CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

BY HAMILTON C. JONES. SALISBURY, N. C. SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1836. VOL. V—NO. 10.—WHOLE NO. 218.

TERMS.

The WATCHMAN may hereafter be had for Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per year.

A Class of FOUR new subscribers who will pay in advance the whole sum at one payment, shall have the paper for one year at Two Dollars each, and as long as the same class shall continue thus to pay in advance the sum of Eight Dollars the same terms shall continue, otherwise they will be charged as other subscribers.

Subscribers who do not pay during the year will be charged three Dollars in all cases.

No subscription will be received for less than one year.

No paper will be discontinued but at the option of the Editor, unless all arrearages are paid up.

☞ All letters to the Editor must be *post paid*; otherwise they will certainly not be attended to.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING—*Fifty Cents a square for the first insertion, and Twenty-Five Cents per square for each insertion afterwards.*

No advertisement will be inserted for less than ONE DOLLAR.

Advertisements will be continued until orders are received to stop them, where no directions are previously given.

Advertisements by the year or six months will be made at a Dollar per month for each square with the privilege of changing the *form* every quarter.

PROPOSALS

For publishing a weekly Journal in the town of MACON, Noxubee County Mississippi,

TO BE ENTITLED

THE MISSISSIPPI STAR.

THE Rapid and increasing growth of this & the surrounding beautiful country has induced the subscriber to establish a weekly Journal at this place. It is well known that whilst other portions of the State are amply supplied with sources of political information, and means of its dissemination, that this rich and fertile, though sparsely populated section is without a single paper; consequently the success of a Journal, established under such circumstances, will in a great degree, depend upon the merit of its conductor and the untiring efforts of his friends.

Usage has rendered it obligatory on the conductors of public Journals, before entering upon their duties, to give an exposition of their political tenets, and as we feel no hesitancy in avowing our sentiments, either because of their unpopular reception with those in Power, or the classes which produced their conviction, most willingly do we conform to the task. In the present posture of our National affairs, we see much to engage the interest and exertion of the friends of free government—the present crisis is pregnant with danger & portends the destruction of elective franchise and the overthrow of those principles upon which popular governments are founded, and upon which alone, Republics can endure. We are decidedly opposed to the dissemination of the People's sentiments by Conventions, established by the aforal influence, and believe that the sanction of such a dangerous interference with the People's Rights will be productive of the worst consequences, and whilst we enjoy the right of thus intermeddling with the immunities of freemen, we most solemnly oppose any individual whom the Baltimore Convention may have thought expedient to nominate as the successor of the present incumbent of the Executive chair. It is unnecessary to advert to the various reasons which embolden our opposition to the candidate of the Baltimore Convention; but it may be well to say, we hold no principle in concordance with him—we believe him committed on the subject of slavery, unless his recent letter is a full and unqualified acknowledgement of his belief in the justice of Emancipation and Abolition. Of the other two candidates for the Presidency, we have but little to say—their political honesty and virtuous deportment in public as well as in private life gives undoubtable evidence of the justness of the claim which they hold upon the confidence and affections of the people—but between Hugh L. White and Wm. H. Harrison, we shall without the fear of defeat, yield our earnest support and untiring exertions to the elevation of the "Cato of East Tennessee" HUGH LAWSON WHITE. We confidently believe in his unwaring patriotism and sincere devotion to the interests of the South, and consider him fully adequate to the discharge of the high functions which that Office would impose upon him; and consequently, he will receive from us that support, to which his private virtues and eminent abilities so justly entitle him.

In advocating the principles we have avowed, it is reasonable to expect that our opponents will assail us; but whilst we shall strenuously adhere to a dignified and moderate course, we feel perfectly willing to meet the advocate of Power upon any subject involving the principles of rational freedom, whenever they may choose to open their batteries upon us. Entering the arena as we do, with no pilot, save the justice of our cause and feeling the full responsibility of the duties devolving upon us, it shall be our aim to sustain the cause of the Whig Party and of Whig Principles with all the zeal and ability we can bring to our aid.

The STAR will be published once a week, at Macon, Noxubee county, Miss., on a neat imperial sheet, at $5 in advance, or $6 at the end of the year.

Newspapers friendly to the cause, are requested to publish the above Prospectus, and receive subscriptions for the same. The first Number will be issued early in December, if the materials can be procured by that time.

JO. GALES JOHNSON.

Stop the Runaway.

RANAWAY from the subscriber living near Liberty Hill, in Iredell county, N. C. a negro man named

PETER,

formerly owned by James Cunningham. He is between forty and fifty years old: of a yellowish complexion—round face and small eyes. He is marked with a scar in one of his ears, which does not grown together; also with a scar on the underside of his heel, which has not filled up: he has also a small scar on one of his cheeks, and is about five feet, five or six inches in height.—Any one taking up this negro and lodging him in jail or delivering him to me, shall be reasonably compensated.

HUGH CUNNINGHAM.

Liberty Hill, Iredell co. N. C.
June 11th, 1836—u47 $

SPEECH OF MR. BELL, (OF TENNESSEE,) ON THE NEW HARBOR BILL.

House of Reps., Thursday, June 23

The House having resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. Lincoln in the chair.) on the bill making appropriations for certain harbors for the year 1836"—

Mr. BELL addressed the committee to the following effect:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I look upon the present bill as the result of that disposition, or rather determination, which has been manifested throughout the session, to bring the wants of the Government up to the increased revenue of the country, instead of keeping the public revenue down to the actual demands of the public service, which has always heretofore been regarded as the true policy of the country. It is because I regard this bill as an emanation of this new system of policy, chiefly, that I oppose it. The bill provides for the improvement of a great number of harbors and inlets upon our lake and sea coast, which have heretofore escaped the notice of the Government, although improvements of this nature have, for many years past, been patronised by Congress. I take it for granted that the several items or objects contained in the bill stand upon equal grounds, so far as regards their importance, and the expediency of making the appropriations demanded for them. It will, therefore, follow, that one part of the bill might as well receive the support of Congress as the other; and those who are opposed to it will act more wisely by making opposition to the principle and policy of the measure as a whole, it will also save time, if the strength of the bill can be tested at the outset. If a majority of members shall be in favor of the principle of the bill, then it may be passed without further delay. To effect this object, and to enable me to take that view of the subject which I desire, I move you, sir, that the enacting clause of the bill be stricken out.

[After the question was stated from the chair, Mr B proceeded]

I did not think it worth while, Mr. Chairman, to oppose what may be called the old harbor bill, because the public works provided for in it are already in progress, and have been in progress for a series of years, under annual appropriations for their completion; but a hope may be entertained that opposition will arise along the first proposition to this bill, after the experience we have had in relation to the old one. It is the nature of these works never to be completed.—Most of the works in the bill which has this moment passed the committee, are very old acquaintances of the old members of this House. I remember most of them as far back as the first session I had the honor of a seat in this body. For several years, many of them were reported as only requiring one more appropriation to complete them. When the officers who had charge of them become ashamed of repeated propositions of this kind, the language in which the applicant was coming on, works that seemed upon the point of completion eight years ago, now require from seven hundred thousand dollars annually for their permanent construction and preservation! It is notorious that many of the old works of the kind enumerated in this bill fell into decay before they became useful to any extent, and the first improvements, made at great expense, were either abandoned as useless, or became dilapidated, and required to be reconstructed. All those harbors may be regarded as bottomless pits of the Treasury. You may expend tens of millions upon them; and such as many will be required, and then no man can see any termination to the demand for further appropriations. Sir, the present bill, although large in amount, would be no cause of alarm to me, if the expenditure now proposed were all that would be required; if, sir, I could foresee that at the end of five or even ten years, there would be an end of further demands. I would be less concerned. But, sir, we know from experience, that whatever may be the original estimate of the cost of these works, the actual expenditure is never limited by them. There is not one of the old works, I venture to say, which has not already had expended upon it fifty or a hundred per cent. beyond the original estimate—It may, then, be taken for granted that each of these new works, like the old ones, will be perpetual drains upon the Treasury, not only in our times, but to the generations that are to come, for there is no limit to invention in this business of making artificial harbors. I do not say that, in all cases, these expenditures will be useless. No, sir, money can accomplish any thing in the way of improvement. Harbors may be constructed by skill and capital, where nature seems to have forbidden the undertaking. It is only questionable whether, when we have so many fine harbors on our coast constructed by the great MAKER of all things, it is wise to drain the pockets of the people, and absorb the Treasury in adding to their number. Let us look at the progress of this branch of the system of internal improvement, in the amount of expenditure. In the year 1835, the entire amount appropriated to these objects was $505,057. The bill which has already received the sanction of this committee provides an expenditure for the present year of nearly $700,000—[a member said $900,000,] a gentleman near me states the amount at $800,000. The bill under consideration proposes to apply $927,264 to new works, making an aggregate of upwards of $1,700,000—more than three times the amount of any former year! What amendments may yet be made to this bill I cannot foresee, but there is little hope that the amounts will be reduced, unless the entire bill shall fail. Well, sir, do honorable members see nothing alarming in this? Is there no evidence here of that disposition, or rather of that determination, to extravagance which I have charged? If this bill shall pass the present Congress, it will of itself lead to an expenditure of ten millions.—Yes, sir, when ten millions have already been expended, in looking forward, we might be cheered with the expectation that yet another ten would close up this gulf of the Treasury.

I have said that I regarded this bill as the result of a deliberate system of extravagance—of a plan for increasing the wants of the Government, and of exhausting the Treasury. Was I not right in this assertion? Look at your increased expenditures in every branch of the public service. But, sir, why descend into particulars? I affirm that your Committee of Ways and Means of this House was organized upon a principle of extravagance. Look at the composition of that committee, sir, and then tell me if it was not constituted with deep design, and expressly with a view to the largest expenditures for which a pretext could be found, in every branch of the public service. Was there ever such a Committee of Ways and Means appointed in this House? Was there ever a more palpable desertion of the principle of representation—a more shameful abandonment of the interests of the entire interior of the country? Who are the members of this committee? At the head of the list we find the gentleman from New York, (Mr. Cambreleng,) representing the largest city in the Union, deeply interested in the largest expenditures upon the navy, upon fortifications, and public works of every description. Next we find the gentleman from Baltimore (Mr. McKim,) the representative of similar interests, and and nearly to great an extent. Next we have the gentlemen from Virginia, (Mr. Layall,) who represents the Norfolk, or rather the Gosport district, in which besides a navy yard, which may be made to exhaust any amount of money, has within its limits two Fortifications, which have already cost the Government nearly three millions of dollars, but are worth—really worth—scarcely one cent in the way of protection, yet they are annually the objects of large appropriations. We we next pass to the distinguished gentleman from Maine, (Mr. Smith,) I say distinguished, because he is distinguished as a gentleman of business habits and intelligence, as a member of this House. This gentleman represents a seaport also, (Portland,) upon a coast of numerous harbors and inlets, all of which could be greatly improved by money, all of which might plausibly claimed to be fortified. We next arrive at my friend from Massachusetts, (Mr. Lawrence,) who represents Boston, a place deeply interested in large expenditures upon the navy and fortifications. The next on the list is the learned gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Ingersoll.) He too, like the five already noticed, represents a large commercial city, having all the interests, to a great extent that the others have, in large expenditures. Last on the list is the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr Owens.) He also represents a large and important commercial city, Savannah,) and like the rest, having a deep interest in large expenditures. We see, then, present the interests of the sea board, in all its economy, we have two gentlemen, one from Ohio, (Mr. Corwin,) and one from Tennessee, (Mr. Jones,) TWO against seven! Seven members of the committee representing districts on the seaboard! I wish every one to draw his own conclusions, but I have seen enough in the action of this House, in the course of the session, to corroborate the inference I have drawn from the peculiar organization of this committee. I must not be understood to impute rather a want of integrity or patriotism to the members of this committee. I respect all the gentlemen I have described as the representatives of districts on the seaboard. But they are bound, from the very nature of our representative system, to have opinions in common with their constituents, especially upon this subject of expenditure, and I repeat, that this committee was organized upon a principle of increased and extravagant expenditure.

It would seem that this bill is intended to lay the foundation of a permanent system of expenditures of this nature. The preamble alarms me.—It is new to me. The announcation of purpose is imposing and high sounding, and denotes design—"To provide for the protection of the commerce, and navigation of the United States"—The protection of the commerce of the United States! Would not that grand object embrace improvements in the interior, as well as upon the exterior boundary of the country? This Government is authorized by the constitution to extend the same degree of protection to the inland commerce that it may to foreign trade. The power in the one case is conveyed in the same language that is used in the other; yet all the improvements proposed by this bill are upon the exterior boundary of the Union. I know it may be said that improvements of the interior channels of communication and trade may be properly included in a distinct bill. That is true, and such has been the practice to some extent. But to what will this lead in the end? Without doubt, to a perpetual struggle between the States of the interior and the States upon the lake and sea coast, for an equality of benefits—of expenditures which would exhaust the revenues of any country.

But in connection with this view of the subject, consider for a moment the monstrous—I will not say intolerable—inequality of this system of improvement; for, if I were compelled to the act, I might submit to much greater, rather than break up this Union. But is it fair, is it just, necessary, or reasonable, that this inequality shall exist? Some of the large States in these bills receive $50,000, some others $100,000, and one large State (New York) will receive upwards of 200,000 this year, to be expended within its limits, and upon objects calculated to increase its relative advantages over the other States of the Union while other States do not receive one cent; and this inequality is to be established forever! It cannot be. The States of the interior must look to their interests, they will look to their own interest, if this system goes on, to whatever extreme it may lead. My friend from Virginia (Mr. Wise) said, on yesterday, that there will be no more appropriations for these improvements; that there will be an end of all such works now, since we passed the deposite bill. Well sir, ought this result to be lamented if it shall turn out to be one of the effects of that bill, which is practically a bill for the distribution of the surplus of the Treasury? Ought the passage of that bill to be deprecated, because it may terminate a system of improvement, which, from the relative locality of the States, must, after all, be unequal and productive of great discontent, and the most wasteful expenditure of the public treasure? Sir, if that bill shall effect no other good but this, it will well deserve the support and approbation of the public. The States, having the means, will be much better judges of the importance of improvements within their limits: and they will be generally more economical and judicious in the management of them than this Government can be. Each one will expend more than its due proportion and none will have cause to complain. We shall at the same time escape the disgraceful combinations by which these bills effect their passage through this House. My friend from Virginia also thinks that another effect of this distribution of the surplus will be to revive and uphold the American system, to increase the tariff, and to sustain an expensive system of improvements by the States. That gentleman must have forgotten that in the feature in the system to which he alludes—I mean the American system, which was thought to be most dangerous, and promised to be most effective in giving it permanency—was the inequality of the distribution of the revenue produced by a high tariff. The States of the Northwest, which were new and susceptible of improvement to any extent, were expected to combine with the manufacturing States, and secure to themselves all, or nearly all, the benefits of the united interests of the system. The States of the West were to have the money expended within their limits, which was paid into the Treasury by the people of all the States; and to this result the South was expected to continue to pay, while others received as well as paid. It was the inequality of the benefits which was expected to give permanency to the system. Where all receive in an equal degree, there is a community of interest in opposing unjust and unreasonable taxation. My friend also contends that the practice of distribution will cripple the operations of this Government; that it will be stripped to *the bare poles*. The argument is, that the avarice of the States, and the desire to increase the funds at their disposal, will prevent the necessary appropriations for the support of the General Government. Now sir, sir. It it be true that the States shall feel a deep interest in a system of distribution, in order to effect those great purposes of education and improvement, the first duties of the local Government, it argues but little foresight or wisdom in them to suppose that they would consent to weaken this Government in any of its essential powers. To enable the Federal Government to raise a large revenue from the customs, or to enable it to preserve and husband the public lands as a source of revenue, all its necessary powers must be maintained in due vigor, and this the States will be ready enough to concede. We must have a sufficient army and navy, and our civil establishment is never likely to be too small for the service.

My friend also laid down another proposition, in which, I think, he was mistaken. He remarked, in relation to the abuses growing out of the condition of the Treasury, and to the remedy that had been provided for them by the bill for distributing the surplus, that they were both evils; and the difference between them was, that the one might be reduced to a system, and the other never could. The experience of all Governments—the history of the world is against the correctness of this conclusion. A Government never goes backward in expenditures and extravagance. Great and expensive establishments are never reduced under any Government, except sometimes at the close of a war a military establishment may be reduced; but, sir, as a general principle, the progress of expenditure and profusion in any government is continued and forward, and revolution alone can terminate it. [Mr. Wise inquired if his friend from Tennessee understood him to advance a different proposition. Mr. B. said he did. Mr. W. then explained, and stated that his argument was, that the present insecure and anomalous condition of the public deposites could not be reduced to a system.] I am glad to find, said Mr. B., that I did my friend injustice in the inference I had drawn from his remarks: but I must take leave to say, that I think the greater evil to be remedied—much the greater calamity which threatened to befal the country by reason of the existing state of the public Treasury, was an increased number of public officers—increased naval and military establishments—an undue increase of Government patronage—and a profuse and profligate waste of the public treasure in every department of the public service: this, sir, was the true disease which called for a prompt and efficient cure. I trust, and confidently believe, that the existing surplus in the Treasury will effect this great purpose. I shall be grievously disappointed if we do not, in a very short time, find the country aroused to inquiry in regard to the public expenditures, in such a manner as to give increased efficiency to the Government by salutary curtailments, while at the same time, the necessary supplies for the support of the Government will be liberally granted. I am surprised to find that any gentleman, who claims to belong to the State rights school should be opposed to this measure of distribution. Why should they be alarmed at the prospect of adding strength and importance to the States?—To do this, has, heretofore, been the great aim and the object of most solicitude to the State rights party. How to reduce the power of the Federal Government, has, heretofore, been the great desideratum with that party. It sounds strange to my ears to hear objections from that quarter to the late decisive measure of this House in relation to the surplus. But, sir, I must again revert to what I consider the first and chief good which we may hope will grow out of this measure—the reduction and limitation of the expenditures and patronage of this Government. We have had some experience already of the disastrous, the ruinous consequences of an overflowing Treasury. Look at your more than *doubled* appropriations for the present year; your Indian wars, and the enormous expenditures required to carry them on! If the late measure shall have all the effect which I anticipate from it, we shall soon see a spirit of inquiry into every abuse of the Government spreading itself over the country. The true measure of supply for the support of Government, and the various public establishments, will be estimated. The utility of the public works proposed to be constructed will receive its due share of attention, and no longer be regarded as subbordinate to the mere object of expenditure. We shall no longer be carelessly and recklessly exposed to the hazard of foreign war, nor to savage massacre, in multiplied Indian hostilities, because our resources are felt to be ample for any emergency, and our Treasury is known to be redundant. Sir, I repeat the idea, that our Indian wars have resulted from a sense of the vast powers and resources of this Government and the abuse of its patronage. While an indifference, and even contempt of an Indian war, continue to be felt by the Government, neither the vigilance, nor precaution, nor the energy necessary to prevent hostilities, will be applied. Sir, is it not true that Indian wars have been raging within the last six months which have cost the lives of hundreds of our citizens, and will cost the Government more than ten millions of money, and which have never yet been thought worthy of a communication to Congress by the President? Sir, I congratulate the country that we may look forward, with confidence to times when there will be some responsibility felt by our public servants, and some accountability exacted from them by the People.

The passage of the bill for the distribution of the surplus revenue among the States has been attributed to various causes of a political nature. The true cause of the great and unexpected favor which that bill found in this House, is to be found in the unexampled spirit of extravagance manifested throughout the session, in the appropriations and public expenditures of every kind.—Strong, therefore, and paradoxical as it may appear, the Committee of Ways and Means, or rather the Chairman of that committee, who has repeatedly avowed himself against it, is yet entitled to the chief merit in passing it. This credit he is justly entitled to, and the country will, no doubt, duly appreciate his services.

We are now Mr. Chairman, near the close of a parliamentary year, one of the most eventful in our history, and one that must long be remembered for good or for evil, in the further progress of this Government. I wish I could consume the time necessary to a review of the most remarkable measures and incidents which have distinguished our proceedings during the present session. Such a review from some one more competent than myself would be a public benefit. I cannot refrain from adverting for one moment to the extraordinary disorder and constant violation of all sound parliamentary rule and practice which has prevailed throughout the session. Every member must feel that the character of the House has been deeply affected by those circumstances, in the opinion of the public. Another session of equal length and disorder must end in disorganization, or vest the entire actual power of the Government in the hands of the Executive. If public respect and public confidence shall be lost in the House of Representatives, we shall no longer have it in our power to boast of a free government. I would not be understood as charging all the disorders of the session to the presiding officer of this House, he, it is true, must come in for his share of responsibility; but to the House itself must attach the greater reproach. It is the absense of a proper regard for the propriety and the order of our proceedings in the members of the House themselves, which alone can account for those repeated scenes of disorder, and the utter contempt for all the laws established by long parliamentary practice, so often manifested in the course of this session.

I do not wish to discriminate between parties in these observations. It is a subject which ought to be felt as far above party feeling and influence. It concerns every patriot of every party to turn his attention to the correction of the evil. I cannot but remember, however, that during the whole period of the session, there has been a labored effort, through the columns of the Government journal, (the Globe) to identify me, humble as I am, with all the disorders and abuses of the session.—I have been constantly held up to the public as an agitator, a disorganizer, and one who deliberately sought to thwart the business of the House, and especially to embarrass the speaker. That there is great injustice in this charge, that a more gross and unfounded calumny never was propagated, I appeal to the impartial of all parties in this House.

In a late number of the Globe, an article appeared headed "CONFESSIONS OF THE LEADER OF THE WHITE PARTY;" and, in the body of the article, I was represented as having stated, in a speech, that "the minority of the House were tyranized over, and they were naturally in a refractory, restless and perturbed condition; and, if they could not be heard orderly, they would do so disorderly." The editor did me over honor of assigning me the rank of leader of the White party; but, the injustice and the falsehood of the charge I have stated was felt by every member of the House who heard my remarks in the debate referred to in the Globe. It is true I stated, in that debate, that the minority were tyranized over in the House; that in the proceedings of a former day they had been compelled to act—to vote—and yet their lips were sealed, by the decision of the Chair, against utterance of complaint or explanation; that they had only desired to state a fact, which had been misstated from the Chair, but that too, was denied them; that to add to the injustice and tyranny of the proceeding, the Globe came out a morning or too after with an article, in which the question was falsely stated, and the most unworthy and disgraceful motives ascribed to every individual, but one, who voted in the minority. It was such injustice—such tyranny as this, which I said naturally tended to produce restlessness, and a violent temper in the minority; and, for this reason, I invoked a spirit of forbearance and moderation on the part of the Chair, and the majority of the House, towards the minority. But, sir, so far was I from giving my countenance and support to the course of the gentleman who refused to vote when their names were called upon the resolution of the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. PINCKNEY,) that I stated explicitly and expressly, if the House passed a vote not to excuse them, and they should, in contempt of the authority of the House, refuse to do so, I should feel myself bound, in vindication of the necessary power of the House, to vote their expulsion from this body, as painful as it might be to my feelings on personal grounds.

In another and later article of the same journal, the minority in the House are charged with having resorted to "every expedient" to thwart the public business, and I am specially referred to as having contributed largely to this object. I take this occasion to say, that every charge of this nature is without the slighest foundation in truth. It is due to myself that I should also avail my self of this occasion to say that in regard to the proposition to abolish slavery in this District, and the abolition question generally, I differed with many of my friends in this House, as they very well know, as to the judicious mode of managing it. In all the discussions which have taken place upon that subject, I have been generally silent; and, when I had occasion to take some part in the incidental questions which have grown out of it in the progress of the session, it will be recollected by the members of the House I sought to allay, rather than increase excitement; though I could not agree with the moderate party in all their views of that question, nor could I vote with those who sought to suppress all discussion by a violation of the right of speech in this House. As to the other expedients for exhausting the time and thwarting the business of the House, I affirm that, upon no occasion, and in no instance, have I lent myself to any such purpose. In the whole course of the session, I do not remember that I have demanded the yeas and nays but once; and that was upon the resolution I offered changing the hour at which this House should meet in the morning, from 12 to 11 o'clock.

But, sir, the wide range of debate indulged in by me, and the time I consumed in the discussion of the naval appropriation bill, has been the pretext for the grossest misrepresentation. As humble an individual as I may be, it has been my fortune within the last year or two to have been the object of the most bitter and unqualified denunciation and calumny by the leading journals in the interest of party in power. I have, at the same time, been the object of unremitted attack and denunciation by those who occupy the highest stations in the Government.—My support of a distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the Presidency has been ascribed to the most unworthy private motives; and every ground of public principle or public interest, in justification, has been denied. Sir, these attacks and these misrepresentations have been continued up to this day. It was natural that, upon the meeting of Congress, I should seek the earliest opportunity of giving an exposition of my course and the motives which led to it; or at least, to show that the friends of Judge White were at issue with those of the Vice President, (Mr. Van Buren,) in regard to principles of the highest grade and importance. Well, sir, I sat in my seat from the first of the session, and waited patiently for an occasion upon which I could properly, and without seeming to trespass upon any rule of order or propriety, make the remarks which my feelings and judgment both dictated proper. I had resolutions drawn up which embodied all the propositions I was desirous of establishing; but, sir, no privilege was allowed me of offering them. It is an extraordinary fact, and it is as unprecended as it is extraordinary, that no member, from the first of the session to this day, has been at liberty to offer a proposition