished from this Foundry without delay, with many since added.

WILLIAM HAGAR & CO. are agents for the sale of the Napier, Washington, and Smith Presses, which, together with Chases, Cases, Composing Sticks, Furniture, Ink, and every article used in the printing business, will be kept on hand, and furnished at manufacturers' prices.

N. B.—No machine cast Type manufactured at this Foundry. New-York, February 25, 1841. 3-3m

Notes of Hand and Land Deeds; also Clerks' and Sheriffs' Blanks, Just printed, and for sale at the Jeffersonian Office.

Clock & Watch Repairing.

SAMUEL LAWING RESPECTFULLY informs the citizens of Charlotte and the public generally, that he has opened a shop in the town of Charlotte, nearly opposite the "Carolina Inn," where he will be glad to receive work in his line of business. Clocks, Watches, &c., will be repaired in the most substantial manner, at short notice, on moderate terms, and warranted to perform well. A portion of public patronage is respectfully solicited. Charlotte, June 1, 1841. 13...F

TO THE PUBLIC.

JOHN O'FARRELL announces to his customers and the public generally, that he has disposed of his entire stock of Groceries, Liquors, &c., to Mr. John B. Rouché of Lincoln, and will close his business in Charlotte on Thursday of the ensuing April County Court. Until then, however, he will continue in business at his old stand, and be glad to accommodate his customers with every article in the Grocery line, on the most reasonable terms.

J. O'F. gives this early notice of his intention to close business, in order that all who owe him, either by note or book account, may have due time to come forward and make settlement, which he earnestly requests them to do between this and July Court, for his notes and accounts must positively then be closed. Charlotte, March 5, 1841. 1-tc

PROSPECTUS.

The publishers of the Globe have recently given to the country an exposition of the motives which prompted the attempt by the Federal party to prostrate their establishment, by the lawless abrogation of their contract as Printers to the Senate. They showed that there were already six Federal newspapers—to which a seventh is about to be added—published at Washington—all devoted to the dissemination of Federal principles, and the defence of Federal measures. And to make this overwhelming battery of Federal presses at the seat of government tell with the more effect throughout the Union, the character of the Globe was to be tarnished, its means impoverished, and its political influence destroyed, by a sweeping denunciation of infamy on the part of the Federal leaders in the Senate—by throwing the dead weight of an expenditure of \$40,000 in preparation to do the Congressional work, on the hands of its publishers. (The printers whose contract was violated, and by having this whole work of defamation and ruin accomplished by the judgment of the Senate of the Union to give it the sanction of the highest tribunal known to our country. The work was done by a caucus packed majority of Federalists, and the Editors of the Globe are left to sustain their establishment by the patronage they may receive from political friends for the papers they publish. We will not ask or receive the sort of lumping contribution by which the banks and Federal politicians sustain their presses. We will abandon the publication of the Globe, if it cannot be supported by the regular subscription price of the paper. If such of our Democratic friends whose circumstances do not justify a subscription to the daily or semi-weekly paper, will patronize the cheaper publications issued by us—the Extra Globe—the Congressional Globe, and the Appendix—we shall be enabled to maintain as heretofore, our corps of Congressional Reporters at the cost of \$3,000 per annum, and to draw to our aid some of the ablest pens in our country. We trust, under these circumstances, and at a time when the greatest interests of the country, and its future destiny, are put at stake upon the events with which the first year of the present Administration is pregnant, that no individual who has the cause of Democracy at heart, will hesitate to meet this appeal, when at the same time he will feel assured that this trifling tax for his own advantage, will sustain in triumph at Washington the long-tried and faithful press of his party.

THE EXTRA GLOBE will be published weekly for six months, commencing on Wednesday, the 19th May, and ending on the 19th November next, making twenty-six numbers, the last of which will contain an index. Each number will contain sixteen royal quarto pages. It will contain principally political matter. The political aspect and bearing of the measures before Congress during the special session will be fully developed, and when the proceedings are considered of much interest to the public, they will be given at length.

THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE and APPENDIX will begin with the extra session of Congress, to commence on Monday, the 31st of May next, and will be continued during the session. The CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE will give an impartial history of the proceedings of both Houses of Congress; and the APPENDIX will contain all the speeches on both sides of important subjects, at full length, as written out or revised by the members themselves. They will be printed as fast as the business of the two Houses furnishes matter for a number. It is certain that we will publish more numbers of each than there will be weeks in the session. They will be issued in the same form as the Extra Globe, and a copious index to each. Nothing but the proceedings and speeches of Congress will be admitted into the Congressional Globe or Appendix.

These works being printed in a suitable form for binding, with copious indexes, will form a valuable, indeed, a necessary, appendage to the library of the statesman and politician, giving, as they do, at an extremely moderate price, a complete epitome of the political and legislative history of the period.

Subscriptions for the EXTRA GLOBE should be here by the 26th May, and for the CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE and APPENDIX by the 6th June next, to insure all the numbers.

TERMS. For 6 copies of the Extra Globe . . . \$1
" 6 copies do . . . 5
" 12 do do . . . 10
" 25 do do . . . 20
And so on in proportion for a greater number.
For 1 copy of the Congressional Globe, or Appendix 50 cents.
" 6 copies of either . . . \$2 50
" 12 do do . . . 5 00
" 25 do do . . . 10 00
And so on in proportion for a greater number.

Payments may be transmitted by mail, postage paid, at our risk. By the regulations of the Post Office Department, postmasters are authorized to frank letters containing money for subscriptions to newspapers.

The notes of any bank, current in the section of country where a subscriber resides, will be received by us at par.

No attention will be paid to any order unless the money accompanies it. BLAIR & RIVES. WASHINGTON CITY, April 20, 1841.

Mr. Rhett's Letter.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, August 25, 1841.

Messrs. BLAIR & RIVES: GENTLEMEN: As the Editors of the National Intelligencer refuse to publish the enclosed communication, you will oblige me by giving it an insertion in your columns. R. B. RHETT.

To the Editors of the National Intelligencer:

GENTLEMEN: In your report of the proceedings of the House of Saturday last, the 21st inst., after recording the grounds on which I asked to be excused from voting on the resolution offered by Mr. Sergeant, proposing to take the Bank bill out of the committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, "on Monday next," you state:

"After Mr. Rhett had read his protest to the resolution, and requested that it be entered upon the record—

"Mr. Davis of Kentucky rose and asked him if he had not voted for a similar resolution to the one under consideration during the first session of the last Congress?

"[Mr. Rhett replied: No, never!]

"Mr. Davis rejoined: he would then read the record upon Mr. Rhett, but objection being made, Mr. D. was not allowed to do so. It is as follows:—

"A motion was made by Mr. Clifford that the rules in relation to the order of business be suspended, to enable him to move the following resolution: Resolved, That the rules of the House be so far suspended that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from the consideration of Senate bill (No. 127) entitled 'A bill to provide for the collection, safe-keeping, transfer, and disbursement of the public revenue' from and after Monday next, unless the same shall be reported at an earlier day; and that said bill, with such amendments, if any, as shall have been adopted, be taken up in the House on Tuesday next, at 10 o'clock, a. m. and be the special order until finally disposed of, reserving to said committee the right according to the rules of the House, to report the same sooner, if the discussion shall terminate.' The question was put on Mr. Clifford's motion to suspend: Yeas 123, nays 54. Among the yeas were Mr. Rhett and every Democrat in the House. Upon the question that the House do agree to Mr. Clifford's resolution: Yeas 124, nays 58. Among the yeas were Mr. Rhett and every Democrat in the House."

Thus, gentlemen, it appears that when you profess to report the proceedings of the House, you hold yourselves at liberty to intersperse them with matters which do not occur at the time in the House. The former opinions or conduct of those opposed to you politically, may be introduced for the purpose of weakening their positions, or even for a far inferior purpose—to lower them personally in public estimation by an effort to convict them of personal inconsistency. If you had thought proper to report only what was said on this occasion, you might have better represented my reply to Mr. Stanley, or have noticed my request to the House to allow Mr. Davis to proceed. If the resolution had been read by Mr. Davis, it would have given me the opportunity I desired of showing what I asserted, that I had never voted for any such resolution as that against which I protested. Since you have thought proper virtually to make this charge in your report of the proceedings of the House, I claim the privilege through your columns of refuting it.

In the first place, you have not quoted the whole journal. You say: "The question was put upon Mr. Clifford's motion to suspend the rules." You should have added: "Two-thirds voting in the affirmative, the rules were suspended." From the point at which you stop, it may be inferred by a reader unacquainted with parliamentary rules, that a mere majority suspended the rules; and, therefore, in this respect, that the resolutions of Mr. Clifford and Mr. Sergeant were alike. This is not so. A rule of the House, in conformity with an express standing rule, existing immemorably, I believe, can only be suspended by a vote of two-thirds, and on this occasion this vote was obtained.

In the second place, you say: "Among the yeas were Mr. Rhett and every Democrat in the House." An inference from this statement might be made, that Democrats only voted for Mr. Clifford's motion to suspend the rules, and afterwards for his resolution, and that they carried those propositions. This is not so. A large number of the Whigs, without whom neither the motion nor resolution could have been carried, voted for them with the Democrats. Amongst them were Mr. Biddle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Briggs and Mr. Calhoun of Massachusetts, Mr. Underwood of Kentucky, Mr. Chinn of Louisiana, Mr. Joseph Williams of Tennessee, Mr. Randolph of New Jersey, and many others. If the motion or resolution had been contrary to parliamentary usage, or an infringement of the rights of the minority, these gentlemen would have been amongst the last who would have voted for or carried them.

The distinction between this resolution, and the resolution of Mr. Sergeant against which I protested—kept out of view in your report—is this: The resolution of Mr. Clifford was a resolution to suspend the rules, which can only be carried by a vote of two-thirds of the House. Mr. Sergeant's resolution was not of this character. By a standing rule of the House, made for the protection of the minority, as all rules are, and always existing as a rule of Congress, the regular course of business cannot be altered or changed but by a suspension of the rules. This regulation was made expressly to protect the minority against the caprice or tyranny of the majority. It was supposed, with this guard to their rights, requiring a co-operation of the minority itself to suspend or change the rules by a vote of two-thirds, their rights were safe—imposition or oppression by a majority was impossible.

But how is it now with the new rule introduced at this session, for the first time, into Congress, and in pursuance of which the resolution proposed last Saturday was passed? Was it a resolution to suspend the rules, requiring the assent of the minority, by a vote of two-thirds, to make it operative? It was a simple resolution—"That, at 4 o'clock this day, (altered afterwards to Monday next), all debate in Committee of the Whole on the bill No. 1, to incorporate the subscribers to the Fiscal Bank of the United States, shall cease." &c. It was an enforcement of a rule which had been made a standing rule of the House, expressly ordained by the

majority to get rid of the inconvenience of the two-thirds hitherto required to suspend the rules, and requiring a mere majority to stop debate at any time in the Committee of the Whole, and force a bill through the House by the aid of the previous question. It was against this new and tyrannical rule, which was ordained expressly for the purpose of putting aside the ancient rule, in conformity to which, Mr. Clifford's resolution was offered last session, with my concurrence and support, that I spoke and protested. How, then, can it be said, with any propriety, that these resolutions are in any sense the same, when one was for a suspension of the rules, the other was to enforce a rule existing? One required a vote of two-thirds of the members necessary to the other a mere majority; one, in fact, was made to defeat the operation of the other, and to overthrow that protection to the minority the other secured. On the great point to which we objected, the two resolutions, instead of being similar, are, in reality, antagonistical.

And look, too, gentlemen, to the circumstances under which these resolutions were introduced, containing, as they do, a most vivid exemplification of their operation and principles. The Independent Treasury bill—for the purpose of drawing which out of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Clifford introduced his resolution to suspend the rules—had been under debate one month and five days, consecutively; and the resolution proposed to allow three more days for continued debate. Scores of speeches had been delivered on it; and by a computation made by a member then on the floor, two-thirds of the time taken up in the debate had been consumed by the majority opposed to the bill. It was this fair scope for free debate—the ample time and liberal indulgence given to the minority to express their opinions, that doubtless influenced those members of it who joined the majority in suspending the rules to bring the debate to a close. Now, turn to the circumstances under which the resolution on the Fiscal Bank bill was introduced last Saturday. The amendment, which was the bill on which we were to vote, containing thirty-eight pages, had been introduced into the House but the day before. The bill, yet wet from the press, is on our tables, and it is gravely proposed to take it out of the Committee of the Whole at 4 o'clock that day and pass it. The excitement this proposition obviously produced in the House, induced the mover, I presume, as a signal specimen of Whig generosity, to give one day longer, and he changed it to 4 o'clock on the Monday ensuing. The independent Treasury bill, contained a very trifling appropriation of money for erecting safes, vaults, &c.; but this bill established a mighty corporation, and contained an appropriation of fifteen millions of dollars. And mark how beneficial to the minority was the few hours allotted for discussing this gigantic measure, striking at the first principles of the Constitution, and penetrating every corner of the land. Not a Democrat was able to utter one word in the debate—not one could obtain the floor. The whole debate, short as it was, and worthless as was the opportunity, fell entirely from the lips of the majority. Who will say, under such circumstances, even if the principles on which both rested were the same, that those who voted for Mr. Clifford's resolution, stand on the same platform with those who voted for the resolution of Saturday? Practically, under the former resolution, there was free, almost licentious debate. Under the latter, practically, there was an effectual gag to the minority. Neither in operation, circumstances, nor principle, then, can they, with any propriety, be said to be the same. Under the rule adopted by this Congress, the ancient security enjoyed by a minority to the right of free debate in the Committee of the Whole, is taken away. They have no rights in the matter. They speak by the permission of the majority; and even if one only, says it, they may speak; and when it orders otherwise, they must be dumb. The enforcement of this rule in this case demonstrates, that if a majority chooses, they may pass any measure thro' the House of Representatives, without one word of debate being uttered concerning it. It allowed but six days (and it may as well, on so great a measure, have allowed not) one, to discuss the Distribution bill, which had never before been considered in the House, and which disposed of hundreds of millions of the people's property. It allowed but five days for the consideration of the Loan bill, borrowing of twelve millions of dollars more. It allowed but one week for the dispatch of the first Bank bill, sent by the Senate, where it was considered one month. If such legislation was consistent with our form of Government, it would be sufficient to turn away all nations from us in disgust and contempt. Against such legislation we have remonstrated—Against such tyranny by a majority, as one of the minority, I have protested.

In one of the grounds of the protest I made against this rule, I maintained that it "was a right in the People of the United States, inherited from their ancestors, and enjoyed and practised time immemorial, to speak through their Representatives to the taxes imposed upon them." The manner in which this right was enjoyed was, by referring all bills, laying taxes or appropriating money, to the Committee of the Whole; that is, the whole House resolves itself into a committee. The advantage is in the privileges of this committee. There, the previous question (the form of cutting off all further debate) does not apply. A free conference takes place, and debate is unlimited and unrestricted. On the great and vital subject of taxes, and the appropriation of them, it is not presumed that there can be too much deliberation or consideration, and those who are to pay the taxes, the people, have the right freely to discuss the manner and the extent to which they shall be laid, and the purposes to which they shall be applied. Permit me briefly to show the origin and nature of this great principle of Anglo-American liberty.

On the 18th of February, 1667, coeval with the establishment of liberty in England by the Revolution of 1688, by which James the Second was expelled from the throne, the Commons of England resolved: "That if any motion be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof ought not presently to be entered upon; but adjourned till such further days as the House shall see fit to appoint; and then it ought to be referred to the Committee of the Whole House; and their opinions be reported thereupon before any resolution or vote of the House do pass therein."

Upwards of a century afterwards, in 1784, Mr. Hastell, in his Parliamentary Precedents, in commenting upon this rule, observes: "The House of Commons have, with great wisdom, imposed these rules and resolutions upon themselves in the exercise of that great and important privilege, 'the sole and exclusive right of granting aids and supplies to the Crown;' in order, (as it is their duty when they are imposing burdens upon their fellow subjects, to give every opportunity for free and frequent discussion,) that they may not, by sudden and hasty votes, incur expenses, or be induced to approve of measures which might entail heavy and lasting burdens upon themselves and their posterity. It is upon this principle, that as long ago as the year 1667, the House laid down for a rule 'that no motion or proposition for an aid or charge upon the people should be presently entered upon.' "That by this means, due and sufficient notice of the subject should be given, and that the members should not be surprised into a vote, but might come prepared to suggest every argument which the importance of the question may demand. Another part of the same order—that such propositions shall receive their first discussion in Committee of the Whole House—is no less wise and prudent. There every member may speak as often as he finds it necessary, and is not confined in delivering his opinions by those rules which are to be observed in speaking in the House; and in matters of account and computation, would be extremely inconvenient, and would necessarily deprive the House of much real and useful information. This mode of proceeding likewise gives an opportunity of a further and more mature deliberation, when the resolutions of the committee are reported; to which the House may either not only agree or disagree, but if they are of opinion that the subject has not been sufficiently canvassed, they may recommit the whole or any part of the report, for the purpose of receiving more accurate information, or more narrowly inquiring into the nature and expediency of the proposed measure. For these reasons, this resolution of the 18th of February, 1667, has been, particularly of late years, very strictly adhered to; and it appears to be one of those rules which, as it has its foundation in prudence, and an attention to the case of the people, ought to be, in all instances, inviolably observed."

Here is the origin of this great rule, with the reasons for its exercise and continuance in the British Parliament to the present day. And I beg you to remark, that instead of its being relaxed in its administration, it has been, according to the testimony of Mr. Hastell, particularly of late years, very strictly adhered to. The reason is obvious. In proportion as the British Government has become more free, and the interests of the people more regarded in its legislation, in the same proportion has this great principle of parliamentary law, introduced by the people for their protection and self government, been more sacredly observed. It has become sanctioned by usage and allowed into a great principle of liberty; and if any Premier or King of England, at the present day, should dare violate it to one half the extent this Congress has witnessed, it would produce a revolution as signal as that of 1688. Nor has it been confined alone to bills of supply. "The speech, messages, and other matters of great concernment are usually referred to the committee of the whole House." 6 Grey, 311. There the inestimable privilege of free debate is obtained, untrammelled by technical rules. There the representative of the people can speak to the taxes to be imposed upon his constituents again and again, unchecked by the previous question. Suggestions are freely made—time for investigations given, that all the light and information which the subject admits of, may be freely imparted and freely received. This is English parliamentary law brought by our ancestors with them into all our colonial assemblies, as that rule, in the enactment of laws, above all others, the most sacred to liberty and the protection of the rights of the people. It has been invariably practised on, as far as I am informed, by every State Legislature in the Union, excepting where the previous question has not been adopted as a rule of governance, and then it may be unnecessary. It has been as inviolably observed by every Congress which has sat in the United States, from the Revolution to the Congress of June, 1841. Even the Federalists of '98, disregarding as they showed themselves to be of popular rights, in the enactment of the alien and sedition laws, whilst they assailed the freedom of the press, left untouched the right of free debate in Congress. The liberty of speech to the people and their representatives was unassailed or abridged. For the first time since 1667, this rule has been set aside, not by Englishmen, or in a Monarchy—but in a Republic, by the descendants of Englishmen, claiming to be freer than they.

Free debate no longer exists in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. The people, through their Representatives, have no longer the right of speaking to the taxes imposed upon them. Tyranny, in the shape of a majority, is erected in the Capitol. The new reign of terror is begun.

I have remarked, gentlemen, that whenever the guillotine, cutting off debate, has fallen on a bill, you have raised a shout of congratulation at its speedy passage. The patriotism of the dead is extolled, and the people are bid to rejoice. If you have thought upon this subject, will you be so good as to inform me how liberty can be maintained by a people, if the liberty of speech, in their deliberative assemblies, is destroyed. Why did Cromwell turn his Parliament out of doors? Was it not because he could not restrain their speech? Why did Napoleon introduce his gens d'armes into the House of Deputies? Was it not because he feared their remonstrances and appeals to the people, against his meditated usurpations? Could these tyrants have made the Representatives of the people dumb, could they have silenced debate by rule, what more could they have desired or demanded? For their purposes, perhaps, it were better such representatives should have remained than be expelled.

They both had obsequious and slavish majorities to carry out their bequests. But they, unfortunately, did not live in our day, in the glorious light of our example. They did not comprehend the first great reform of a Federal Congress in these States, to gag by rule; and therefore, they found it necessary to gag by the sword. And have you lived so