RALEIGH REGISTER,

AND NORTH-CAROLINA GAZETTE.

"OURS ARE THE PLANS OF FAIR DELIGHTFUL PEACE, UNWARP'D BY PARTY RAGE, TO LIVE LIKE BROTHERS."

VOL. XXXII. THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1831. NO. 15.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,
By Joseph Gales & Son,
Raleigh, North-Carolina.

TERMS.

THREE DOLLARS per annum; one half in advance. Those who do not, either at the time of subscribing, or subsequently, give notice of their wish to have the Paper discontinued at the expiration of their year, will be presumed as desiring its continuance until countermanded.

ADVERTISEMENTS,

Not exceeding *sixteen lines*, will be inserted *three times* for a Dollar; and twenty-five cents for each subsequent publication; those of greater length, in the same proportion. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out, and charged accordingly.

Congressional Debate.

ON THE MINISTER TO RUSSIA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, February 3, 1831.

The motion to strike out the appropriation for the salary of a Minister to Russia being under consideration, Mr. BURGES, of Rhode Island addressed the House as follows:

MR. SPEAKER: Permit me to justify myself, under all which has been said, both against me, & against whatever has been advanced by me in support of the motion made by the gentleman from Ohio. With the indulgence of the House, it may be well to look back to the question made by this motion; for, gentlemen in their zeal to eulogize the Minister or to abuse those who doubt the correctness of his appointment, have departed almost entirely from the matter in issue before us.

The objection to this appropriation, and the motion to strike it from this bill, have been made because it is proposed for the payment of a salary to a foreign Minister, who, by his commission of Legation, or by certain secret articles given to him, is authorised to *leave* the Court to which he is sent, to go to *any other* country *whenever*, in his *own* opinion, his health may require it; and not to *return* to that Court so long as, *according* to the *same* opinion, it may be *injurious* to his health to do so. We deny such mission to be a legal one; we deny that the salary provided by law for foreign Ministers, is, or ever can be due to any man sent abroad under *such* credentials; with such privileges *reserved*, and such powers *granted* to him, not to the *public* but to *his own* use. The objection to this appropriation has, therefore, not been made because the gentleman was, when sent abroad, and had long been, a valetudinarian; or because, if then in health, that health exhausted by the toils of diplomacy, might require refreshment by relaxation and relief from public service; No, Sir; nor because that refreshment might not be found unless under a milder sky, and by removing to a more genial climate than that of Russia. Such things may excite, as they certainly have excited, the special wonder of the Nation; and they are, and they will be very proper topics of debate, when considering the "state purposes" of this mission; but they have not been, nor will they be made the *grounds* of objection to the appropriation of this item in the bill.

We object to this salary on account of the illegality of this Mission, and because the Secretary of State, knowing the feeble health of Mr. Randolph—knowing his inability to attend to the laborious details of that public service—knowing that his constitution could not endure either the *winter* or *summer* climate of Russia, did invent this mission, and did advise the President to send out this gentleman with credentials as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States *at* the Court of his Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Russia; and at the same time to give him a commission, no matter for what cause, to *reside as* such Minister, in *whatever* country he might *choose* to reside. Such a mission cannot be formed—such a Minister cannot be sent abroad, either under our laws or our constitution, or under the usages and laws of Nations. I ask the attention of the House, therefore, to the enquiry, whether this salary can be *due* for an *illegal* and *void* Mission? whether it can be due as a *quantum meruit*, or a pro rata compensation for the services which were rendered at the Court of Russia; or *last of all*, whether it can be due, because this mission may *subserve* certain purposes, *highly useful* to the Secretary of State? Before these enquiries can, to the best purpose, be made, it is proper to give some reply to what has been offered by several gentlemen against this motion. These gentlemen have said less to support this appropriation, than to impugn the motives of those who oppose it. With my motives these gentlemen are welcome to amuse themselves—The storm of their abuse past over me, as the winter storms of my native New-England have often passed over the humble dwelling of my boyhood, without shaking a stone from the chimney, or starting a shingle on the roof. I have too much respect for myself to believe that they have abused me from the wantonness of malice, but do believe it was done simply because they could find nothing to say more appropriate to the question.

This motion has been made to protect the rights of the Nation against the encroachments of power. Those who resist such encroachments and assaults of power, must always expect to encounter vociferous, if not infuriated adversaries. I have not entered this warfare without "*counting the cost*." A school of high authority taught me that, in a war of aggression, "He who takes the sword shall perish by the sword"—but in a war of defence "let him who has no sword sell his *coat* and buy one."

How then has our defence been met and answered? How by the gentleman from Virginia! [Mr. BARBOUR.] First of all, I am accused of objecting to this appropriation, because it is for the use of a Virginian. In this the gentleman is utterly mistaken. I informed him of this error in a few moments after he had taken his seat. He has, notwithstanding, chosen to put this error in print. Suffer me, Sir, in my place, and before this House, to protest against this procedure. The gentlemen who heard me then, and who do me the honor to hear me now, I call to witness, that I said no such thing; and I should have nothing to regret, could my protestation be made the printed companion of the gentleman's allegation against me, and travel side by side with it under the eye of the nation. This, I know, cannot be done; and I must suffer the imputation, wherever his speech is read, without my correction of its errors. Be it so; but I believe there is too much good sense, and too much moral sentiment in Virginia, to set down one of their fellow men as quite so stupid, or quite so malevolent.

The gentleman alleges that I consider this mission as a bribe offered to Virginia. This might have been said by me, because I believed it to be true. If said, was it said, or could it be intended, in derogation of Virginia? Is Virginia dishonored by this attempt of the wiley Secretary? I did not, and no man will intimate that Virginia had even looked with a favorable eye on this bribe, this splendid bestowment.—Not those who hear, but those who listen to the song of the syren, and are allured by the enchantment, become debased by the temptation. Sir, from the cradle to the grave, the enticements of pleasure beset our youth; the toils of ambition are spread for our vigorous manhood; and in old age, the honest *amor habendi*, when all other loves are frozen in the heart, allures the dim eye to gaze at, and the surd ear to listen to, the glittering beauties and golden melodies of avarice. Are we dishonored, because in the language of Sir Wm. Jones, "vice is permitted to spread her snares around us, that the triumph of virtue may be more conspicuous?" The ermine of the judge is not tarnished because some unprincipled litigant has craftily proffered a bribe to the court. The name of the insulted Lucretia has arrived to us after a journey of more than 2000 years. Is it soiled by time, or by the breath of any one of the millions of millions who have pronounced it? That name, Sir, like the Alps of her own Italy, whose tops nearest to heaven, are covered with eternal snow, is the monument of imperishable purity—while the name of the treacherous and cowardly Tarquin, with infamy, will be, as it has been, throughout all time, the name of whatever is most vile and odious. Sir, Virginia is not dishonored; the tempter, and not the tempted, will suffer the infamy of the deed.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Barbour] would overthrow our objections to this appropriation by eulogizing the man sent on the Mission. He alludes to the monuments of Mr. Randolph's fame; and lest men might call on him to shew where they are, he has placed them in the hearts of his countrymen, were no being but "the searcher of hearts" could discover their existence. What indications has Virginia given that those monuments are where the gentleman has located them? He has long been a Representative in Congress from that State. This is something in his favor; but from a State so long separated into districts, it is not conclusive. It is confined to his constituents, and only proves what the gentleman himself has often asserted on this floor, "that never had man such constituents." He represented the whole State in the Senate—true; but this was for the fragment only of a term. Why was he not re-appointed? The interests, the honor, and high dignity of Virginia had been placed under his guardianship. How did he perform the offices created by these trusts? His conduct as a Senator from Virginia was brought before the Legislature of that State, on a question concerning his re-appointment. In this great Areopagus, than which none is more dignified, each judge, if he had a monument of this man in his heart or his house, read the inscription upon it. On what was he tried? Not on its political creed—he did not suffer, as the best of men have, for heresy.—His faith was, for every purpose beneficial to himself, and; his works alone were brought into question. On this question a deep and interesting debate arose. The gentleman may have been present and heard it; or if not, as it was published, he must have read it. It belonged to Virginia, and was a part of her great commonwealth concern; nor would I have brought this wholesome example of family discipline before the nation, had not the eulogist of this froward son of Virginia told us that the monuments of his exploits were in the hearts of his countrymen. Does this debate, or the result of it, confirm the gentleman's assertion? He was weighed; and "mene mene tekel upharsin" was written on all his monuments. He was rejected, and a distinguished Virginian was chosen to represent that State in the Senate, and restore her ancient honor and dignity in the councils of the nation.

I ask again, where are the monuments of this man's glory? Has he improved his native state in the great arts of civil life? In agriculture, his own peculiar vocation? It has never been said of him. Have manufactures been fostered by his encouragement? Sir, the very name is odious to him. The sheep, the most innocent of all animals, and supplying by its wool the material for perhaps our most useful manufacture—the sheep is so hateful to him, that, with all the poetry of the golden age in his blood, this gentleman has said "*I would go twenty rods out of my way to kick a sheep.*" Commerce has been as little encouraged by him as either of her sister arts in our family of national industry. He is one of a class of men, now grown quite small in our country, who despise traffic and traders; and would have considered Cosmo de Medicis, the princely merchant and founder of Florence, as no better than a tin pedlar. He is literary, moral, I trust pious; but what has he done to advance learning, morality, or religion! In this House, where he so long had a seat, where are the fruits of his sage councils; the laws originated, or sustained by his eloquence; and which will carry his name to posterity as a patriot statesman? When the gentleman shall point to those monuments, and shew them to belong to Mr. Randolph, he may realize a fame somewhat less fugitive and perishable than mere words.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Barbour) would carry my opposition to this salary to mere political account; and says I am opposed to it because Mr. Randolph overthrew the fabric of federal power. Be it so; let the man enjoy the entire fame of all the benefit, and all the mischief he has done. I had no share in that power which every citizen did not equally enjoy.—It gave me no honor, no emolument. I do not believe, and I think thousands who aided in its overthrow, do not now believe, that any structure, since that time erected on its ruins, has given a holier sanctuary to the Constitution, or a more secure shelter to the rights and liberties of the people. If this giant partizan did overthrow that fabric, he could not bury under its ruins the great principles of the revolution, "Union and independence;" the songs of my cradle, the political creed of every hour of my life, and not sooner to be forgotten than the sainted bosom which nourished my infancy.

What did this man build, what could he build, in its place? Sir, when day-light first dawned on the world after this event, John Randolph sat, in the glimpses of morning, like the genius of the earthquake, amidst the ruins of some splendid city, without the power, or the will to move a single stone to rear a new edifice. Nay, Sir, when the statesmen of those times, forgetting the storm of party, set themselves in earnest to rebuilding this man of monuments resisted their labors. Little does the gentleman know me, if he believes I feel anger at the labors, or envy at the fame, of the man whom he has eulogized. He will be remembered, when much better Virginians, and perhaps the gentleman himself, may be forgotten; but he will be remembered as the years of *mildew* and *blight* and *famine* are remembered, when those of *plenty* and *prosperity* are forgotten. He may live in story; but not, like Washington, "*in the hearts of his countrymen.*"

I should have said no more of the Secretary of Legation, had not the gentleman transmuted his confirmation by the Senate into the Roman ceremonial of bestowing the Toga Virilis. This toga, this gown, was, in the open forum, given annually by all the Romans to all their boys, who had, during the year, arrived to the age of seventeen years. By this classical allusion, I presume the gentleman intends to assure us, that Mr. Randolph's Secretary of Legation has fully arrived at that interesting period of his life. I had asserted he was twenty-one, but I willingly admit the gentleman's correction.

The other gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Coke) has reinforced his colleague. Will these gentlemen never have done with mistating me? Have I reproached Virginia? Never, sir, never! When speaking of any one of her citizens here, I have spoken of him as an American citizen.—When speaking of that State, I have, on this floor, & elsewhere, spoken of her as one which poured her whole Spartan soul into the Revolution, which sent to the field of conflict a band of patriot warriors, "who have filled the world with their and our glory;" and which, to secure the benefits, in addition to the triumphs of victory, relinquished her territorial claims to an empire, preferring to *State sectional* interest the more *glorious* objects of *Union and Independence*. I reproach Virginia! Is it not the birth place, is it not the burial place, of Washington? Sir, who can reproach that most fortunate, most consecrated region, or even suppose the enormity possible, "and hope to be forgiven!"

I have, as the gentleman says, abused the President and his Machiavelian policy. I have spoken of the President as of the first dignitary of the nation, and in no terms of disrespect. I have alleged, that, like monarchs in the old world, he has been advised by ministers; and under that advisement, has permitted those ministers to furnish, in his name, his annual message to Congress. Will the gentleman pledge his literary reputation, upon a denial of this allegation? I have said the President has been miscounselled; has suffered his confidence to be abused by an artful Minister; and that, too, in this very appointment. I put it to the gentleman, upon his conscience, to say, whether he believes this question could have come up, in this House, if Mr. Tazewel had been Secretary of State?

Of the Secretary of State I have spoken, and will *speak*, as I believe he *merits*. He is a power constitutionally connected with the Executive; but now, like the parasite plant under the shelter of the oak, it has crept, and clasped, and wound itself around the trunk, spire above spire, until it overtops the loftiest branch of the magnificent tree. The leaves of the ivy will *soon* conceal those of the oak; and, unless the insidious plant be removed, render it a sapless trunk.

The gentleman recommends to us charity, Christian charity. Where does he learn, that the delinquencies of Rulers are to be visited only in charity? While the Messenger of divine charity wept over the coming ruin of his nation, did he not severely rebuke those Rulers, that generation of vipers, stinging and poisoning that nation, and hastening on that destruction.

Sir, we are charitable. The people have looked on in charity. Charity has done her utmost. Her "mantle has covered a multitude of sins;" but the brood has multiplied, and increased in size, and outgrown the covering.

This gentleman unites with his colleague, in eulogizing Virginia. It is all supererogation.—History has done it justice. The lofty-minded matron, we know, thought well of herself; but no one deemed her quite so proud as the gentleman has announced her to us. In wielding the broom, or scolding her household, she may well scorn Neptune's trident, and Jove's power to thunder, as the gentleman says she does; and some of her children have given us fair samples of the family lectures.

* * * * * * * *

All these gentlemen agree in the argument against this motion, drawn from the incompetency of this House to question this appropriation. The President and Senate, to whom the Constitution has confided our foreign relations, have, they tell us, established this Legation; and this House cannot, as they affirm, refuse this appropriation in support of it. Are we placed by the People as the constitutional keepers of the public treasure, and yet bound to follow every Executive call for their money? Is it our whole fiscal duty to obey orders, and grant subsidies! Does not deliberation, and debate, and discretion, belong to this House? We can grant, and every power which can grant, is, by its very nature, endowed with the power of refusal. Sir, our power to refuse appropriations is the Constitutional check placed in our hands not to stop but to regulate, the movements of the Executive. Without, this power and its discreet and diligent use, the nation would be at the disposal of the President and Cabinet Council.

Sir, this mission may be regarded as the commencement of a system of sinecure appointments—of salaries without services. Sent to one Court, where he did nothing; and, in the exercise of his powers, gone to another, where he can do nothing, what service is required, or was, or could be expected from him? When he shall return next June, what will he have done? His most zealous friends must say, NOTHING. If, then, he receive this salary, he will receive it without service of any kind rendered to the nation for it. The Secretary does avow, in the Message, that the "power to leave the Russian Court for the advantage of a more genial climate, was given to Mr. Randolph in *consideration* of the extent to which his constitution had been impaired in the public service." What were those services? The duties of a member of this House or of the Senate, and for which he received his legal compensation, like every other member. Was "his constitution impaired" by these services? Were not the constitutions of others impaired, and even their lives consumed, in like services? Is this gentleman alone selected for a place where he may, "in consideration of the extent to which his constitution has been impaired by those services," receive in one year the sum of $18,000? This, sir, is the FIRST PENSION for CIVIL SERVICE on our records. How many hearts of Revolutionary soldiers would this have made glad? Into how many abodes of desolation and widowhood it might have carried the light of joy, and brought on you the blessings of how many now ready to perish? Such a system of sinecure appointment and *civil pensionage* may be extended alike to the Courts of all civilized nations, and to the hordes of Nomade barbarians, requiring no residence, either near the places or tents of the foreign power; the formality of a visit and a presentation may soon be omitted, and the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary will, "in consideration of his public services," be permitted to receive his outfit and salary, while he continues to reside on his plantation.

What a scheme of speculation does this system open to the crafty and unprincipled, to men always at market either to sell themselves or to buy others! By this, *unstable* politicians of every variety of creed may be kept to the true faith. By this, tempest-beaten partisans, ship-wrecked in principle and fortune, may be towed into port, and laid up and preserved for future use. Establish this system, sir, and add to it a Government Treasury Bank, and the Secretary might buy into the Presidency with your own money; nor, like that Roman who bought the Imperial Purple at auction, be obliged to lay down his own gold and silver for the purchase. Shall we, sir, through any fear of transcending our jurisdiction, give our sanction to such a system? A bolder stand than is now required was taken 16 years ago, on this floor, by an honorable member, now in office, and presiding over the deliberations of the other House of Congress. 'I will,' said he, 'vote no appropriation for the Navy until the Secretary of that Department is removed.' What was the result? The Secretary was removed; and the naval branch of the service did receive, as it always has received, his cordial and efficient support. In 1795, when the appropriation was under consideration for carrying into effect the second treaty with Great Britain, Mr. Gallatin declared, in this House, that a treaty had no binding force as a law of the land until such appropriations were made; and that this House, holding the power to control such appropriations, held the constitutional power of rejecting treaties. Mr. Madison contended that this House had the right to judge concerning the expediency of treaties; and, as they might decide that question, to grant or refuse appropriations for carrying them into effect. This case does not require the aid of these doctrines: for public faith will not be touched in our foreign relations if Mr. Randolph should not receive a salary for residing in England as minister to Russia. Has the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. J. S. Barbour) forgotten that the motion to strike out the enacting clause of the bill appropriating salaries for the Panama Mission was sustained by sixty-one members of this House, and that he himself with nine of his colleagues, voted for it? Will gentlemen still contend for their own incompetency to question this appropriation? Sir, we are, by the Consitution, vested with a high competency and discretion on these important matters; and to these constitutional attributes of this House has this motion been addressed.

It is humiliating, but I must reply to the gentleman from New-York. For myself, I would let him pass. It is a kind of Domitian amusement, this killing flies with a bodkin. Gladly would I say, with the commiseration of Uncle Toby, to the little buzzing incovenience (when I have him in my hand,) "Go, poor insect, *go*: the world is surely wide enough for thee and me."

I have some apology for giving some attention to the speech of the gentleman from New-York. The place, however it may be filled, does give a kind of character to what is said or done in it. No matter how utterly inconsiderable, or even contemptible a person may be, whenever a constitutional portion of the people has placed him at one of these desks, replying to what he may have said, though it may not be very creditable, yet must be excusable, in any Member of this House. The Romans were wont to place a *wooden image* in their gardens, as the special protector of the place: and Horace has related to us the soliloquy of one of these Roman deities, wherein he gives some account of his own apotheosis: "*I was*," said the Priapus, "*a useless log, until the carpenter took me in hand; but he has now worked me up into a god!*" The People of New-York can surely turn out as good work as the Roman carpenter.

* * * * * * * *

The Gentleman from New-York has thrown his ponderosity into the scale of panegyric, thereby to render the weight of eulogy on the Russian Minister overwhelming—scrap iron increases the weight not the value of gold. He does admit some sort of talent in speaking, to the parliamentary rivals of himself in eloquence—to Lowndes, to Clay, and to Webster. Cicero took his family name from a bean on some part of his face; and doubtless many a coxcomb has believed himself to be an orator, because, like Cicero, he had a wart on his nose. Some-body has said that "Man, of all the animal creation alone, is endowed with vanity." Who ever saw a Cock Sparrow measuring his wing in flight with the Falcon? I believe there are gentlemen in this House who could give us good reasons why the eloquence of the Orator of Roanoke is so well recollected by the gentleman from New-York. No worker on the Roanoke plantation has better reasons to remember the eloquence of the overseer. Much as that eccentric man loved his joke and his sarcasms, he loved his fame more; and he would have spared the lash on that occasion, could he have suspected it might bring him into the poor condition of enduring praise at the hands of the gentleman from New York. Such revenge for such a cause, is said to be peculiar to that gentleman, and *one* species of one *other* rare among us.

Has the gentleman so long been a mere abjective to the Secretary of State, that he thinks it slanderous to associate the name of that Politician with any *other* accident? Children, in these scientific times, who have advanced somewhat into the mysteries of chemistry do, after beating up soap and water together in a basin amuse themselves with a clean pipe in blowing up bubbles and sending them off from the bowl inflated and glittering, to sail away a moment, and then burst and vanish into their original nothingness. For aught I know the Secretary may be amusing himself by the same innocent experiment. Who would interrupt the sentimental harmony of political friendship! For all which he is distinguished, the character of the Secretary is fixed; it cannot be *elevated* by any labors of the protege—it cannot be *lowered* by the efforts of others. God forbid that I should throw a straw in the way of any man's advancement. Their friends are *daily* carrying and laying at the gate of the Treasury, those who have *every* thing to recommend them *except* the *piety* and *good works* of the beggar in the parable; and who, all alike, desire to be fed from the crumbs which fall from the tables of those feasting within. "Hope deferred," we find, does "not make every heart sick." Gentlemen, doubtless, have assurances that *our political Lazarus* shall be served in his *turn*. The next basket of broken meat brought out may be sent to New-York, and amply satisfy the appetite sharpened by two years want of it.

The gentleman accuses me of a departure from the question to bring into the debate our late treaty with the Sublime Porte. Sir, every thing rendering our Russian relations important, comes into any question concerning them. Do not our new relations with the great European rival of Russia demonstrate more strongly our need of an efficient mission at the Court of St. Petersburgh? The Secretary has told us in the Message, that the Black Sea has been opened to us by our treaty with the Sublime Porte. The gentleman does know full well, that the swords of our brave Russian friends not only hewed their way through the Balkan down to the plains of Adrianople; but that by the treaty of that City they, for all purposes of navigation, widened the Bosphorus to a breadth equal to the Hellespont, and thereby united the Euxine with the Egean, Levant, whole Mediterranean, the Atlantic, and all other seas & oceans. What may our Russian imperial friend say to us for receiving from the Turk as a boon, to say nothing of our promise in return, what his valor, blood, and treasure had conquered for us and all nations? Omitting, therefore, the secret article, does not the opening of the Euxine, either by the Russian power or the Turkish treaty, mightily enhance the importance of this question, and call imperatively on the Executive for an efficient mission at the Court of St. Petersburgh? If the gentleman cannot perceive this, he is less a statesman than he would seem to be; and even much less such, if that were possible.

But I drew my facts from unprincipled partisans, and newspaper rumour! I said so before—I drew part of the truth from the Secretary—the *treaty*. The other part of the *secret article*, from the *newspapers*.

Sir, it has been the labor of the Secretary's life to *establish* newspapers, entitled to *no* credit; and to *discredit* all others. He has founded a school, and is at the head of it. In that school the great axiom is, "every thing is fair in politics;" and to him are not politics every thing? Let him go on to improve the condition of the Press. Let him extinguish the light of truth wherever he can extend the finger of power.—Let him do one thing more—aided by his minions, no matter where—let him persuade the people, that the *honest*, the *independent* papers of this country, are vehicles of falsehood, and mere rumor; let them be, as they have been, *on this floor*, branded as *false*, *foul*, and *dirty*; and let the member who quotes from their pages the history and impress of the times, be reproached as a blockhead, a blackguard, a slanderer—and what more could the Secretary of State desire, which he would not be sure to obtain? Sir, such a consummation would have saved to Charles the throne of France; and to the patriots of that country, their revolution.

I did quote for the secret article, in the Turkish Treaty, from the newspaper: dares the gentleman question the truth of the quotation? Had I drawn a bow with a more advised aim, could the pigeon on the pole have fluttered more manifestly? The gentleman has notwithstanding all these assertions, accused me of drawing my facts from a perjured Senator. Has it come to this? Was it found necessary not to commit our first treaty with the Great Disciple of Mahomet to the Christian Senators of the United States, until their lips were sealed by the solemnities of an oath? It is a new formula in the executive department of the Senate; and will appear by the published journals of that body to have no place in their proceeding until the present session. When a treaty in 1795 was published by a Senator against an injunction of that body, who accused him of perjury? The gentleman whose mission is now under consideration, did on this floor, pronounce a studied eulogium on Stephens Thompson Mason, the Senator who published that treaty. Would he eulogize perjury? Sir, the secret article was published before the treaty was announced to the House, or sent to the Senate. The correspondence on the West India question was published in the same manner. Has the Secretary of State adopted this method, and put out his feelers, to take the national pulse?

I do not ask what warranted, but who authorized or instructed, or encouraged the gentleman to connect perjury with that venerated word which designates the members of a National Council, the most dignified and honorable on earth?

How could I shun insult, when such men are reviled? I do not ask by what statesman or gentlemen, but by what apology for a man?—In what other assembly on earth has "the hoary head" been used as a term of reproach? Has the gentleman passed so far beyond the vigour, and bloom & modesty of invenescence, that he has forgotton the amiable instinct of our nature which warns our youth to pay in advance that consideration to age which it may come to desire for itself? Though grey hairs have been held in respect by barbarians, in all countries, and by even the most profligate and unmannered in all ages, yet knowing that (abovo ad plumas) I am not disappointed in the language or demeanor of the gentlemen from New-York. Men, better than I am, have been reviled in their age by men no better than he is. Washington was called a "hoary headed incendiary," by a vagabond of *almost* unparalleled mendacity and impudence. The "bald head" is, I assure the gentleman no joke; though he seems to be original in using it as such. This inconvenience, or if you please, imperfection, has been suffered by *some* very *great* men; but once rarely if *ever*, has it been experienced by *any* very *little* ones. Cæsar is said to have been more grateful to the Roman people for granting him the right to wear the laurel crown than for any other of their gifts; because the wearing it enabled him to conceal the exterior badiness of his head. If it be true, as Shakespeare tells us it is, that what nature has scanted men in wit, she has made up to them in hair, then the gentleman I believe, should he win a laurel crown, would never like Cæsar have occasion to wear it, for any lack of that commodity.

Who reviled the prophet, returning from the blazing translation of his master, with a countenance bright with the glories of opening Heaven and wrapt in the mantle of Elijah—who, Sir, reviled the prophet for his "bald head?" Profligate *young* men, *bons children* as they are called; the *scum* and *sweepings* of the city, and as we find by the historian, *fit* only for *food* for those animals which are *fed on offal*.

The gentleman is equally out of his orthinology, as in every thing else. The bird of Jove, not the vulture, is that soaring wonder, by men called the "Bald Eagle;" and, sir, never was that "soaring eagle, in his pride of place, hawked at, and brought down by the mousing owl."

Sir, my remarks have been excursive, but I have travelled over no ground where some one of the gentlemen had not placed himself before me. If these gentlemen are out of the field, and I do not see them in force, on any point of the argument, I will return to the questions made by us under our motion.

At this period of his Speech, Mr. BURGES gave way to a motion for adjournment.

Foreign News.

Continued from the late arrivals.

LAFAYETTE.

The motives which led to the resignation of Lafayette, are thus stated in one of the papers:—

The Chamber of Deputies, apparently alarmed for reform, passed a vote enacting that the National Guards should not be permitted to choose their own General.

On Friday evening, December 24th, a resolution was passed by the Chamber of Deputies, declaring the office held by General Lafayette, as commander-in-chief of the National Guards, unnecessary.

The necessary consequence of the vote in the Chamber of Deputies last Friday evening, upon the new organization of the National Guard, was the removal of Gen. Lafayette from the command of that body, with, however, the perfect understanding, that he was to be re-appointed by the King. The General and his friends, however, took fire, and determined not to submit to this piece of coquetry, and yesterday, after a consultation with his friends, the venerable patriot resigned his commission into the hands of the King, in a letter, in which he declared that, in resuming his station as a simple soldier of the revolution, he was determined by all the means still at his disposal to support the throne and the principles which had grown out of the events of July. It was always understood, before the vote of Friday, that Lafayette's appointment was for life, but that the office would die with him. This splended mark of public confidence could only have been justified by the patriot's long tried virtues and purity of heart. The King, upon receiving Gen. Lafayette's letter yesterday, immediately sent (as he called him) for "his old and long attached friend." The call was promptly obeyed, and a long interview was the result. Lafayette declared that he appeared not as an unconnected individual, but as a negotiator; and in reply to the King's earnest entreaty, that he would re-accept the command in-chief of the Guards from his hands, said that he could never do so, without an infusion of popular strength into his majesty's present councils, and the introduction of such an electoral law as would satisfy the people, and give solidity to the institutions of the revolution. They parted late in the day on terms of warm mutual respect, and the King held a council of ministers, which lasted till midnight.

Paris, Dec. 28.

You will see from the Journals the partial change which has taken place among the ministers; but it has not yet been mentioned that, although General Lafayette refused the earnest, indeed supplicating entreaties of the King to retain his command of the National Guard, he went to the palace at three o'clock on the following morning to revoke his resignation, but the King replied, it was then too late; for Gen. Lobau had received his commission.

The four ex-ministers were removed on the night of 29th December from Vincennes, to be transferred to the fortress of Ham, in Picardy, there to undergo their sentence of perpetual imprisonment.

THE POLISH REVOLUTION.

Advices from Warsaw, through the German papers, are to the 9th December, and from the frontiers of Poland, to the 12th—both inclusive. The number killed during the commotions at Warsaw is stated to be 6,000, but it could not be ascertained with accuracy.

The Messager des Chambres states, that all the last accounts from Warsaw, confirm the previous intelligence of a division of the Lithuanian army about from 25,000 to 30,000 strong, having declared in favour of Polish Independence, and that the Lithuanian regiment of the Imperial Guard, which accompanied the Grand Duke Constantine in his retreat, had returned to Warsaw. A proclamation had been published at Warsaw enjoining the inhabitants to return to their work, and ordering the churches and public establishments to be re-opened. On the 5th instant General Chlopick had been invested with the command of all the troops and National Guards of the Capital, and wears the title of Dictator; but he issued a proclamation, in which he stated, that he had only accepted it in consequence of the importance of existing circumstances, and in imitation of the example of the Romans, who, in times of danger, confided the sovereign and absolute power to the hands of a Dictator. The proclamation also intimates the General's intention to resign the command when the two Chambers assembled.

The Dictator had ordered divine service to be performed to thank Heaven for the restoration of order and tranquility. The Dictator has also issued orders forbidding, under pain of death, any person to pass the frontiers of the neighbouring States with arms. The severity of the General serves to maintain order and discipline.—One soldier had been shot for insubordination.