

statement of the grounds of an opinion which may, after all, be too absurd to be put forth, without, at least, a plausible excuse. Heretofore I have but glanced at the topics to which I have adverted. I know that I had to do with one who would not require to be led by the hand to any conclusion to which I might wish to conduct him. Heretofore, too, I have presented few ideas, to which I had any reason to believe, that you could feel a very decided repugnance. Not so now, sir. In the present instance, I am right, then have you and those who have acted with you, been deeply, perhaps fatally in error. I feel the delicacy of offering an argument to you, in proof of this. Let me hope, Sir, that you give me credit for a disposition to conduct it in the spirit which becomes such an undertaking.

In modern history we read but of one country, to the Laws and Constitution of which the name of liberty is known. I know it is the fashion, among us, to speak of it as if existed in name alone. So much are those demagogues, who habitually occupy the public ear, accustomed to this distinguished language, that it is hard for any man to reach the distinguished elevation to which you have attained, without having made his lips familiar with it. Your high talents, sir, may have exempted you from the necessity of this prostitution of yourself to vulgar prejudices. But if yours has been the common lot of political aspirants, it is only one of the many proofs that might be offered, that, even among our best, our justly boasted freedom is not quite so perfect in practice as in theory. The authority of opinion is a good thing; but, when it extends to the control of opinion itself, it perpetrates a sort of suicide. But you are too familiar with the jurisprudence of our parent country not to know, that with civil institutions far less plausible than our own, with a Constitution strikingly deficient in that theoretical symmetry which characterizes ours, and with many great and essential faults in their system, personal liberty is not less secure to the people of England than to us; that the laws which protect against violence and calamity are much more rigidly enforced; and that property is surrounded by safeguards, established by law and fortified by opinion, of an efficacy far superior to any thing of the kind enjoyed by us. It has been proudly said, "that the house of an Englishman is his Castle." However humble, however confined, however mean, the hotel that he pleases to call his home, is still his Castle. It may be open to all the elements; the rains of heaven may drench his lowly hearth, and every blast may sweep freely through it, but the KING CANNOT ENTER IT; the KING DARE NOT ENTER IT. How far your own mansion is thus secure from the unwelcome intrusion of your dusty footed Sovereign, is best known to yourself. Here again your commanding talents may have afforded you an exemption from the common lot. They may have enabled you to insist on the free enjoyment of all your rights, on the regulation of your domestic economy, and on the choice of your company, without any loss of popularity. If so, Sir, this is but one more of the blessings heaven's bounty has bestowed upon you, which may well be the subject of envy to those less happily endowed.

But, whether more or less of liberty be found, under the seemingly unfriendly forms of the English Government, there is certainly enough to make it an interesting speculation, to enquire, "how it got there." In its original form there certainly was nothing of it. Of all the wars that have stained that land with blood, not one was fought on behalf of liberty. They were all the strife of Ambition contending with Ambition. The triumphs of Freedom have all been pacific. Her charters have never been sealed with blood. Her title deeds are all in the language of concession free and unconstrained. What was there in the atmosphere of that Island, that power should there assume a character so pleasurable, so "easy to be entreated," so gentle and complying? Such was not the temper of her stern Edwards and fiercer Henrys. Their concessions were indeed enforced, but they were not unpurchased. In every instance they may be traced to the want of money, and appear to have been rendered necessary by the acknowledged right of the people to withhold supplies. The existence of this one right, in the absence of every other, is a curious, but unquestioned fact. It is the more interesting because, on inquiry, we trace its origin to that very fiction of law, which made the King the sole absolute proprietor of all the Lands of the Kingdom. This, then, became the fund from which the stipend of the feudal soldier was paid; the price at once, and the corroboration of his service. In this way the claim of the subject to the unrestrained enjoyment of his land, became entwined with the very idea of his allegiance, and as the best trained mercenaries will mutiny for want of pay, so the sternest feudal chieftain dared not dispute the title of his feudatory to his land, or disturb him in the enjoyment of its fruits. Those, in that early day, constituted the whole wealth of the realm; and thus it was that property, which elsewhere has fallen an unresisting prey to power, was rendered sacred by the very maxims on which power itself was based. The ceremonial which acknowledged the authority of the chief, ratified, the title of his feudatory. — Kneeling at the feet of his lord, he was sprinkled with the very anointing which consecrated his superior.

It is not edifying, sir, to observe in this, how variant are theory and practice, and how causes, deeply seated in the nature of things, will work their appropriate results in spite of human contrivances, however stern and unobedient? This single right, apparently so helpless, so inviting to rapacity, and so utterly at its mercy, required a sanctity by time which it imparted to all property; and, when commerce and manufactures brought increase of wealth—wealth paid the ransom of all other rights, and purchased a complete enfranchisement from lawless power. Reverse the case, sir, and the history of the bloody but impotent struggles for freedom, in all other countries, give the result.

There is no principle of the Constitution of England, which has been more studied by American Statesmen than that of which I have spoken. None has been better understood. To none were we more indebted for the just apprehension of our colonial rights, and for the sympathy of the ablest of the English Whigs. It was on these principles that the Fathers of our Liberties, and founders of our institutions took their stand against arbitrary power. They found their rights registered in ancient records, and preserved in modern forms. They saw that while the statutes of the British Parliament purport to be enacted by the King, Lords and Commons of the Realm, the tax bills, as they are called, declare that the Lords and Commons do give and grant to the King a certain revenue. They are thus inferred from this, that if the King had no right to take what did not belong to him, the Parliament had no more right to give what did not belong to them. In hoc signo vincere. This principle was their sword and their shield, and their strong tower.

Lord Gatham once said that the rude language of Magna Charta "Nullus liber homo" was worth all the classics. I wish it may not prove, sir, that this simple phrase, "do give and grant," is of more value to liberty than all the intricate machinery and elaborate provisions of our Constitutions. But can we believe, that the wise practi-

cal men who laid the foundation of our government, meant to lose sight of a principle which they had just asserted so strenuously and successfully? They certainly did not. A remarkable proof of the importance which they attached to it is found in the Virginia act of 1779, abolishing feudal tenures. By that act all quit rents accruing upon grants of the Crown or State were freely relinquished, and that expressly on the ground, as recited in the act itself "of the danger to free Government, from a fixed revenue." The tax laws of the same State, never permanent, but re-enacted from year to year, are a relic of the same principles, retained long after the principle itself is forgotten.

But what remains—what trace—what shadow of it do we find in the Federal Government? None but the prohibition to use unappropriated money, rendered perfectly nugatory by the constructions which make the receivers and keepers of that money Executive officers. I have already adverted to this when endeavoring to show that this was not the true construction of the Constitution. But we owe it to the Congress of 1789, to adopt any plausible interpretation of their conduct consistent with a due respect to the manifest intention of the framers of that instrument. Are we not then bound, in justice to these eminent men, to presume that they thought it of little consequence to whom the custody of the public money should be intrusted, so long as it remained with Congress alone to decide whether they should have any money or not?

When we remember that, at that day it was doubted, whether all the sources of revenue at the command of Congress could be made adequate to the wants of the Government, even on the most moderate scale of expenditure, and that the idea of an impost tax sufficient for the purpose had then entered no man's mind, we must hesitate before we accuse them of any criminal remissness, in thus placing the whole treasure of the country under the control of the Executive. But what then, sir, (I beg you to believe that I ask the question with all respect) what then was the duty of those, who, at a later day, first introduced the idea of a protective, and consequently a permanent tariff? What became their duty, when this was carried to such a length as to establish a permanent interest engaged to perpetuate that tariff, and to place before a majority of the people a prevailing inducement to continue it? Late experience has given occasion to ask the question, "what power is retained by Congress to restrain the Executive from any course of measures however pernicious." When the deposits were removed in 1833, had the concurrent vote of both Houses been necessary to replenish the Treasury, the Senate might have said to the President, "Put back that money, or you shall have no more. Such would have been the language of the British Parliament to the Crown. The Senate, equally bold, was not in condition to hold it. Could they have done so, the iron will of Andrew Jackson himself, deprived of the means of rewarding his followers, must have bent to the necessity. The people would have supported the Senate, Sir, for the wherewithal to corrupt them, and to buy up support to his usurpation would have been wanting. Under such circumstances, the President would feel the necessity of conforming to the reasonable wishes of the Legislature. The necessity of consulting these, & of giving just satisfaction, at once a majority of the People, & to a majority of the States, would be a security against any very wide aberrations from prudence and justice. As it is, the President has but to please himself, and the other departments of Government are bound to be pleased. But under the control of such a check as I have supposed, would Andrew Jackson have presumed to pocket your land bill? Would Martin Van Buren have dared to continue the Specie Circular? Would the most important office be kept vacant because the Senate would not submit to Executive dictation, or until a dirty tool could be spared from some other dirty work, or until it might suit the convenience of a minion to fill it? Do you remember how long our representation at the Court of St. James was suspended? How long the post vacated by the death of the late Chief Justice, was left unoccupied, and the outstretched necks and longing eyes, which, during that tantalizing suspense, were turned to that august seat? In short, sir, to illustrate and confirm this by something like arithmetical proof, what power on earth could, of late, have prevented the establishment of the Sub-Treasury Scheme, and the hard money project, but the beggared condition of the Treasury at the time? I repeat it, sir. Give the President a permanent tariff of protection, let him collect the impost in specie, and then give him a place to keep it, in the custody of his own officers, and he is my master & yours for life. Your great talents, like the strength of the ox, would get you more energy to your struggles, and make the yoke more galling.

Upon the whole, sir, I think I do but speak your thought, when I say, that the power of the Executive is exorbitant, and that it ought to be limited and restrained. The remedy devised by the bold & practical wisdom of our English ancestors, and has been taken away by a fixed tariff of protection. The bill of compromise affords a sort of palliative.—It removes a part of the evil, but it gives greater permanency to all that is left of it. By this, the weaker party are engaged in honour, not to ask, what the other are engaged, by interest, not to grant. Let us hope, sir, on the other hand, that the stronger party will feel that their honour is also engaged, not to insist on that which the weaker have effectually disabled themselves to prevent.

From what I have said, you may be apt to infer that my own acquiescence in the compromise would be restless and impatient. So it might be, were there any hope of a change for the better; but the giant who will not be quiet under the weight of Mount

Etna, struggles to as much purpose as we should. They who take upon themselves to speak on behalf of the South, declare distinctly, that we are absolutely and irrevocably bound, by a sacred engagement, to bear, without a murmur, all the consequences of the compromise, whether commercial or political. But, I never indeed understood that Mr Calhoun had authority to pledge South Carolina. Mr McDuffie, if I mistake not, came into toil with great reluctance—but the State, it seems, has ratified the engagement. As to the delegation from the other Southern States, it must be admitted, that they truly, though in some instances, I doubt not, reluctantly represented the fears, if not the wishes or interests of their constituents.

Upon the whole, I look upon the compromise as irrevocable, so long as the advocates of the protective system will suffer it to rest undisturbed. We have nothing left, but to throw ourselves on their forbearance. To you, sir, and to others, our Statesmen, it belongs to consider well whether the political consequences I have pointed out are evil, whether they admit of a remedy or palliative, and, if so, what these may be.

A FRIEND OF STATE RIGHTS.

WASHINGTON, July 1, 1838.

MR. CLAY AND MR. CALHOUN.

In the sketch I gave you last week of some passages that occurred between Messrs Clay and Calhoun, there were several points to which I was, for want of time compelled to make only cursory allusions. The Washington Chronicle, having in the course of its systematic and incessant misrepresentations, assailed him for his course on that occasion, it is just to Mr. Clay that I should state a little more fully the substance of his observations.

Mr. President, (said this distinguished Statesman) there is one remark of the Senator (Mr. Calhoun) which I cannot allow to pass without notice. The Senator has again alluded to the subject of abolition—a portion of the public press and amongst others, a paper in this place, supposed to be the organ of the Senator, has made a charge upon me which every Senator on this floor knows to be false. I have charged me with being an abolitionist—I, an abolitionist!—I, an abolitionist! I, Sir, who represent slaveholders; and who am as ready as any man on this floor or elsewhere, when a case occurs of real danger to that or any other right secured by the Constitution, to defend it to the utmost. I have seen no such case of danger—much as I have seen to regret and condemn in the conduct of the abolitionists; I have seen no such indications of danger of interference, with our rights by the action of the States or of this Government, to justify a resort to those desperate measures which will endanger our glorious and happy institutions—not have I seen any thing to satisfy me that the harsh epithets and violent denunciations of the gentleman, can have other than the most injurious effects—and I say, here in my place, that the course of the Senator has made more abolitionists in the last two years, than all the powers of the abolitionists themselves ever would have made;—and, I say further, sir, that there are those who agitate this delicate and dangerous subject, from motives of selfish and personal ambition—I understand the game, sir; it is intended to unite the South on this and other kindred topics, and when that section is consolidated into a dense and excited mass, some other topic will be started to conciliate the necessary support in some other section. I believe true, sir, nothing the less, because gentlemen are eternally asserting that they do not expect or desire office; and affect with the loftiest scorn, to trample the highest honors of the republic under their feet.

Sir, we will not countenance such unwholesome schemes: nor will I hesitate to denounce them wherever and by whomever started. I go for the Union, the whole Union; as we receive it from our fathers:—I go for no sectional interests or parties—no Southern party, no Western, no Northern, no Eastern party. But I desire to see Government administered in a spirit of broad, expansive, equal justice;—on such principles alone can be preserved, or is it worth preserving.—Sir, my destiny has been cast among a slaveholding people, and whenever a conflict shall come in defence of our rights to our slaves, (which God avert!) here or elsewhere, I shall be found in front of that Senator!

[From the Baltimore Patriot.]
U. S. Senate, June 28, 1838.
[After describing the passes between Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Calhoun, the correspondent of the Patriot proceeds thus:]
Mr. Clay next rose, and in a strain of delightful badinage, commented on the differences just exhibited by two such good friends as the Senators from South Carolina and Pennsylvania. He was soon to witness their difference, and would be glad to see a reconciliation between two gentlemen who were such staunch supporters of the Administration.

Mr. Clay then referred to the declaration by Messrs Calhoun and Strange of their readiness to go before the country on that bill which had been so signally defeated by the People's Representatives. He assured them, for himself and friends, that the satisfaction of the opponents of the measure would be equally great at going before the nation on that decision. For the People have already given their verdict against the Sub-Treasury from one end of the Union to the other. But if the gentlemen are anxious for another appeal, let them have it! At the next session you will find yourself prostrated beyond a chance of recovery.

Mr. Clay alluded, in a strain of great spirit and liveliness, to the remark of Mr. Calhoun, that the responsibility rests now on the Whigs. What said the gentleman, do you then acknowledge that you are defeated? Then give up your seats like men—resign your posts—go home—let us have the power along with the responsibility, and my word for it, we will, within sixty days, bring about a restoration of confidence and prosperity. But at the moment in which we are told that we are alone responsible, the Senator from South Carolina also declares he will vote against us—and vote against his friends, Really, with such a set of perverse, obstinate, unpraiseworthy gentlemen, who will support no thing, let it come from friend or foe—we must content to do the best we can. The great object should be to restore the confidence and prosperity of the country; and this he maintained was the purpose of the bill introduced by his friend from Massachusetts.

Clay then cursorily reviewed the most important provisions of that measure, and urged its adoption. He contrasted it with the substitute, and pronounced the latter to be a strange compound of distrust and confidence. You could, said he, in the banks so far as to receive their notes, but, in the very act of converting them into specie, there is an implied distrust. It is the want of confidence which has been so fatal to the prosperity of the country; and in keeping up that distrust the substitute would be most injurious.

If Mr. Webster's measure should fail, Mr. Clay said the responsibility would rest on those who were so obstinate and infatuated as to refuse any measure but that odious and pernicious one which had already brought to the Administration a Waterloo defeat—that bill which is now dead as any man that has been hanged on a gibbet—a measure carried here in defiance of the expressed wishes of the constituents of Senators, and attempted to be forced through the House of Representatives in the face of the known will of the People.

Mr. Calhoun rejoined. He said that Mr. Clay charged him with being a partisan of the Administration. This he denied; and, as usual, talked and urged some time about his consistency. It was not, he declared, in the power of Mr. Clay to give him his political position.

Mr. Calhoun then tried to cheer on his troops by a jubilant strain. They were not overthrown—not they! Mr. Clay he said was quite mistaken. The battle was not yet fought out. They had only a slight skirmish. Mr. Clay would find when the fight should take place on the true issue between his bank, which he (John C. Calhoun of all men living) styled a monarchical institution, and the Sub Treasury, that the latter would triumph. There would be two to one against it—Waterloo defeat—inglorious discomfiture, &c. In this strain did Mr. Calhoun continue for half an hour.

Mr. Clay rejoined most felicitously. He said he certainly did not desire to locate the Senator from South Carolina. He would never aim at so impracticable an object. But he maintained that Mr. Calhoun's own language warranted every one in classing him with the friends of the Administration.

The Senator (said Mr. Clay) talks of belonging to no party. But have we not heard him repeatedly talking of making a rally—of the party of 1827—of the party of 98? Have we not heard him speak of uniting the whole South? Is he of that—the South-uniting party?

He calls (continued Mr. Clay) the end of the Sub Treasury bill a mere "skirmish." Why it has been defeated two times, at the beginning and end of the Congressional year, by the Representatives of the People; and the public voice proclaims the country's approval of the decision.

Mr. Clay gave the "honest nullifier" prophecy for prophecy. The House of Representatives, in the year 1839, will open, he said with a majority of two thirds against the Administration, if these measures are persisted in; and we shall have some changes too in the Senate, (added Mr. C.) looking archly round to the quarter of the "instructed.")

Mr. Clay repelled the accusation that the bank he proposed had anything of a monarchical character; but if it had, Mr. Calhoun's lips are shut against it, for he supported such a one twice. But it is quite chimerical to talk of the monarchical character of a national institution. We had such a one for forty years, and our liberties were never in danger, until the power of the Executive was exercised to draw it to his foot-stool.

Mr. Clay concluded by declaring that, although he was for a National Bank, he would not present a scheme for such an institution, if he were assured the People were for it; and he assured Mr. Calhoun that he would be found ever ready to carry out the will of the people as that Senator had shown himself zealous to obstruct it.

Mr. Calhoun made a brief rejoinder, of which the whole purpose was to attempt to hold up Mr. Clay as an enemy of the South; and to contrast his own course in organizing a Southern party, to procure a greater equalization of the burdens of Government, with that of Mr. Clay, who he intimated, was looking to other quarters for support and popularity.

Mr. Clay indignantly repelled this insinuation. He looked to no section, he said, for support. All the Government measures in which he had any agency had reference to the prosperity of the Union, and the whole Union.

The distinguished orator then broke forth in a strain of the most impassioned eloquence, denouncing every attempt to unite the people of any section of country in a community of interests separate from the people of the other sections.—Any man who would set abroad such a work aimed to produce the occurrence of the greatest misfortune which could possibly befall the American People. He may succeed in conciliating sectional favor—he may disclaim all ambitious views—he may trample under foot every imputation of his designs; but the tendency of such opinions and principles is directly to that catastrophe—a dissolution of the Union.

Mr. Calhoun now repeated those insinuations—for they had hardly the character of charges—in which he had indulged against Mr. Clay during the abolition debates of the last winter, of being less ardent in defence of the domestic institutions of the South than he ought to be.

Mr. Clay repelled the insinuation, and declared with peculiar emphasis, that if the day should arrive when an attack would be made upon the domestic institutions of the South, Mr. Calhoun never would be found in front of him in resisting those attacks. But he believed that the course of that Senator itself has done more to multiply abolitionists than all other causes combined.

He again urged in a lofty strain of eloquence the obligation to maintain the Union, and declared that the love of the Union, so deeply planted in the hearts of the American People, would crush every one opposed to it.

TENNESSEE POLITICS.

We copy the following letter from the Nashville Banner. It is from the pen of Mr. A. A. Hall, the Editor of that paper, who has long been a prominent and influential politician in that State. The letter indicates what will probably be the course of Tennessee at the next Presidential election.—R. Whig

FROM THE EDITOR AT WASHINGTON.

JULY 3d, 1838.

The course of the Nashville Whig calls for further notice. In any ordinary controversy that might have sprung up between the two papers in my absence, I should not have desired to interfere. In the present case however, not only are important principles involved, but the prospects of Mr. Clay himself in Tennessee may be seriously jeopardized. For were it known, that either he or his leading friends countenanced and encouraged the conduct of the Whig, I do not hesitate to say, he never could receive the vote of our State. That paper has been recently established by a gentleman who plumes himself as having uniformly opposed Gen. Jackson, and given a consistent and original support to Mr. Clay. He aspires to be regarded as the Clay or-

gan in Tennessee. Now, the opposition in our State consists, first, of the original Clay or Anti-Jackson party, numbering some eight or ten thousand votes, and composing about one fifth of the party,—the other four-fifths consist of original friends of General Jackson, who deserted him when he abandoned his principles. These have never supported Mr. Clay. At the late election for President, they supported Judge White. The original friends of Mr. Clay, or the Anti-Jackson party proper in Tennessee also voted for Judge White, not because it was pretended his political principles accorded with theirs—not because he was their first choice, but avowedly because they preferred him to Mr. Van Buren. In this, they acted an honest, manly part, and went as far as they could consistently and creditably have gone. It was certainly all that the friends of Judge White could have reasonably asked or expected. Well, the battle was fought, though won in Tennessee, lost in the United States. Of course, it has to be fought over again. The friends of the different individuals spoken of as candidates in opposition to Mr. Van Buren, are accordingly engaged in bringing forward their names and pressing their claims. Among the rest, the Nashville Whig has hoisted the Clay flag and is zealously urging the pretensions of that distinguished individual. To this, no exceptions, whatever, were taken by such of the friends of Judge White in Tennessee as formerly belonged to the Jackson party, and who had heretofore been opposed to Mr. Clay. But although they took no exceptions to the nomination and support of Mr. Clay, by the Whig, the peculiar position they occupied, totally precluded them from pursuing a similar line of policy. They had differed with Mr. Clay and other Whig candidates on great measures of national policy. They could not know whether Judge White, whom they preferred and still prefer, to all other individuals for the office of Chief Magistrate, would again be taken up with any prospect of success or not. They could not possibly know from what materials they would ultimately have to select. Their course, therefore, was obvious. Seeing that the political principles of no one of the most prominent individuals spoken of accorded entirely with theirs, and seeing moreover, that the friends of those individuals could not for the present agree on any one of them, but that the selection of a candidate was by agreement postponed until December, 1839—under these circumstances, I say, the line of duty before the great body of the opposition in Tennessee—the original Jackson men—was plain. It was, to maintain their attitude of determined hostility to the present Administration, to await the selection by their Whig brethren of a suitable candidate in opposition to Mr. Van Buren, and then to throw all their weight into the scale of the opposing candidate. The fact is notorious and undeniable that although four-fifths of the opposition in Tennessee have been, on former occasions opposed to Mr. Clay and yet stand prepared to give him a hearty united support, in case he be the opposing candidate to Mr. Van Buren.

I cannot better give the grounds and reasons of this preference than by truly stating what I understand to be the present position and what will be the future course of our old friend Judge White, than whom an honest man or more consistent politician does not live.

He, in common with the great body of his friends in Tennessee, differed heretofore with Mr. Clay in relation to the American System.—But as Mr. Van Buren was also a supporter of that system, the objection lies equally to him as to Mr. Clay. If it be objected that Mr. Van Buren has changed his mind and is now opposed to the system, it may with truth be said of Mr. Clay, that he stands pledged not to attempt to revive it. If Mr. Clay, therefore, should be the candidate of the opposition, Judge White does not perceive that Mr. Van Buren has any advantages over him on the score of the Tariff and Internal Improvements by the General Government.

Mr. Clay is in favor of a U. States Bank and Mr. Van Buren of the Sub-Treasury, or in other words, of a Government Bank. Judge White is opposed to both, but of the two, esteems the former far less objectionable than the latter. In reference to the Bank question, therefore, Judge White would feel no hesitation in voting for Mr. Clay rather than for Mr. Van Buren. In his opposition to a U. States Bank, Judge White is aware that he differs in opinion with most of his leading friends in Tennessee; but his friends may rest assured, that he will never permit his vote to stand in the way of the wishes of his State, on that or any other question.

These vexed question adjusted, there are other considerations which would decidedly impel Judge White to prefer Mr. Clay to Mr. Van Buren. The former is in favor of a limitation of Executive patronage—the latter against it. Mr. Clay is also opposed to the proscriptive policy which constitutes a prominent feature in Mr. Van Buren's administration.—And so with other measures of national policy.

Abating therefore, not one jot of his principles, but reserving to himself the right of maintaining them, let who may be elected, Judge White, on principle, will give Mr. Clay his ready support in opposition to Mr. Van Buren. And he will act on the same principles in preference to any and all candidates for the Presidency.

Here then are the grounds and principles upon which Judge White and his old Jackson friends in Tennessee are prepared to support Mr. Clay, in case he is selected to run against Mr. V. Buren. This is their position; from which they will neither be persuaded nor driven. Any attempt to force them by gibes and taunts to change their position, come from what quarter soever it may, will be resisted.—A well grounded belief that Mr. Clay or his leading friends would countenance and encourage such attempt, would infallibly lose him the vote of the State. Yet this is what the Nashville Whig is attempting. It sets up to be the real Simon Pure. It is dissatisfied with the position maintained by the great body of Judge White's friends in Tennessee, although that position is precisely similar to the attitude assumed by the original Clay party in Tennessee during the last elections, in reference to the Judge. Did they proclaim Judge White

to be their "Simon Pure," they would only support him for a moment, and then would be altogether for the individual. They, I have said, and appreciate the majority of the Whigs, then, Whig could possess the highest degree of integrity. It will, in its way, regard the Whig.

But other Jackson men may not have seen or rather, may see as well as I do, erroneously through authority—that print men's eyes, forcing them to see the same of Mr. Clay, and tending to give a tardy in giving in the event of intolerance is of the day. For being produced in Nashville to be well for their cause, present aware of

Municipal Advertiser states, (the celebration has made to the New York do 000, for the library, including a copy of the book for the accommodation.

A few days ago, stolen near Knoxville, a black girl, who about the circumstances of the case, upon her testimony, tied him with extreme attention a man named and exclaiming, "the money!" He confesses it! "I never, after reading, he would continue length released, to stand. A resolution began to take who on being told, out, "I have found the wench on my innocent man had told.

"This occurred lesson to all who vengeance of the The atrocious serves to be stamp of men and the actor in the blood should at once be from society and the Nashville Journal.

At death's door, administration, key, and one of the judging from the Kentucky Gazette.

"I give you for fees, if the more freely to the Whigs should age to the Gazette ed up."

A valuable Esq. of Baltimore, valuable method is in the consists simply of influence of age, whom he made learn, made an which proved have no doubt, most invaluable, method of killing, fact it without he conceals, thus reel. On a rough ly one forth of may be this.

Mr. Benton's son's heart.

At Nashville, ter the General getting hold of

"This now for boring ear.—To be sure purpose. Please look at the head Lou. Jour.