



PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
SALMON HALL
AT THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, PAYABLE
HALF YEARLY IN ADVANCE.
ADVERTISEMENTS WILL BE INSERTED
AT SEVENTY-FIVE CENTS A SQUARE, THE
FIRST WEEK, AND THIRTY-FIVE CENTS
FOR EACH CONTINUATION.

*Mr. Hanson's second Speech on
MR. WEBSTER'S RESOLUTIONS.*

A motion being made for an indefinite postponement, Mr. HANSON rose in reply to Mr. GRUNDY.

He would again ask the attention of the house as long as his strength would enable him to keep the floor, whilst he set forth those views which directed his mind upon the present enquiry. He qually regretted that gentleman should have dipped so deeply into the documents connected with this very plain and simple question under discussion, and the necessity he was under of replying, in a particular manner, to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Grundy.) The assertions made by that gentleman, the sentiments he uttered, and the monstrous doctrines he advanced, rendered such a reply unavoidable, if indeed he could ever be disposed to avoid doing his duty. Desirous as he had been from the beginning, to confine the discussion within its proper limits and bounds, with the hope of having presented to the people a simple, plain proposition, he would not have suffered himself to be led into a tedious investigation, but that it seemed altogether fitting for him to reply to the member from Tennessee.

One of Mr. Hanson's reasons for avoiding the course pursued in the debate of opening upon the house a deluge of documentary evidence, was, if possible, to deprive gentlemen, like the member from Tennessee, of an opportunity to display the lawyerlike dexterity, and a characteristic skill and cunning, for which he understood the member stood unrivalled and pre eminent in the highly civilized, polished and refined state which honored the house with his presence here. As it was, however, Mr. H. did not regret the course that had been taken, because it had been the means of placing the gentleman from Tennessee in the light Mr. H. was most pleased to behold him—of exhibiting him in those native colors, dressed in which he would be best recognised by those who best knew him—of displaying him in his true character, of a bitter reviler of one of the great parties in this country, and the *apologist of France*.

Here the Speaker called to order; saying, the gentleman from Maryland could not proceed in such a course of argument—that the epithet "*cunning*" was not proper to be applied to a member of that house, still more was it out of order to use the words "*apologist of France*."

Mr. Hanson asked if the same latitude of debate allowed to the gentleman from Tennessee would not be extended to him. The Speaker replied "certainly." It is not, said Mr. H. I must get at the gentleman in some other way—in the course of the argument. Mr. Grundy rose to explain:—Mr. H. said he had the floor, and meant to keep it; there would be an opportunity to reply.

Mr. Hanson proceeded—It struck me, Mr. Speaker, with considerable force, and I have no doubt other gentlemen on this floor thought it not less remarkable, that although the enquiry embraced in the resolutions related exclusively to the perfidy and falsehood of the French government, presuming innocence at home, after occupying the floor full one hour by the clock, during which time innumerable insinuations were made, when not one fact could be substantiated, the gentleman has not uttered one word of reproach, has not suffered a breath of improbation to escape his lips against this France. On the contrary, in the very breath that he impugns the principles and arraigns the patriotism of the best and wisest men that adorn our country, he himself seeks to shroud and smooth over the enormities of the French government.

The gentleman spoke of our labouring in our new vocation to sow distrust among the people and to throw obstructions in the way of administration, thus weakening the arm of our own government and

strengthening that of the enemy. If that gentleman will only turn his eyes inward and examine his own heart, if he will look at home, he may come to the conclusion, that our new vocation is at least as praiseworthy and honourable as his *old* vocation. If I am not mistaken, sir, this is the fiery furious gentleman, who, during the war session, went about beating up to arms and enlisting recruits, crying out, follow me ye of stout hearts, let the faint hearted now leave us. That gentleman Mr. Speaker, (pointing to Mr. Grundy) it should be known, can set examples in and out of this house, which, I confess, it would require a very stout heart to imitate, which with perfect honor might be shunned, nor should that heart be denounced as faint which should pause, palpitate and shudder at the *bare idea* of such imitation. The gentleman may labor in his *vocation* without danger of interruption from me in his *suits or pursuits*. But who are the friends of "the fast anchored isle?" (and I hope she will long remain fast anchored; I trust in God, she will not be loosed from her moorings, at least until the Colossal power of France is at an end—we have nothing to disguise or conceal upon this subject) that he accuses of weakening the arm of government and aiding the enemy?—Think you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman alluded to would suffer by a comparison of public and private virtues with the member from Tennessee? I will not do irreverence to the gray hairs of the venerable and exalted characters (pointing to Col. Pickering, just before him, and meaning also Judge Benson and Col. Stuart) whose lives have been dedicated to the service of their country—in whose bosoms the flame of patriotism still burns bright and cannot be extinguished by the snow above—I will not disparage their fair virtues by any such comparison. No, sir, the reputation of the models of political excellence and moral worth that we delight to honor, rests upon a base of adamant. They are lifted high up above the reach of obloquy, or crimination from that quarter.

The gentleman in his zeal, to cast odious suspicion upon the friends of peace, has said, the hon. gentleman from New-York (Mr. Grosvenor) "out-Herods Herod, out-Castlereaghs Lord Castlereagh," when by his own exhibition, the gentleman from Tennessee out Bobbadil, Bobbadil, and out Bassano's Bassano. At the same time he loudly calls upon the hon. gentleman from New-Hampshire, no longer to support his resolutions by *proxy*, when he himself was made a mouth-piece by the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Calhoun)

The gentleman charges the minority with being the cause of the war, said Mr. H. Did he mean to say, that they had been laughed or ridiculed into the measure? This was paying a left handed compliment indeed to the understanding, and high political attributes of the men that rule the country, as well as to his own sense and judgment. The truth was, they had waded so far, it was better to go on than turn back. They had a completely committed themselves in their bullying system—their policy of addressing themselves to the fears of England, that, according to their own misconceived notions of consistency and honor, they were obliged to go on, all retreat being cut off—no avenue being left open for escape. Mr. H. here spoke of a self created committee of Congressmen who called on the President and required him to send the house a message recommending war. He said, the first demand was unsuccessful, but the second succeeded, when he was given to understand, that his re-election depended upon his recommending war at once. Mr. H. inveighed in strong terms against such a state of things, when a Presidential election was made to depend upon a recommendation of war.

In answer to the doctrine of moral treason, Mr. H. spoke of the Western insurrection, and contrasted the conduct of federalist now, with that of the democrats then. Altho' groaning and sweating under the pressure of the privations and afflictions induced by an unrighteous and wasteful war, they had never combined to rebel against the government, and point their bayonets against their own country. They claimed nothing but the privilege which was the birth-right of every man in this free country, of opposing the measures of government in a constitutional way. He spoke indignantly of the conduct of

Gallatin in that insurrection, who had been so well rewarded, and was known to have been the very soul of the government for many years past, and was now sent to Russia, to intrigue on the continent of Europe. After speaking of the conduct of the present ruling party during the French war, he again assailed the slavish Asiatic doctrines advocated as a mean of carrying on the war. None but a helot or a serf could harbor in his bosom such hideous deformed principles, and he who did entertain them was unworthy of being a member of a free community, much less of having a seat on this floor. He had not the patience or philosophy to treat this subject as it might be treated by others. Even in the district he represented, distinguished as it was for lofty and correct sentiments, some men of reputed sense were so borne down by clamor or terrified by the threatening aspect of affairs as actually to ask the opinion of a lawyer, how far it was lawful to oppose war, now that it was declared. Such was the industry and success with which the doctrine of moral treason, passive obedience and non resistance was disseminated, wherever agents could be found base enough to do such jobs for their employers.

There was no way of terminating this war, if the house, who held the purse strings of the nation, would grant the supplies to carry it on. The house owed all its importance and authority to the power of the purse. They alone held the purse strings of the nation. To this feature of the constitution, they should cling as the floating plank on the ocean—as the rock of their salvation. It was in the power of the house to terminate this bloody and disastrous contest with a nation willing to be at peace with us, and that man was indeed morally guilty of treason, who would furnish the means of ruining his country under the impressions entertained by the minority of this war. With the conviction written on his mind in strong and indelible character, Mr. H. would feel like a traitor, if he aided in supplying the means to bring the republic to a premature but inevitable fate, if the war was continued another year, of which there could be no doubt, as far the actions and the hearty wishes of the dominant party and their leaders were a criterion to judge by.

Mr. H. said, that nothing but the spirit, perseverance and patriotism of the Federal party, have saved the nation so long from falling into the fangs of France. They cleaved closer and closer to the country as her danger increased. But for their unconquerable attachment to liberty, their ardent and unintermitting exertions to save the nation from the greatest of all sub-lunary miseries, years ago we should have fallen into the snare set for us by the fell destroyer of nations. By slow but sure process, said he, has the existing state of intense suffering, alarm, discontent and danger been brought upon this people. As direct as constant as the vane upon the steeple points to the quarter whence the wind blows, and shifts with every adverse breeze, as faithfully as the needle designates the north, have the measures of the present incumbent of the palace, & his predecessor and preceptor *pointed to this war*. True as they had occasionally varied and shifted their measures in matter of *form* as circumstances required—now relaxing now bracing and invigorating their system—but the political barometer never deceived us. The vane always shewed whether the wind set from Mount Monticello or Gallia's shore, which the weather-wise considered as one and the same thing, in regard to the effect upon the political season. Yes sir, said he as regularly as the compass and the Heavens conducted the great mariner Cooke around the globe, and the breeze propelled his bark along, have the predominating minds of the ruling party, driven on by head-strong passion, have the master magicians behind the scenes, so beautifully dizened to amuse the eye and divert the judgment, conducted this deluded people like the alluring night lamp, into swamps through briars, thickets and quagmires. But to foretell a year ago the disastrous events that have passed in review before us is almost "one long unbroken funeral train" betrayed a distempered imagination. A peculiar proclivity to error was perceived in all our speculations, and a treasonable excitement of false alarms was charged against those who foresaw and were *old* to foretell abortion and disgrace in all the transcendent schemes of

glory, conquest and aggrandizement, engendered in the disordered brains of their authors. Indeed whoever had the hardihood to venture a prediction of miscarriage, was assailed with the ready argument of minions and pensioners—the cry of tory was thrown into his face like a bowl of cold water. The lamp post, the guillotine, or the gallows, was a punishment scarcely ignominious enough for the man who dare oppose the most righteous, honorable and profitable war?

Mr. H. here proceeded to shew, that the war had no other foundation but a false and mistaken data—in a word that it was bottomed on falsehood, and therefore the minority should not be sprung up as moral traitors, or have their throats cut for opposing it in a *constitutional way*—unlike the opposers of the French war of '98, the only way in which it had been opposed, and he hoped would continue to be opposed, with a zeal and constancy commensurate with the great and salutary objects to be attained.

He began with the celebrated "*triangular report*" as it was called—1808, which assumed the alternative of war, embargo or submission, declaring that "war with one of the belligerents would be submission to the other." He asserted, (and called upon gentlemen then in the house, who were of the committee of foreign relations, in 1808, to contradict him if they could undertake to do so) that the report mentioned proceeded from the pen of the President, was not the production of the committee, but was handed over by the Executive to one of the heads of department, who handed it to the committee. Of course the stand taken was by the Executive—it was their act, and they were thus pledged to the United States, and to the two great belligerents of Europe to preserve a strict neutrality, a faithful impartiality towards them, &c.

He then cited the law of May 1810, holding out the same terms to France and England, and empowering the President to suspend the law of non-intercourse in favor of either that should accede to our offer, and enforce it against the power that should decline an arrangement—the "*fact*" of such repeal to be declared by proclamation. He explained how and when the word "*fact*" was introduced into the non-intercourse law of 1810. Because it was thought, by those opposed to the arrangement with Mr. Erskine, that the Executive had transcended his powers, by proclaiming the orders to be repealed, when the repeal was to take effect *in futuro*. The law was then construed by its makers as bearing no such meaning, but to require an unconditional repeal to take effect at the time. He would say nothing of the manner in which both houses endeavoured to contravene that arrangement before its disavowal in England, and thus breaking the plighted faith of government; but was certain the word *fact* was introduced in the new law, in order more clearly to define its meaning, and to guard against a second departure from its spirit and letter. Nevertheless the Duke of Cadore's letter of August 5th, 1810, was taken as a repeal, coming within the strict meaning of the act, although the repeal was therein made to depend upon a condition precedent, and not an actual *bona fide* repeal, as contemplated by the law. What were those conditions? That England should repeal her orders in council, abandon her new principles of blockade, or the United States should *cause her rights to be respected*—in other words take part against "the common enemy," which was finally done, before an authentic act of repeal was published by France and presented to England. The French government has itself furnished the proof of this fact, out of which grew the present resolutions.

A word or two said Mr. H. about these new principles of blockade. According to the Napoleon code, a blockade to be legal, must be of a fortified place, and there must be an investiture by sea and land. According to the same code a ship is declared to be an extension of territory, a floating colony, to visit or search therefore is an invasion of the territories of a neutral, and an act of war. For not repelling such invasion, France chastises us by a general order to her corsairs, to sink burn and destroy, while in port the douaniers seize or confiscate all within the reach of the Imperial robber. So that Bonaparte will sink our territory and burn our colony, because we do not resist by war the right of visit and search, legally

Mr. H. had before spoken at some length upon the question against Mr. Calhoun's motion, to strike out from the first resolution, the words "by whom, and to what manner."