

THE RALEIGH TIMES.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY CH. C. RABOTEAU,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS: \$2 50 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE, OR
\$3 00 IF PAYMENT IS DELAYED SIX MONTHS.

VOL. III.

RALEIGH, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1850.

NO 43.

PROSPECTUS FOR ENLARGING AND IMPROVING The Raleigh Times,

AND FOR PUBLISHING SEMI-WEEKLY.

It is proposed to enlarge and improve the *Raleigh Times*, and publish the Paper Semi-Weekly and Weekly after the 1st of November next, if a sufficient number of subscribers can be obtained. The object of the Editor will be mainly to sustain and defend Wm. Principles—to oppose the leading Democratic Presses—and to endeavor to rally and reunite the WING PARTY OF NORTH CAROLINA. He will devote his energies and abilities to this work, with fearless independence and zealous industry. While the *Raleigh Times* will be principally a Political Paper, yet the current News of the day, domestic and commercial, and literary and miscellaneous articles of interest, shall receive a fair share of attention, with the usual variety for general readers. As the Legislature of the State meets next winter, the *Times* will contain a full record of the proceedings of that body. We shall report such Debates as are of great interest, as well as express our free views upon every important subject before it, as far as may be necessary for the information of our distant readers.

It is impossible, within the reasonable limits of a Prospectus, to embrace all the objects and designs of a Newspaper. The general information of the public, upon political, legislative, commercial and domestic matters, together with the latest news, may be found in the columns of the *Times*.

The size of the paper will be that of the *Raleigh Standard*, which the *Times* is intended principally to oppose. A new Press and type, with all other necessary materials, will be used for the printing. The *Weekly* paper, it will be seen by reference to our terms, will therefore be the *cheapest* paper in the State. We design it shall be the best. Let the Whigs of North Carolina support this paper, and extend its circulation far and wide, as the strongest and most fearless advocate of their cause.

To sum up all, the *Times* will be a strong and zealous supporter of the Wing Party; and the active, fearless enemy of Locofocoism and Disunion. We submit our claims to the intelligent and patriotic Whigs of the State for that patronage and support which is necessary for our success.

TERMS OF THE SEMI-WEEKLY.

The Semi-Weekly *Raleigh Times* will be published on Tuesdays and Fridays, at Four Dollars per annum.

TERMS OF THE WEEKLY.

The *Weekly Times* will be published on Friday, and will be sent to subscribers for Two Dollars per annum. Six copies will be sent one year for Ten Dollars. Payable in advance.

For the Postmaster of the State are requested to act as our Agents; and all acting and forwarding subscribers, shall be entitled to a copy of the paper.

Address
CH. C. RABOTEAU,
Editor and Proprietor, Raleigh, N.C.
RALEIGH, Sept. 7, 1850.

REMARKS OF HON. EDWARD STANLEY, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SATURDAY, August 31, 1850.

IN REPLY TO MR. FITCH ON THE SUBJECT OF THE ACTION OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE WITH REFERENCE TO THE CONDUCT OF OFFICE-HOLDERS UNDER MR. POLK'S ADMINISTRATION, &c., &c., &c.

Mr. STANLEY said that if there was nothing of more importance before the House, he would ask attention for a very short time while he submitted some remarks in reply to what had fallen from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FITCH] on the subject of the action of the select committee with reference to the so-called "Bundled" essays, and other things referred to by that gentleman. As this committee derived its existence and its authority from a resolution of the House, if there had been anything in the subject matter unworthy of investigation, it was an unworthy act in the House to appoint the committee and to impose on it the duty of investigating it. Having been appointed and instructed by the House, there was nothing left to that committee but to perform the duties committed to its charge. There had not existed in any member of the committee, so far as he knew, any desire to annoy the gentlemen who were called before it. Had the committee desired to annoy Mr. Ritchie or Mr. Sengstack, they might have made a different report; as it is, they have merely submitted a report stating the facts that the gentlemen had refused to reply to the questions which the committee considered it to be their duty to propound, and to ask instruction as to their future course. The report was made for that purpose alone. It was for the House to decide what course the committee should pursue. A motion made by the gentleman from New Hampshire, [Mr. HIBBERD], to lay the subject on the table, but the House had refused to lay it on the table. After this, there seemed to be nothing left for him to do but to submit the resolution which he had offered.

The gentleman from Indiana had occupied the House for some time in the defence of Mr. Ritchie, and in an elaborate criticism of the course of the committee. Now he would promise at the outset to occupy the House to a longer extent than the gentleman from Indiana had done. That gentleman seemed to be of opinion that the labor of the committee had resulted in ascertaining the name of the writer who had taken the signature of "Bundled." When the facts shall be published, it will appear that much more than this has been ascertained. It was well known who was the author of those essays—it did not require a select committee of nine to find this fact; it would have required committee of two hundred and thirty members, some months to have found a man who ever read a Bundled essay, unless he was connected with the "Union." No one ever thought they did injury; but when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RICHARDSON] was inquiring whether any clerk appointed by Mr. Ewing wrote for newspapers, it was thought advisable to remind him, those essays, under such a horrible name, were written by an office-holder.

He supposed that whenever the committee should make its report, it would be found that money had been collected in the public offices in Washington for the purpose of influencing the elections in the State of Pennsylvania, and for the purpose of sending voters to the election on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, &c. It would be found that persons holding official stations were rambling throughout the country, making electioneering speeches in Pennsylvania and Maryland, and other States; that others were employed in directing documents to the post offices all over the Union, where they could produce any effect. By reference to the names of the journals of the day, it would be found that not only were public officers employed in the direction of these political documents, but even the officers in the Penitentiary were required to do similar services. And is all this nothing? The gentleman from Indiana seemed to consider it. It may be all nothing to Indiana. But must say, that it would be regarded in a very different light in the district which he represented. Ever since the days of Swartwout, there had been a stupor at the amount of the defalcations

which had occurred among the public officers. According to my impression, these defalcations were pretty generally to be found among those who had furnished money to influence the elections. Those who are defalcators must have retained the money of the public for some purpose, and they are found to be most active in raising money for the State of Pennsylvania and other States, during the elections. A disabusing officer may have thousands passing through his hands daily: a friend may come to him and tell him that he wants a certain sum to secure the election, and when their President is elected, the borrower will get an office and repay—especially if he could get a few "extra allowances." The result may turn out differently from what was expected; the reward which was looked for is not obtained, and the officer who has advanced the money becomes a defaulter. Now, was all this to be considered as correct? Was all this nothing? It was all nothing in the opinion of the gentleman from Indiana.

If the gentleman from Indiana had gone a little further in the regions of fancy, he might have found something more which would be applicable to the subject. He would find what were the opinions of Jefferson, Jackson, Macon, &c., on the subject of the interference of officeholders in elections. I could refer to an extract or two for the information of that gentleman, and of the House. I will not read those extracts, Mr. Speaker, for nobody of two hundred and thirty persons can hear reading with patience. I believe, if Webster or Clay would come here and read one of their best speeches, in less than half an hour they would not have half the listeners they had at first.

Mr. Jefferson is the great man for whose memory the Democrats of the present day profess to cherish great respect. Whatever is Jeffersonian is democratic. He is said to be the great head of their party. I think I pay more respect to some of his opinions, than many modern Democrats even from Virginia.

Before Mr. Jefferson was elected President, and while his election was uncertain, he wrote to Governor McKean, February 2, 1801:

"One thing I will say, that, as to the future, interference with elections, whether of the State or General Government by officers of the latter, should be deemed cause of removal; because the constitutionality of the elective principle becomes nothing, if it may be smothered by the enormous patronage of the General Government."—Letter to Gov. McKean, February 2, 1801.

This language to me is very clear. I think Mr. Jefferson was right. What say those who are eternally prating of their Jeffersonian democracy? Hear Mr. Jefferson, again. Shortly after his election to the Presidency, the several heads of departments, by his order, issued a circular, an extract from which I have before me. I will print it with my remarks. I believe it is right now, and deeply regret Mr. Jefferson's professed followers treat with contempt his precepts.

[Here is the extract Mr. S. had before him.]

"The President of the United States has seen with dissatisfaction officers of the General Government taking, on various occasions, active parts in elections of public functionaries, whether of the General or State Governments. Freedom of elections being essential to the mutual independence of government, and of the different branches of the same government, so vitally cherished by most of our constitutions, it is deemed improper for officers depending on the Executive of the Union to attempt to control or influence the free exercise of the elective right. This I am instructed, therefore, to notify all officers within my department, holding their appointments under the authority of the President directly, and to desire them to notify to all subordinate to them. The right of any officer to give his vote at elections as a qualified citizen is not meant to be restrained, nor, however given, shall it have any effect to influence the votes of others, nor take any part in the business of electioneering, but being deemed inconsistent with the spirit of the Constitution and his duties to it."—(See Niles' Register, vol. 29, p. 274.)

General Jackson was a Jefferson Democrat, and when he was elected President, he was disposed to adhere to Jefferson's doctrines.

In General Jackson's inaugural address is the following:

"The recent demonstration of public sentiment in the list of Executive duties, in characters too legible to be overlooked, the task of reform; which will require particularly the correction of those abuses that have brought the patronage of the Federal Government into conflict with the freedom of elections, and the counteraction of those causes which have disturbed the rightful course of appointment, and have placed or continued power in unfaithful or incompetent hands."

Now, sir, will some of the Democracy inform me whether collecting money from clerks here, for the elections in Pennsylvania—whether public officers like Mr. Burke, in the Patent Office, writing for newspapers while he had a salary of three thousand dollars a year—whether officeholders in the city, leaving their offices and making speeches in other States—is bringing the "patronage of the Federal Government in conflict with the freedom of elections?" Did Jefferson and Jackson mean anything or not?

Mr. Buchanan, too, seemed to be of the same opinion. In a speech delivered by him in the House of Representatives, he said:

"Does not the gentleman know, that when a man is once appointed to office, all the selfish passions of his nature are enlisted for the purpose of retaining it? The office-holders are the enlisted soldiers of the administration by which they are sustained."

Hear Mr. Grundy, formerly a Senator from Tennessee, and a distinguished Jefferson Democrat:—"When," said he, in the Senate of the United States, "I see an office-holder interfering in elections, the first idea that strikes me is, that he is thinking of his office and his bread, and therefore an unfit adviser of those whose only object is the public good."

Now the gentleman from Indiana argues as if he thought Jefferson and Jackson were greatly behind the age, and that the enlisted soldiers of the administration were excellent advisers of the people. Genl. Harrison was elected a Jeffersonian Republican, and after his election to the Presidency he issued a circular, following Mr. Jefferson's example, and very nearly in the language of the circular issued by Mr. Jefferson's orders, to which I referred just now. The circular of Presl Harrison bears date March 29, 1841, in the following words:

"The President is of opinion that it is a great abuse to bring the patronage of the General Government into conflict with the freedom of elections, and that this abuse ought to be corrected wherever it may have been permitted to exist, and to be prevented for the future."

He therefore directs information to be given to all officers and agents in your department of the public service, that partisan interference in popular elections, whether of State officers or officers of this Government, and for whomsoever or against whomsoever

it may be exercised, or the payment of any contribution or assessment on salaries or official compensation for party or election purposes, will be regarded by him as a cause of removal.

"It is not intended that any officer shall be retained in the free and proper expression and maintenance of his opinions respecting public men or public measures, or in the exercise to the fullest degree of the constitutional right of suffrage; but persons employed under the Government, and paid for their services out of the public Treasury, are not expected to take an active or officious part in attempts to influence the minds or votes of others—such conduct being deemed inconsistent with the spirit of the Constitution and the duties of public agents acting under it; and the President is resolved, so far as depends upon him, that while the elective franchise by the people shall be free from undue influences of official station and authority, opinion shall also be free among the officers and agents of the Government."

I hope the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FITCH] will read attentively these extracts, and be able to tell his constituents whether Mr. Jefferson and General Jackson were right or wrong.

I should be obliged, also, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. MEADE], who made, as the Union says, an "able speech" on this report, if he will say whether he agrees or disagrees with these opinions of Mr. Jefferson? I wish to hear from a Virginia Democrat, whether Mr. Jefferson was right or wrong.

Mr. MEADE replied, dissenting from the correctness of Mr. STANLEY's readings of the doctrines of Mr. Jefferson's views in the connection. Mr. Jefferson [Mr. M. contended] did not, as Mr. S. intimated, hold that a person on taking office lost his right of citizenship. He was merely opposed to permitting officeholders to neglect their official duties for the purpose of interfering in public affairs. But if Jefferson's doctrine in this matter was as Mr. STANLEY urged, he was understood to say) he (Mr. M.) did not hold to it.

Mr. S. continued. I am glad to hear a Virginia Democrat bold enough to dare to differ with Mr. Jefferson, even with an "if." But, sir, I defy the gentleman to put any other construction on Mr. Jefferson's language than I have. I have not intimated that Mr. Jefferson held an officeholder "lost his right of citizenship." So far from it, Mr. Jefferson held directly the reverse of this, as the extract before me shows. But he said, an officeholder of the General Government should not attempt to influence the votes of others, nor take any part in the business of electioneering. Mr. Jefferson's objection was not that they might neglect their duties. He spoke of a "principle," which the gentleman from Virginia seems to lose sight of. According to that gentleman, an officeholder might employ a substitute, and spend thousands of dollars in electioneering, and travel through several States, "attempting to influence the votes of others," and yet be governed by Mr. Jefferson's circular? If this be so, Mr. Jefferson did not know what he was writing about. The gentleman does not meet directly my question.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FITCH] has said, perhaps it might turn out that a clerk in the Post Office Department had been removed by the Postmaster General in Mr. Polk's time, because he was the political correspondent of a newspaper. The gentleman has traveled somewhat out of the regular order of debate in referring to some of the evidence before the Committee of Investigation. But the gentleman is mistaken. He only remembers a part of the testimony. Not to depart further from the rules than the gentleman has, I will say, perhaps it will appear hereafter that a certain clerk in the Post Office Department was also a reporter, or assistant editor of the Union, and at the same time a correspondent for several political newspapers—a clerk who seemed to have as many hands as Briareus. And this clerk who wrote letters for several papers, was not content with merely giving the title-tattle of Washington city—not content with attacking the Whig party, but he attacked some Democratic members of Congress. It became necessary, too, that the Texas Democracy should assail Silas Wright, and the clerk referred to did this in an Ohio paper. This produced complaint, and after a month elapsed this clerk resigned; employment was found for him in the Patent Office until he went to New York to edit a paper there. The gentleman from Indiana will find this statement better supported by the evidence than his own.

Though the gentleman is mistaken in the facts, I think him for saying it was "prompt and proper action" on the part of a Democratic head of a department to dismiss a clerk for such conduct.

The gentleman from Indiana, in enumerating the discoveries of the committee, said it would be found that he had ascertained that Whig and Democratic committees had sent documents to the folding-room, during the recess of Congress, to be prepared for distribution. But this is not all. Both parties did this; but both parties did not have the assistance of the officers of the Penitentiary. For the first time in the history of our Government have the officers of the Penitentiary been engaged in open electioneering, having thousands of pamphlets folded in the folding room of the House of Representatives, and directed by Penitentiary officers.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, in 1848 allusion was made in the whig papers here, to the conduct of these Penitentiary men; and how do you suppose the charge was answered? Why, sir, the keeper of the Penitentiary had affidavits prepared by his clerks or assistants, and they swore that the "convicts" were not employed in directing documents; and then the "Union" shouted that the charge was fully disproved. I am willing to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the "convicts" did not assist in directing documents. It was by following Locofoco doctrines, and by Locofoco practices that they go to the Penitentiary, and while under punishment, it requires but little charity to believe they were unwilling to scatter falsehoods against the Whigs, whose counsels had they been regarded, would have kept them honest men.

These Penitentiary affidavit-makers had no doubt, read the story of the two thieves: one stole the article and handed it to his companion; he who stole it swore he did not have it, and he who had it swore he did not take it. If the editor of the "Union" had lived in those days, he would, for a proper consideration, have published their affidavits, and said their innocence was fully established.

The gentleman from Indiana says I am entitled to a patent for another discovery, and that is "a discovery which solves a long-unsolved problem, converts what was theory into fact." But this discovery was that at a political gathering at Bladenburg, a Democratic speaker was interrupted by the "call to dinner." When I am entitled to a patent, Mr. Speaker, for converting theory into fact, the gentleman from Indiana will be entitled to one, for converting facts into fancies. I think it will appear, when the evidence is printed, that a Democratic speaker, holding the office of Assistant Postmaster General, was interrupted in his speech by the arrival of a barrel of whiskey. I should like to hear the gentleman from Indiana arguing before his honest constituents that this

was a proper place for an officer holding so high a place under the General Government.

The gentleman from Indiana has, to say the least, of it, very unnecessarily referred to the fact that my honorable friend from Virginia [Mr. HAYMOND] introduced the resolution in the committee bringing Mr. Ritchie's refusal to testify before the House. And the gentleman, still indulging in his imagination in creating "a myth," supposes that the gentleman from Indiana was seeking "revenge," because Mr. Ritchie spoke of him before his election as "a gay young deceiver." If I were to be uncharitable, I thought while the gentleman from Indiana was speaking, I might suppose that gentleman was fishing for a compliment from Mr. Ritchie. It would only be judging the gentleman as he has judged another. I think the intimation was uncalculated for and unjust, for no man in this House bears himself with more modesty, is more respectful towards others, or more exemplary and faithful in the discharge of his duties, than the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. HAYMOND]. His constituents, knowing him well, confided in his intelligence and integrity; and when Mr. Ritchie was struggling hard to secure a Democratic majority here, with a view of getting relief from a contract for printing, his friend, the "accomplished Mr. Thompson," beaten by the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. HAYMOND]. This is the highest offence even Mr. Ritchie can charge against him.

The gentleman from Indiana, in his most fanciful speech, says, as I find reported, when speaking of Mr. Sengstack's refusal to testify, as follows:

"It is usual in a court of justice for a witness to be required to swear to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. This committee departed from this rule, and required a witness to depose to the truth and nothing but the truth, but refused to permit him to state the whole truth, lest it should implicate Whig officeholders in some disreputable transaction—a catastrophe which the Whig portion of the committee resolutely declared it was not their design to bring about—was not the purpose for which the committee was appointed."

Here, sir, the gentleman from Indiana does himself no credit, and does great injustice to the committee. The House will be surprised to learn that the oath which was administered to the witness was after a form prepared in committee when the gentleman from Indiana was present—and so far from "departing from this rule," the witness was sworn to "tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." And as to the Whig portion of the committee "resolutely declaring" the whole truth should not be stated lest it should "implicate Whig officeholders in some disreputable transaction," it is all idle fancy—all the creation of the gentleman's imagination—such stuff as dreams are made of. The gentleman should not just so with facts. If I understand the argument of the gentleman from Indiana correctly, it is this: If a witness is brought into court to testify relative to an assault he saw committed by John Smith on Bill Jones, the witness asks properly if he says, I will not tell you what I know of that fight, unless you allow me to say what I know of another fight between two of the jury!

The gentleman from Indiana has criticized the form of the question which was propounded to Mr. Ritchie. He was asked, as the other witnesses were, to state what he might know relative to the several matters referred to in the resolution of the House of May 6, which he had before him. He declined to give the names of his correspondents. No one of the committee complained of this; we all appreciated his feelings. But, in order to enable the committee to discharge its duty, and not to urge Mr. Ritchie to depart from the course he thought proper to pursue, the question was put to him in what was deemed an unobjectionable form, as follows: "Was the author of the communication in the Union of Sept. 12, 1848, an office-holder embraced in the resolution of the House?" It was very easy for Mr. Ritchie to answer this question without betraying any of his correspondents, which no one wished him to do, in a matter of so little importance especially. But the gentleman from Indiana would impress upon the House that he cannot tell which is the communication referred to, and says he does not know, neither does he believe any other member does, except the chairman. Now this is "strange—passing strange." The question was written carefully by one of the members of the committee, not by the chairman, and the Union was before Mr. Ritchie, and the communication shown him; and yet the gentleman from Indiana pretends he does not know what communication was referred to!

The object in asking the question was merely to confirm the testimony previously taken, that the writer of the communication, who said he wrote the life of Cass, was an office-holder under Polk; was, at the early part of this session, one of the "favorite candidates" of the Democratic party; and afterwards ran away to avoid being sent to the Penitentiary. Does the gentleman from Indiana now know which was the communication?

The gentleman from Indiana thinks this investigation will prove all "tomfoolery." I think the country will form a very different opinion when the report is printed; but whatever there may have been of tomfoolery in our proceedings, the gentleman has proved himself as well qualified to take part in it as any other member of the committee.

As far as the gentleman has commented on the remarks of my friend from Maryland [Mr. EVANS] I have nothing to say. He is well able to take care of himself; and though the Union says he was slain by the "eloquent and witty" member from Indiana, it will be necessary for Mr. Ritchie to say of the "eloquent and witty" gentleman that "he slew the slain," before he kills the gentleman from Maryland. He will not stay dead under such killing.

I remarked a few moments since, Mr. Speaker, that if I were uncharitable I might find a motive which actuated the gentleman from Indiana to defend Mr. Ritchie. The gentleman said Mr. Ritchie was (I quote his words before me) "a man much his senior—a man who, whatever political errors may be chargeable to him, has ever borne the character of a good citizen and honorable gentleman; who has for forty years been a leading political editor, giving tone and sentiment to thousands of men, and patriotism, and talent, equal to whatever of those qualities the gentleman from Maryland may possess. It will become a very sad politician, like him and myself, to assail one who has been the companion and intimate friend of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe."

Now, sir, is not the whole secret explained? This editor gives "tone and sentiment to thousands." Yes, no doubt, in Indiana, as well as in Virginia.

You Democrats, Mr. Speaker, are a fortunate set of gentlemen. You are blessed with an editor remarkable for his powers in making great men out of small materials; and, according to Mr. Ritchie, there are none but "great, eloquent, able, and witty" men among you. Mr. Ritchie's goose is all swans. I do not mean to say you are all gone—by no means. I know many among your party who need not such fulsome praise—who are disgusted with it. But the gentleman from In-

diana, though certainly far from being a goose, is one of Mr. Ritchie's swans in the Union this morning.

Hear Mr. Ritchie in the editorial of August 31st, 1850.

"SELF DEFENCE.—It was our intention to review the honorable ALEXANDER EVANS's attack, and expose his folly in its true colors; but the whole matter is done up so completely to our hand by the eloquent and witty member from Indiana—Dr. FITCH—that it is scarcely necessary for us to add another syllable to the subject. It would be really attempting to gild refined gold, or to add perfume to the rose, or, what is still more pertinent, to attempt to slay the slain."

Is not this done "up completely?" Is this giving "tone and sentiment to thousands?" While we mourn for the "slain," let us congratulate the thrice-lucky, "eloquent and witty" "Dr. FITCH," who has received his reward from the swan-making, tone-and-sentiment-giving Mr. Ritchie, the friend of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe!

Now, sir, I ask again, if it is not as fair in me to presume the gentleman from Indiana was actuated by a hope of getting a compliment from Mr. Ritchie, as it was in that gentleman to intimate that my friend from Virginia, in his conduct, was influenced by personal unkindness?

I am not disposed now to deny that Mr. Ritchie may be a gentleman, though we sometimes differ in opinion as to the attributes of a gentleman—I am disposed to respect his age. To respect old age, was one of the earliest lessons of my childhood. I was taught it very soon after I learned the ten commandments. I would give Mr. Ritchie my umbrella in a storm, and provide for myself as I could. I would resign a seat in a carriage to him, and walk home to save him from personal inconvenience. But by admitting he is entitled to our respect for his age, it does not follow that he is infallible or faultless as an editor. Who can read the Union for the first six months of the current year, and see how shameless and ferocious were the assaults upon General Taylor and his Cabinet, without saying Mr. Ritchie ought to blush when he remembers them? How different is the character of the National Intelligencer. In the most excited party times, who ever saw an editorial in that paper grossly abusive of its political opponents, or calculated to give pain to the families of members of a Cabinet? How many hundreds of such articles have appeared in the Union?

But he was the friend of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, and, therefore, the gentleman from Indiana argues, when Mr. Ritchie assails any member of Congress, he is to submit in silence, and Mr. Ritchie is to be the uncontradicted "Sir Oracle" of the press. I am willing to admit, when the gentleman from Indiana makes a speech, no man can do justice to its merits. No even Mr. Ritchie is able.

"To gild refined gold, to paint the lily,
To throw a perfume on the violet,
To smooth the ruff, or add another hue
Unto the rainbow;"

or, as Mr. Ritchie has it, "to add perfume to the rose."

But it does not follow that all are "slain" whom either the editor of the Union, or the gentleman from Indiana attacks. Mr. Blair, formerly the editor of the *Globe*, was the companion and friend of General Jackson, and of Colonel Benton. Mr. Blair is as reputable as Mr. Ritchie in every respect; yet by Mr. Blair's published statement, Mr. Polk was guilty of a departure from the truth. I do not at all doubt that Mr. Blair told the truth in the statement to which I allude, but according to the logic of the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Polk is not to be believed, for Mr. Blair was the friend of Jackson, was honored by his confidence. I will not now argue how much of honor Mr. Ritchie derived from the friendship of Jefferson. I may be the opinion of some, that Mr. Jefferson received as much honor as he conferred. Politics, like misery, makes us acquainted with strange company. Mr. Jefferson was a man of singular tastes, and sometimes unworthy persons were the objects of his regard. The gentleman from Indiana is educated, and has cultivated his talents. If he will read Sullivan's Familiar Letters, and the Observations on the Writings of Jefferson, he will hesitate to say that Mr. Ritchie was the most honest of men because he was the friend of Jefferson.

The gentleman from Indiana said, that when a report is made from another select committee relative to certain charges against a member, [Mr. GIMCKINS], it will be found that a Whig editor refuses to betray the correspondent of a paper. Yes, sir, I was aware of this fact, and was anxious, I confess, to let the Democracy act on Mr. Ritchie's case, before they could reach the Whig editor. I know the Democrats could not punish one and allow another to pass by unnoticed.

But the gentleman speaks of the "waste of time and money to the country." Sir, who is responsible for this? The first step was taken on the other side of the House; and when this report was made I occupied not five minutes. A motion was made to lay the report on the table. And now, sir, inform the gentleman from Indiana that I examined the votes of his friends, and if they had not changed their votes, after the roll had been called, the report would have been laid on the table. But twenty-two Democrats changed their votes and refused to dispose of the report. And strange to say, the gentleman from Indiana was among those who changed. He is responsible for this "waste of time and money," as much as any other gentleman. He voted against laying the report on the table.

But the gentleman from Indiana spoke of the trivial character of this investigation. Very trivial, indeed: when a little while after the gentleman said he had desired to "enlarge the powers of the committee, that he might examine the conduct of Whig as well as Democratic officeholders." Oh! how consistent are these trivial objections? The gentleman complains that the "enlargement" was refused. Why? because he was told, if he wanted to examine the conduct of Whig officeholders, he could get a committee consisting of a majority of Democrats; he can have this now. The Whigs believed the purpose of the enlargement was to impose additional labors on the committee, and propose a report this session. The Whigs wanted an enlargement of the powers of the first investigating committee, raised on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. RICHARDSON]. Why did the Democratic party deny that to us? To examine the conduct of Democratic officeholders who were correspondents of papers in "rival" in the estimation of the gentleman from Indiana; but to examine whether any Whig officeholders were correspondents is an "enlargement of powers," not trivial! What will Mr. Ritchie say when he compliments the logic of the gentleman from Indiana? A trivial matter, indeed! I find by the *Journal* before me, that on the twenty-ninth day of April last, a gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. WATSON], moved to suspend the rules to

enable him to introduce a resolution to appoint a select committee to inquire whether there existed any combination to break up the contract system as regards the public printing, and to inquire whether any laws are necessary to prevent fraudulent or fictitious bids." Here was a grave matter involving a question of hundreds of thousands of dollars. On this motion to suspend the rules the vote was—yeas 145, nays 14; and among the nays are the names of GRAHAM N. FITCH and RICHARD K. MEADE. Was this, too, a "trivial affair" to the gentleman from Indiana, or to the gentleman from Virginia who made the "able speech" on the freedom of the Press?

Now, sir, let us see who is responsible for beginning these trivial "investigations." On the 23d of April, by "unanimous consent," as appears from *Journals* of this session, page 818 Mr. RICHARDSON, of Illinois, offered a series of resolutions, proposing to raise a select committee to inquire into certain charges he made against Mr. Ewing; and the fifth of the series was as follows:

"Whether any person or persons in office, by appointment from said Ewing, are correspondents or editors of newspapers and what papers they edit or write for, and what their salaries."

The question was put, Will the House agree to the said resolutions? and among the votes in the affirmative I find the names of GRAHAM N. FITCH, WILLIAM MCWILLIE, and R. H. STANTON, Democrats, members of the committee from which this report comes; and also the name of R. K. MEADE, who, according to the editorial of the "Union" of this morning, "made a vigorous attack" upon the report of the committee.

On the 6th of May, after the resolutions of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RICHARDSON] had been agreed to, I offered, as an amendment to his, the resolutions under which the committee of which I was chairman was acting. From page 875 of the *Journals*, it will appear as follows:

"Mr. STANLEY moved that the rules be suspended for the purpose of enabling him to offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the select committee appointed on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. RICHARDSON], to inquire and report what persons in office, by appointment of Thomas Ewing, Secretary of the Interior, are correspondents of newspapers, their salaries, and what papers they edit or write for, be also instructed to inquire and report to this House what persons holding office under the last administration, clerks, &c., &c., wrote for or edited newspapers, &c., &c."

I wanted the "whole truth," on both sides.

On page 877 of the *Journal*, it will appear the demand for the previous question was not seconded. So the Democratic party refused to allow any amendment. Then it was said, "Take a select committee." I agreed, modified my resolution accordingly, and a select committee was appointed: an "enlargement" of powers to Mr. RICHARDSON's committee was refused.

But this is not the end of the "trivial" proceedings.

On the 27th May the gentleman from Kentucky, a member of the committee, to whose fairness it gives me pleasure to testify, [Mr. R. H. STANTON], moved to suspend the rules to enable him to offer a resolution to instruct the committee appointed on the 6th of May, 1850, to inquire, among other things, what clerks and other officers absented themselves from their duties to engage in folding and directing documents, to be circulated to promote the election of General Taylor, &c., &c., &c. Surely to such a trivial matter, the gentleman from Indiana was opposed; but no, the *Journal* before me bear witness that GRAHAM N. FITCH, HENRY HIBBERD, WILLIAM MCWILLIE, and R. H. STANTON, all the Democratic members of the committee, together with Mr. R. K. MEADE, voted to suspend the rules.

Now, sir, I hope we shall hear no more witty and eloquent speeches against this "trivial" investigation.

One remark more, and I take leave of the gentleman from Indiana.

The gentleman, while lecturing my friend from Maryland, [Mr. EVANS], forgot, I think, the propriety that became him. He saw fit to refer to Mr. Truman Smith, of the Senate, in no respectful way. He used the word "corruption" in connection with his name. And what was the instance of corruption? It proves that Mr. Smith franked a good many documents to different States, and some of them were sent to a postmaster; and how did this happen? Both Whigs and Democrats—all, I might say, frank papers and speeches at the request of other persons. Sometimes in an excited canvass, names are sent, with the request that speeches should be sent to them. It was so with Mr. Smith. He had no knowledge of the persons to whom he franked, and had no information whether they held office or were private citizens.

Sir, the gentleman from Indiana does not know Mr. Smith. His worst enemy cannot deny he is a man of ability and of irreproachable private character. He was honored by General Taylor with the offer of a seat in his Cabinet. As a patriot, he is disinterested. As a man, his reputation is unsullied. Well will it be for the gentleman from Indiana, if he is able to preserve as good a name as Mr. Smith has—a name far above the reach of any assaults the gentleman from Indiana can make.

A few words in reply to the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. MEADE], and I will detain the House no longer. That gentleman, in defending the conduct of those officeholders who interfered in elections, said, he hoped no man was slavish enough to subscribe to this doctrine, that when he takes communion, he forfeits his rights as a private citizen. It might be answered enough to this, to refer the gentleman again to what Mr. Jefferson says.—But let us ask the gentleman, do officers of the army forfeit any of their rights when they accept a commission? Surely not. But that would not make it proper in the colonel of a regiment to give his soldiers tickets and march them up to the polls, compelling them to vote as he wished. He would ask the gentleman from Virginia, does a man who takes charge of a congregation in North Carolina forfeit any of his rights? By no means. Yet a clergyman who has the care of souls, is not allowed to be a member of our Legislature. It is a revolutionary principle, that the people, the laity are to be free from the control of the priests in their public conduct. It was also thought proper to keep the military subordinate to the civil power. But it has never been alleged, that when a man becomes a soldier or a clergyman, he was forfeiting his rights as a citizen.

Some things are contrary to the letter of the Constitution, and others are contrary to its spirit. No officer of the army or navy can hold a seat in this House. No person holding "any office under the United States" shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office. If an American citizen who holds an office under the General Government forfeits his rights, and cannot hold a seat here, he forfeits them according to the Constitu-