

# THE STAR AND NORTH CAROLINA GAZETTE.

DAVID OUTLAW, Editors.  
THOS. J. LEMAY, Proprietor.

RALEIGH, N. C. THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1836

VOL XXVII. NO. 17

THOMAS J. LEMAY,  
PROPRIETOR AND PUBLISHER.

**TERMS.**  
Subscriptions, three dollars per annum—one half a year. Subscribers in other States cannot be allowed to remain arrears longer than one year, & persons resident without this State, who may desire to become subscribers, will be strictly required to pay the whole amount of the year's subscription in advance.  
Advertisements, not exceeding fifteen lines inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for each continuance.  
Letters to the Editor must be post paid.

LETTER V.  
Albion, Sept. 15th, 1834.

To the Hon. Martin Van Buren.  
SIR—During the year 1812, and for sometime previous, you was a resident of Hudson. Mr. James A. Hamilton was also a resident of the same place. Congenial spirits, an intimacy was formed, which has ripened into a most affectionate and tender friendship. The ties which now bind you together are indissoluble. They are the ties of policy and of interest. Each in the other is known. At that period you were *unofficially* rallying under different standards; but really, had the same objects in view. It was the design of both to discredit the war; of both, to bring into disrepute the authors and advocates of the war; of both, to decry Southern men; and Southern measures; of both, to destroy the well earned popularity of Jas. Madison, and thus defeat his re-election.

On the 8th of July, 1812, an address of the Hudson federalists was published. The object was, to convene a meeting of the party in the county, for the purpose of denouncing the President and the war. Among other federalists, it was signed by James A. Hamilton, and the convention referred to.  
Resolved, *That the war is impolitic, unnecessary, and disastrous; and that to expel the militia in an offensive war* (that is, to enter Canada) *is unbecomingly national.*

It was with such men that you were acting during the summer and autumn of 1812, in opposition to James Madison; and yet, your adherents have impudently represented you as the early friend of the war. It is not alone the policy which you pursued in 1812, that I am anxious to hold up to condemnation; but the profligacy, also, of assailing and traducing the opponents of the war, after having acted in concert with them at its commencement; and not having abandoned them until they and you were defeated in the presidential contest.

The whole summer and autumn of 1812, the enemies of Mr. Madison were indefatigable, throughout the state of New York, in their efforts to prevent his re-election. Nor was your sir, a calm or an idle spectator. Your denunciations of the war, and its authors, were loud and strong. The papers which were supported by you and your friends, (I do not allude to acknowledged *federal* journals) were in the constant habit of using language, such as the following, which is extracted from one of them: August, 1812. *An administration which enters into war, without reneue, without preparation, and without plan, or with preparation worse than none, pursues a miserable course.* &c. Again.  
October, 1812. *Madison has begun war, with his debts; deb's huge taxes; hezel bankruptcy &c.* &c.  
*Clinton will hezel peace; peace hegets riches and property; property begets harmony.* &c.

Such was the language of the public prints (in this State) which advocated your views and your policy. As it is unfair, or uncandid, to infer that it was done by your authority, and with your approbation?

These references are made, for the purpose of shewing how the war, in 1812, absorbed your whole soul. It has already been remarked, that Mr. Clinton was nominated at a caucus held in this city, on the 29th of May, 1812. Mr. Madison was nominated in Congressional caucus, on the 23d of May, 1812; and here I have a word for your friend and champion, Mr. Ritchie, of Richmond. The old man is good at a sunset. His present support of you is evidence of the fact. Do you believe, as he evidently does, that Virginia can be made to follow his bidding? While you were thus opposing Mr. Ritchie, with equal zeal, supporting Mr. Madison. On the 12th of February, 1812, the Virginia legislature held a caucus to nominate electors. It continued, during the evenings of the 13th and 14th. Andrew Stevenson, was Chairman; Thomas Ritchie, was secretary.

After giving the ticket the Editor of the Enquirer remarks, "It is proper to say, that but one sentiment reign'd, through the meeting, and that the only test laid down, whether they should or should not vote for such and such an elector was—whether he would or would not vote for James Madison as President of the United States."

On the 3d November, 1812, the legislature met in this city for the purpose of choosing electors. You took your seat as a member of the Senate.

ing the tables against them admirably. He told them that they had pretended to discover a good deal of that kind of policy in a certain quarter here he looked quite knowing at the Vice President) - but that their resolution draft a respectful answer. That answer is laconic, cold, and heartless. It times more non-committal than any contains no sentence approving the war, or complimenting the patriots who had the firmness to assert the nation's rights. It contains no denunciation of that Government who had plundered our property, incarcerated in floating dungeons our defenceless citizens, and who by their wrongs had driven us to take up arms in self-defence. And yet with this official document, starting us in the face, you are unblushingly pronounced a friend to the late war.

The following is your chilling language: "The Senate fully concur with your Excellency in the sentiment, that at a period like the present, when our country is engaged in a war with one of the most powerful nations of Europe, difference of opinion on abstract points, should not be suffered to impede or prevent our united and vigorous support of the constituted authority of the nation." Consume that modestly.

In this manner you refer to the war in 1812. But in 1814 you had abandoned your late friends. You was again on a committee to answer the Governor's message. How changed your tone. Speaking of Mr. Madison and his cabinet, you say—"An administration, selected for its wisdom and its virtues will, in our opinion, prosecute the war till our multiplied resources are exhausted, and our rights secured." Indeed! how patriotic. But why was not this discovery made in 1812? Why did you oppose an administration selected for its wisdom and its virtues? Why did you attempt to overthrow and cast it down? Why did you not in 1812, speak of avenge our multiplied wrongs and secure our rights?"

In 1816 you was on a similar committee. Peace had now been proclaimed. In your reply to the Governor, you say—"The war in which the nation has been involved, was not only righteous in its origin, but successful in its prosecution." Did you, or did not, know in 1812, that the war was righteous in its origin? Why was your doubt founded on the subject at that time?

My next letter will notice your course in the caucus of November, 1812, when you opposed the nomination of Col. Henry Rutgers and others, as presidential electors, and then your vote in the Senate, on this nomination, will be reviewed. These acts are fine specimens of your early zeal in favor of the war.

PATRICK HENRY.  
Correspondence of the Baltimore Patriot.  
Washington, March 21, 1836.

EXPUNGING.  
A FAR E—SCENE SECOND.  
Mr. Benton gave us the conclusion of his introductory speech to-day. It was in the hands of the printer of the Globe on Thursday last week. Though less brilliantly attended to-day, the Senate Chamber bore witness to the zeal of this firm, consistent, long tried, faithful, honorable friend of the President's for his honor, fame and glory. If BENTON be not President of the United States after MARTIN VAN BUREN, why then "Republicans are ungrateful," let who will gainsay it!

Mr. B. commenced his labor of love to-day with a detailed examination of that part of the President's conduct which furnished the Senate with the occasion of the resolutions. In that could not be maintained there was nothing at all meritorious in the Senate contrary to the Constitution. He read several extracts to prove that it was not so, from the protest of the President, and entered into an argument to show that there was no ground for the accusation contained in the resolution adopted, on motion of Mr. Clay, by the Senate.

Then he began to criticise that resolution. He said it was ambiguous in its terms. Blaming the President for an impeachable offence, it did not even show the grounds of the accusation. It alluded, without specification, to some, "late conduct" of the President, and passed a grave censure upon that officer, without making out a case against him, or attempting to do so. With a peculiarity of illustration that may well be called Bentonian, he said the opposers of the President in the Senate had made up "a pony purse of guilt," each putting something into it, and all contributing to make it operate against its object.

Next he fell into a strain of irony. If ever any man was absurdly ridiculous when attempting to be jocose, Benton, the Expunger, is that man. He is like a monkey who has had his tail razed;—the higher he climbs, and the more frisky he grows, the more palatable he shows his defect. Most lugubrious mieth is Benton's. He was for making out all the opposition the non-nopolisers of the non-committal policy. This he thought would indeed be turn-

ing the tables against them admirably. He told them that they had pretended to discover a good deal of that kind of policy in a certain quarter here he looked quite knowing at the Vice President) - but that their resolution draft a respectful answer. That answer is laconic, cold, and heartless. It times more non-committal than any contains no sentence approving the war, or complimenting the patriots who had the firmness to assert the nation's rights. It contains no denunciation of that Government who had plundered our property, incarcerated in floating dungeons our defenceless citizens, and who by their wrongs had driven us to take up arms in self-defence. And yet with this official document, starting us in the face, you are unblushingly pronounced a friend to the late war.

All this was given in the usual courteous and elegant style of Mr. Benton, while his friends Lane, Alexander, Everett, Blair, and the rest sat near him in wrapt and applause admiration.

"And they all of them turn'd up the whites of their eyes,  
"And all of them cried 'oh law!'"  
Mr. Benton said that the language of the Senate towards the President during that famous debate, on Mr. Clay's resolution was paralleled only by that of Coke towards Raleigh, by Jefferson on his western circuits, and by the French terrorists towards their victims. "I know something of the history of nations, Mr. President, and can draw comparisons from its pages." Most accurate and classical Mr. Benton!

This celebrated orator took occasion to remark, when alluding to these proceedings of the Senate, predicting so much defeat and distress to the business community, that "the withdrawal by the President of the public deposits from the United States Bank was no more calculated to produce a pressure in the money market, than the tossing of a pea into the Chesapeake Bay was likely to raise a tempest in the Atlantic Ocean!" Shade of Blair! What a burst of rhetorical splendor! And yet the orator promised that he should indulge in no such lofty imaginings, to such magnificent flights!—Kind soul! To re-consider a resolution, fraught with so much disappointment to thy admiring auditors!

Then raved he against the Bank for getting up the panic, then recapitulates the old story about the subaltern part played by the Senate, then winks he at Blair who *grins*, and at Clay who tries as hard as a gentleman ever should to keep his eyes open, then "stirs" he "up" all "the monkeys with a long pole," by turning round to where they sit with gaping admiration of him, and telling them that the Bank folks kept the Senate panicking here while they were laughing in their sleeves, having made a good speculation out of the removal of the deposits! "The Bank" said Benton "should have sent a note to its servants here, and told them that the panic was all over and that it was time to give over panicking." Hs. had said Lane. He, he! grinn'd Blair. Ho ho! gasped Cuthbert, while all the rest joined in the exultant chorus, *ad libitum*, of this splendid effort of their witty *Magnus Opus*.

The Bank was demolished, and will doubtless immediately relinquish their new charter. The Senate was struck dumb with delight on one side, and inextricable confusion the other, and the Great Expunger was the idol of the hour; those who did not worship him out of love, bowed before him out of fear! It was Benton's Apotheosis!

Then followed a labored adulatory peroration, in favor of President Jackson, the payer of the National debt! the originator!! of a plan for the uniform defence of the nation!!! the saviour of his country from the Bank!!! He ascribed to that functionary more wisdom than Washington, more political sagacity than Pitt, more patriotism than Brutus. He praised his foreign and domestic policy, he eulogised him personally, publicly, privately, relatively and individually, said he had been rewarded with infamy by a Senate jealous of his popularity, and with honor and love by a people who would never be satisfied till the former had expunged the stigma they had dared to throw upon him from their records! He said there was only one parallel in history to this most exalted instance of patriotic devotedness; and that was the Consul of Rome, who had exploded the Catalinian conspiracy, and saved the State from its machinations. Jackson and the Consul, Rome and our country, Catalini and Biddle were perfectly parallel in this comparison, Benton

thought, and the subsequent banishment of the Consul, and condemnation of the President, made it still more perfect. One thing only was wanted to make it complete, and that was that the public voice should remove the stigma in the one case as in the other. Mr. Porter has the floor to-morrow. Nothing important in the House. Petition day.

March 22, 1836.  
Mr. PORTER'S SPEECH.—  
Mr. PORTER'S SPEECH.—  
Mr. PORTER'S SPEECH.—

The party force did not assemble in so large numbers as yesterday. I saw nothing of Blair and the intellectual brow of Mr. Smith, of Albion, and the portly figure of the graceful Mr. Vanderpool, of Kunklehook, were among the missing. —Blair, of the Globe was on the duty, and Everett, the weaker after something he will not find, was duly re-elected at Benton's show as usual. Mr. Wall read Blackwood's Magazine, (I thought it was the latest issue.) Governor Hill presided not to listen, and for the rest, I never knew Senators and audience more attentive.

Mr. Porter began by announcing that this Senate had no more right over the late resolutions of Congress than over those of any other Congress. (I thought it was the latest issue.) He declared the relation of the Senate to each Congress, forming a part of its duty, and having after an adjournment or dissolution no power over its doings as to make it a clear point to every understanding.

He argued that it was the duty of the Senate and the House to keep a record of all its proceedings. The Constitution does not exclude either to constitutional proceedings, it includes all, whether constitutional or otherwise. It is like, whether otherwise, the Journals of Congress would present a very singular appearance. But they were intended not merely as guides to the understanding of the resolutions of Congress, but as a record, warning against errors. "Leaving then all the extraneous subject introduced into this debate, the Bank, the panic, the treasury, bank, gold money, the president, glory, and the old-father list." Mr. Porter said he should discuss the question upon its merits. He consulted the Constitution, and showed that it requires the Senate "to keep a record of its proceedings," and he then went into an inquiry as to what was meant verily, by this requisition. Any unlettered man or woman from Maine to the Sabine, he contended, would answer that question as soon as asked, and correctly; but the lawyers and the gentlemen from Missouri called them, the "theatricalists" of the Senate could not answer it so readily. As far as he could understand it, "to keep" in not to record and preserve, in the sense used by the Constitution; other definitions doubtless could be given. The gentleman from Missouri had given the word its true meaning, but he had not given its true meaning, but had furnished no definition. In England, it means what has been said, and in Scotland, too, "to keep" is to record and preserve. "to keep a journal is to record and preserve proceedings." "to keep a journal" requires the gentleman under the table, to understand the requisition to mean "to record and preserve," the gentleman from Missouri could not mean to obliterate and deface. He then went on to detail the result of a different doctrine being established. In the fluctuation of party, the journals would be used as a guide to the true party aims, and alterations, were made to mere party aims, and from page to page, would show nothing but expurgations and erasures. This Mr. Porter said, had been anticipated by Benton as special pleading; the reason of this was that "some were aware that the same charge would be brought against his arguments, and that he would therefore forestall the other side in using it."

In a style of facetiousness and sarcastic irony, peculiar to that witty and talented Senator, Mr. Porter then went on to give some practical illustrations of the latitude claimed by Benton in defining the word "to keep." He instanced the case of a man's carrying a box to a library, and to be kept. He asks the groom "to keep" him, and on asking how this has been done, he receives for reply, that that word has thirty-six meanings according to Webster's dictionary, and that as one of these meanings was "to copy closely," and that as the groom could not do that with the horse, he had turned him out! How would the gentleman from Missouri like that? And so with a book: suppose the Senator from Missouri should give a friend a book "to keep," and afterwards asking for it, should be told that "to keep" is "to put in the library," "to put in the book," and that as the book had refused to go out, it had not been kept; how would that suit the gentleman's idea of keeping? And then Mr. Porter asked Mr. Benton "supposing that years ago, when I first had the pleasure of meeting that gentleman on the pleasant banks of the Ohio, he had turned the lock of his door to grass! Would the not in such a case be likely to call him a gay, dissipated, and a half-splitter?" I can give you an idea of the talents of Sheridan; and so seemed to think the laughter. Even Benton could not forbear a smile, although evidently deeply disappointed to see his pet definition of "keeping a journal" fairly laughed out of existence.

"But the gentleman from Missouri," said Mr. Porter, "has great resources. He has remedy for every difficulty." He then exposed the fallacious arguments which he had based, you will remember, on the fact that there are a thousand printed copies of the Journal distributed by law and kept, and that one Journal, namely the manuscript, kept by the Secretary, being only one it was not important to keep. Before the clear elucidation of Mr. P. this fallacy faded away like smoke which follows the discharge of a cannon.

The argument of Benton that the parliamentary usage of Great Britain, from which we have our parliamentary rules, sanctioned expurgating the records, was yet more signally overthrown; and by an answer that every child will see the force of, and conclusive to every objection, Mr. P. of "There is nothing in the Constitution of Great Britain on the subject of 'keeping the journals' of the legislature; it is there mere *lex parliamentaria*. In this country, it is a constitutional requisition; and we follow British parliamentary usage only when not limited by the Constitution."

But Mr. Porter insisted that if the precedents furnished by British history are to be followed, they be thoroughly followed throughout. He asserted that the House of Commons had never voted to expunge any thing from their Journal concerning the Executive. When that had been done, it had always been done by the hands of the Executive himself.

dence in addressing the Senate on this question. The honorable Senator from Missouri has, with his usual industry, pronounced an elaborate argument in support of the resolution he has offered to the Senate. I suppose well as the simplicity and patriotism it to be the result of long meditation and much preparation. Neither the time allotted me since this discussion commenced, nor the state of my health, has enabled me to give to the question the attention it merits; indeed, such is our wisdom and our virtues. There is nothing therefore in the spirit of our Constitution, any more than there is in its letter, which can be tortured into the slightest support of the alarming and dangerous proposition which the Senator proposes for our adoption. I might, therefore, sir, well spare myself the task of following the honorable Senator from Missouri through the labored examination which he has made of the vote of the Senate in the year 1834, in relation to the removal of the deposits by the President, or of noticing the heated and exaggerated picture he has drawn of the motives of those by whom it was given. Such discussion can have no profitable effect on the naked question as to the power of the Senate to alter and deface the public record. It may, it is true, increase party spirit, and flush it to the perpetration of an act which, in my conscience and on my honor, I believe will hereafter (when reason resumes its sway) be a source of deep mortification to all who now participate in it; but it can do nothing more. However, sir, some of the assertions and reasonings of the honorable Senator in this part of his speech to the Senate ought not to pass entirely unnoticed, and I may, perhaps, speak a little to a few of them before I sit down. My present purpose, however, is with the merits of the question, and leaving to the honorable Senator, for a time, the banks, and the panic, and the panic makers, and President Jackson, and his glory, and the old federalist—who, by the way, if they have joined the present Administration, are all transmuted into *pure democrats of the old school*—I shall proceed to discuss the subject upon those considerations, and those alone, by which, in my view of the matter, a correct conclusion can be obtained.

And, proceeding to do so, sir, I find it written in the fifth section of the first article of the constitution, that "each House shall keep a journal of its proceedings, and, from time to time, publish the same, excepting such parts as may, in their judgment, require secrecy." Now, sir, the first question which suggests itself in the inquiry is, what is meant by the words "keep a journal of its proceedings?" To that question I know of but one answer that can be given; and it is that which instantly suggests itself to every one, learned and unlearned who reads them, namely, that each House should record its proceedings, and preserve the record so made. If this be not the true meaning, I know not what answer can be given. No other will satisfy the object contemplated by the Constitution. For without recording there would be no journal, and, without preserving the journal would not be kept. The honorable Senator has not furnished us with his reading of this clause. He has, to be sure, talked, and talked correctly, of a variety of meanings which belong to the word *keep*; but viewed in any other light than as a handsome exercise of ingenuity, I could not see what practical result was to be attained from the discussion; for, after all, he failed to tell us what meaning he precisely attached to the expressions *keep a journal*. In this, sir, he did wisely.—They have one, and one only meaning, in the common sense of all mankind. They have never had any other in England, or in Scotland, or in Ireland, nor in any of the twenty four sovereignties which compose this Union. The understanding of them has been uniform, whether applied to courts of justice or legislative bodies. *The House shall keep a journal, the Clerk shall keep a record, in all times, and in all countries where the language prevails, have been understood to write down what is done, and to preserve what is written.* The expression, it is true, is idiomatic, but for that very reason is the sense unembarrassed and perfect. It never was questioned or denied until the honorable Senator, in this rash attempt, found it necessary to perplex and mystify what until now every one considered clear and intelligible.

If then, Mr. President, the plain meaning of the words *keep a journal of its proceedings* be that the Senate shall cause a record of its proceedings to be made, and preserve them, is there an impartial man who can doubt or deny that the resolution offered by the senator is a manifest violation of the Constitution? I think there is not for the effect of that resolution will not be to preserve but to destroy. Does it make any difference that only a part of these proceedings, not the whole, is to be blotted, or obscured, or defaced? It makes none. The injunction is, that you shall keep a journal of your proceedings; and if you deface any, the smallest portion of

the Constitution, it is clear, cannot be satisfied by the distinction the gentleman has made. Its language is directly, palpably opposed to it; so also, sir, is its spirit. It is giving the enlightened framers of that instrument credit indeed for little wisdom to suppose that they contemplated making any difference. The objects sought to be attained by this constitutional injunction were many. They will readily suggest themselves to Senators, and it is unnecessary to enumerate them. Among the most important was the preservation of the evidence of the great public concerns and valuable private interests which depend on the action of Congress. Another scarcely less important object was to secure to the People a record of their servants' acts and votes, so that a correct judgment might be formed of their conduct, and justice dealt to them when their term of service expired. The illustrious men by whom the inestimable charter of our Union was formed, knew well that history which professes to teach, and does teach by the lights which experience furnishes, would be a false and treacherous guide if it recorded only the good deeds of men. They knew it was of equal importance it should enregister their errors and their vices, and they intended, therefore, that the record which they made provision for should be a beacon to warn as well as a light to allure. What useful knowledge, sir, could any man acquire by the perusal of ancient story, if it presented

SPEECH OF MR. PORTER, OF LOUISIANA.  
In opposition to the motion made by Mr. Benton to Expunge from the Journal of the Senate the Resolution of 24th March, 1834, disapproving of the Removal of the Deposits by the President. Delivered on Tuesday, March 22, 1836.  
MR. PRESIDENT: I have some diffi-