

# THE PILOT.

"POWER IS ALWAYS STEALING FROM THE MANY TO THE FEW."

Vol. 1.

BALTIMORE, MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1840.

No. 3.

## THE PILOT,

EDITED BY  
DUFF GREEN.

Is published at No. 11, Water st. Baltimore, nearly opposite  
Chesapeake.

TERMS.—Daily, at Six Dollars per annum, or Twelve and  
a half Cents per week, payable to the carriers.  
Country, Five Dollars per annum, payable in advance.  
Extra, in pamphlet form and double Royal size, at One  
Dollar, for twenty-five numbers.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.  
1 square 1 insertion, 50 cts. 1 square 1 month, \$4 00  
1 do. 2 do. 0 75 1 do. 2 months 7 00  
1 do. 3 do. 1 00 1 do. 3 do. 10 00  
1 do. 1 week, 1 75 1 do. 6 do. 16 00  
1 do. 2 do. 2 75 1 square per year, \$30 00  
Cuts of two lines only, \$5 per annum, in advance.  
@—Ten lines, or less, made a square. If an advertisement  
exceeds ten lines, the price will be in proportion. All adver-  
tisements are payable at the time of their insertion, except  
yearlies, which are payable quarterly in advance. All adver-  
tisements ordered in all forms, will be charged fifty cents for  
each subsequent insertion.

RICHARD J. MATCHETT, PRINTER.

## SLANDERS REFUTED.

The Cheviot and Vincennes Speeches; Letter from  
Gen. Harrison, endorsing the latter—refutation  
of the slander of selling white men for debt.

From the Yeoman.

We are gratified in being able to lay before our readers that part of Gen. Harrison's Cheviot speech, in 1833, which relates to Abolition. The reader will see how grossly this eminent patriot has been wronged, by the publication of the garbled extract which the Administration presses have given, and which the Van Buren Convention has also detached from its context. Every impartial mind will be struck with the soundness of Gen. Harrison's views, and the consistency and eloquent style in which he expressed them. Let it be remembered, too, that this speech was delivered the year subsequent to the memorable agitation in Virginia, when so many of the present supporters of the Administration were clamorous for abolition.

Extracts from his Speech at Cheviot, Ohio, July 4th, 1833.

"There is, however, a subject now beginning to agitate them (the Southern States) in relation to which, if their alarm has any foundation, the relative situation in which they may stand to some of the States, will be the very reverse to what it now is. I allude to a supposed disposition in some individuals in the non-slaveholding States to interfere with the slave population of the other States, for the purpose of forcing their emancipation. I do not call your attention to this subject, fellow citizens, from the apprehension that there is a man amongst you who will lead his aid to a project so pregnant with mischief; and still less that there is a State in the Union— which could be brought to give it countenance. But such are the feelings of our Southern brethren upon this subject—such their views, and their just views, of the evils which an interference of this kind would bring upon them, that long before it would reach the point of receiving the sanction of a State, the evil of the attempt would be consummated, as far as we are concerned, by a dissolution of the Union. If there is any principle of the Constitution of the United States less disputable than any other, it is, that the slave population is under the EXCLUSIVE CONTROL of the States which possess them. If there is any measure likely to rivet the chains, and blast the prospects of the negroes for emancipation, it is the interference of unauthorized persons. Can any one who is acquainted with the operations of the human mind doubt this? We have seen how resistive our Southern brethren have been from a supposed violation of their political rights. What must be the consequence of an acknowledged violation of these rights, (for every man of sense must admit it to be so,) conjoined with an insulting interference with their domestic concerns? Shall I be accused of want of feeling for the slaves, by these remarks? A further examination will elucidate the matter. I take it for granted that no one will say, that either the Government of the United States, or those of the non-slaveholding States, can interfere in any way with the right of property in the slaves.— Upon whom, then, are the efforts of the misguided and pretended friends of the slaves to operate? It must be either on the governments of the slaveholding States, the individuals who hold them or upon the slaves themselves. And what are to be the arguments, what are the means by which they are to influence the two first of these? Is there a man vain enough to go to the land of Madison, of Macon, and of Crawford, and tell them that they either do not understand the principles of moral and political rights of man; or that, understanding, they disregard them? Can they address an argument to the interest or fears of the enlightened population of the slave States, that has not occurred to themselves a thousand and a thousand times? To whom, then, are they to address themselves, but to the slaves? And what can be said to them, that will not lead to an indiscriminate slaughter of every age and sex, and ultimately to their own destruction? Should there be an incarnate devil, who has imagined, with approbation, such a catastrophe to his fellow citizens as I have described, let him look to the result to those for whose benefit he would produce it. Particular sections of the country may be laid waste, all the crimes that infuriated man, under the influence of all the black passions of his nature, can omit, may be perpetrated for a season; the tides of the oceans however will more certainly—change than that the flood of horrors will be arrested, and turned upon those who may get it in motion.

"I will not stop to inquire into the motives of those who are engaged in this fatal and unconstitutional project. There may be some who have embarked in it without properly considering its consequences, and who are actuated by benevolent and virtuous principles. But, if such there are, I am very certain that their fellow citizens will, ere long, 'curse the virtues which have undone their country.'"

"Should I be asked if there is no way by which the General Government can aid the cause of emancipation; I answer, that it has long been an object near my heart to see the whole of its surplus revenue appropriated to that object. With the sanction of the States holding the slaves, there appears to me to be no constitutional objection to its being thus applied, embracing not only the colonization of those that may be otherwise freed,

but the purchase of the freedom of others. By a zealous prosecution of a plan formed upon that basis, we might look forward to a day, not very distant, when a North American sun would not look down upon a slave. To those who have rejected the plan of colonization, I would ask, if they have well weighed the consequences of emancipation without it? How long would the emancipated negroes remain satisfied with that? Would any of the Southern States then (the negroes armed and organized) be able to resist their claims to a participation in all their political rights? Would it even stop there? would they not claim admittance to all the social rights and privileges of a community in which, in some instances, they would compose the majority? Let those who take pleasure in the contemplation of such scenes as must inevitably follow, finish out the picture.

"If I am correct in the principles here advanced, I support my assertion, that the discussion on the subject of emancipation in the non-slaveholding States is equally injurious to the slaves and their masters, and that it has no sanction in the principles of the Constitution. I must not be understood to say, that there is anything in that instrument which prohibits such discussion. I know there is not. But the man who believes that the claims which his fellow-citizens have upon him, are satisfied by adhering to the letter of the political contract that connects them, must have a very imperfect knowledge of the principles upon which our glorious Union was formed, and by which alone it can be maintained. I mean those feelings of regard and affection which were manifested in the first dawn of the Revolution, which induced every American to think that an injury inflicted upon his fellow-citizen, however distant his location, was an injury to himself; which made us, in effect, one people, before we had any paper contract, which induced the venerable Shelby, in the second war for independence, to leave the comforts which his age required, to encounter the dangers and privations incident to a wilderness war; which drew from the same quarter the innumerable battalions of volunteers which preceded and followed him; and from the banks of the distant Appomattox, that band of youthful heroes, which has immortalized the appellation by which it was distinguished.— Those worthy sons of immortal sires did not stop to inquire into the alleged injustice and immorality of the Indian war. It was sufficient for them to learn their fellow-citizens were in danger, that the tomahawk and scalping knife were suspended over the heads of the women and children of Ohio; to induce them to abandon the ease, and in many instances, the luxury and splendor by which, from infancy, they had been surrounded, to encounter the fatigues and dangers of war, amidst the horrors of a Canadian winter."

Extract from Gen. Harrison's Speech at Vincennes, Indiana, July 4th, 1835.

"I have now, fellow-citizens, a few words more to say on another subject, and which is, in my opinion, of more importance than any other that is now in the course of discussion in any part of the Union. I allude to the societies which have been formed, and the movements of certain individuals in some of the States, in relation to a portion of the population in others. The conduct of these persons is the more dangerous, because their object is masked under the garb of disinterestedness and benevolence; and their course vindicated by arguments and propositions which in the abstract no one can deny.

But, however fascinating may be the dress with which their schemes are presented to their fellow-citizens, with what purity of intention they may have been formed and sustained, they will be found to carry in their train mischief to the whole Union, and horrors to a large portion of it, which, it is probable, some of the projectors and many of their supporters have never thought of; the latter, the first in the series of evils which are to spring from their source, are such as you have read of, to have been perpetrated on the fair plains of Italy and Gaul by the Scythian hordes of Attila and Alaric; and such as most of you apprehended upon that memorable night, when the tomahawks and war clubs of the followers of Tecumseh were rattling in your suburbs. I regard not the disavowals of any such intention upon the part of the authors of these schemes since, upon the examination of the publications which have been made, they will be found to contain the very facts, and very arguments, which would have been used, if such would have been their object. I am certain that there is not in this assembly, one of these deluded men and that there are few within the bounds of the State. If there are any, I would earnestly entreat them to forbear; to pause in their career, and deliberately considered the consequence of their conduct to the whole Union, and to those for whose benefit they profess to act. That the latter will be the victims of the weak, injudicious, presumptuous and unconstitutional efforts to serve them, a thorough examination of the subject must convince them. The struggle (and struggle there must be) may commence with horrors such as I have described, but it will end with more firmly riveting the chains, or in the utter extirpation, of those whose cause they advocate.

"Am I wrong, fellow citizens, in applying the terms weak, presumptuous and unconstitutional, to the measure of the emancipators? A slight examination will, I think, show that I am not. In a vindication of the objects of a Convention which was lately held in one of the towns of Ohio, which I saw in a newspaper, it was said that nothing more was intended than to produce a state of public feeling which would lead to an amendment of the Constitution, authorizing the abolition of Slavery in the United States. Now can an amendment of the Constitution be effected without the consent of the Southern States?—What then is the proposition to be submitted to them? It is this:—'The present provisions of the Constitution secured to you the right (a right which you held before it was made, which you have never given up,) to manage your domestic concerns in your own way, but as we are convinced that you do not manage them properly, we want you to put in the hands of the General Government, in the councils of which we have the majority, the control over these matters, the effect of which will be virtually to transfer the power from yours into our hands.'"

Again—in some of the States, and in sections

of others, the black population far exceeds that of the white.—Some of the emancipators propose an immediate abolition. What is the proposition then, as it regards these States and parts of States, but the alternatives of amalgamation with the blacks, or an exchange of situations with them? Is there any man of common sense who does not believe that the emancipated blacks, being a majority, will not insist upon a full participation of political rights with the whites; and when possessed of these, they will not contend for a full share of social rights also? What but the extremity of weakness and folly could induce any one to think, that such propositions as these could be listened to by a people so intelligent as the Southern States? Further.—The emancipators generally declare that it is their intention to effect their object (although their acts contradict the assertion) by no other means than by convincing the slaveholders that the immediate emancipation of the slaves is called for, both by moral obligation and sound policy. An unfeeling youth, at the moment of his leaving (indeed in many instances before he has left it,) his Theological Seminary, undertakes to give lectures upon morals to the countrymen of Wythe, Tucker, Pendleton and Lowndes, and lessons of political wisdom to States, whose affairs have so recently been directed by Jefferson and Madison, Macon and Crawford. Is it possible, that instances of greater vanity and presumption could be exhibited? But the course pursued by the emancipators is unconstitutional. I do not say that there are any words in the Constitution which forbid the discussions they are engaged in;—I know there are not. And there is even an article which seems to the citizens the right to express and publish their opinions without restriction. But in the construction of the Constitution, it is always necessary to refer to the circumstances under which it was framed, and to ascertain its meaning by a comparison of its provisions with each other, and with the previous situation of the several States who were parties to it. In a portion of these, slavery was recognized, and they took care to have the right secured to them, to follow and reclaim such of them as were fugitives to other States. The laws of Congress passed under this power, have provided punishment to any who shall oppose or interrupt the exercise of this right. Now can any one believe, that the instrument which contains a provision of this kind, which authorizes a master to pursue his slave into another State, take him back, and provides a punishment for any citizen or citizens of that State who should oppose him, should, at the same time, authorize the latter to assemble together, to pass Resolutions and adopt Addresses, not only to encourage the Slaves to leave their masters, but to cut their throats before they do so?

"I insist that if the citizens of the non-slave holding States can avail themselves of the article of the Constitution which prohibits the restriction of speech or the press, to publish any thing injurious to the rights of the slaveholding States, that they can go to the extreme that I have mentioned, and effect any thing further which writing or speaking could effect. But, fellow-citizens, these are not the principles of the Constitution. Such a construction would defeat one of the great objects of its formation, which was that of securing the peace and harmony of the States which were parties to it. The liberty of speech and of the press, were given as the most effectual means to preserve to each and every citizen their own rights, and to the States the rights which appertain to them at the time of their adoption. It could never have been expected that it would be used by the citizens of one portion of the States for the purpose of depriving those of another portion of the rights which they had reserved at the adoption of the Constitution, and in the exercise of which none but themselves have any concern or interest. If slavery is an evil, it is with them. If there is guilt in it, the guilt is theirs, not ours, since neither the States where it does not exist, nor the Government of the United States, can, without usurpation of power, and the violation of a solemn compact, do any thing to remove it without the consent of those who are immediately interested. But they will neither ask for aid, nor consent to be aided, whilst the illegal, progressing, and dangerous movements are in progress, of which I complain; the interest of all concerned requires that these should be stopped immediately.—This can only be done by the force of public opinion, and that cannot too soon be brought into operation. Every movement which is made by the Abolitionists in the non-slaveholding States, is viewed by our Southern brethren as an attack upon their rights, and which, if persisted in, must in the end eradicate those feelings of attachment and affection between the citizens of all the States, which was produced by a community of interests and dangers in the War of the Revolution, which was the foundation of our happy union; and by a continuance of which, it can alone be preserved. I entreat you then, to frown upon measures which are to produce results so much to be deprecated. The opinion which I have now given, I have omitted no opportunity for the last two years to lay before the people of my own State. I have taken the liberty to express them here, knowing that even if they should unfortunately not accord with yours, they would be kindly received."

Gen. Harrison has just addressed a letter, of which the following is an extract, to a distinguished member of Congress from South Carolina.

"I saw some time since an article from the Charleston Courier, stating that my Vincennes speech contained all the South had a right to expect on the abolition question. In a subsequent article, however, the Editor says that I had concealed my sentiments on the subject, after I had been brought out as a candidate for the Presidency. In this, the Editor greatly errs. The speech was delivered at Vincennes, in June, 1835. At that time my name was upon every anti-administration paper in Indiana, as the opposition candidate, and upon most of those in Ohio, and I had been nominated, in a very considerable number of public meetings, many months before.—My first nomination at Harrisburg, Pa. took place in the fall of 1834. I enclose you an Albany paper of February 7, 1835, to show how extensive I was then regarded as a candidate for the Presidency."

We copy the extract from the Charleson Courier, a Van Buren paper, the honorable editor of which paper, accompanies it with the following remarks, to which we invite public attention.

"We said a short time ago, in one of our editorial articles, that but a line was needed from Gen. H. to clear his skirts, so utterly and thoroughly from abolitionism, as to disarm even his bitterest foes of that weapon against him, and to render them ashamed to wield it any longer.— THAT LINE HAS NOW BEEN GIVEN; and Gen. HARRISON stands before the republic 'redeemed, regenerated and disenthralled' from the diabolical genius of Northern abolitionism. We proclaim it, as we promised, and sound it from hill top, with loud and joyous peals, in triumph through the land.

From the National Intelligencer.

We have the pleasure of laying before our readers a letter from an honorable Member of the House of Representatives, which has been happily drawn out from him by a letter from a friend at Philadelphia, who asked for information in reference to a statement there made that, in the year 1817, the thanks of Congress were refused to General Harrison, on the ground of some improper interference of his, whilst in command on the frontier, with the supplies for the Army.— Mr. Cushing, with characteristic industry; stimulated by a laudable zeal to do justice to the Whig candidate for the Presidency, has investigated the whole history of this tale, and in the following letter, placed it in its true light.

WASHINGTON, MARCH 13, 1840.

Dear Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, in which, referring to the alleged refusal of Congress to pass a vote of thanks to General Harrison for his services in the last war with Great Britain, you request information from me on the subject; and I shall, with great pleasure, communicate to you the facts, as they stand proved, uncontested by the journals and debates of Congress and the records of the Government.

It is not true that Congress refused a vote of thanks to General Harrison. On the contrary, such a vote was passed, and may be found, by any one who chooses to look for it, in the published volumes of the acts of Congress for the proper year.

The allegation that the thanks of Congress were refused to him, is founded upon the authority of an imperfect, and therefore erroneous paragraph in one of the newspapers of the day, and upon the artifice of suppressing most of the material facts of the case, as they appear in the journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

When the circumstances which have been seized upon by the political opponents of General Harrison as the pretext for this allegation, are examined, it will be seen that, instead of justifying reproach, they are in the highest degree honorable to his character and his reputation.

It is the undeniable fact, that, on the 30th of March 1818, the two houses of Congress passed a resolution, which as afterwards approved by the President runs as follows:

"Resolution directing medals to be struck, and, together with the thanks of Congress, presented to Major General Harrison and Governor Shelby, and for other purposes.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the thanks of Congress be, and they are hereby, presented to Major General William Henry Harrison and Isaac Shelby, late Governor of Kentucky, and, through them, to the officers and men under their command, for their gallantry and good conduct in defeating the combined British and Indian forces under Major General Proctor, on the Thames, in Upper Canada, on the fifth day of October, one thousand eight hundred and thirteen, capturing the British army, with their baggage, camp equipage, and artillery; and that the President of the United States be requested to cause two gold medals to be struck, emblematical of this triumph, and presented to General Harrison and Isaac Shelby, late Governor of Kentucky.

"H. CLAY,  
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.  
"JOHN GAILLARD,  
"President of the Senate, pro tem.  
"Approved, April 4, 1818.  
"JAMES MONROE."

This resolution is, of course, the final and conclusive action of Congress upon the whole matter of a vote of thanks to General Harrison; and, as the journals show, it passed each House on the same day, and without a division.

Prior to that time, however, in a preceding Congress, a similar resolution had been reported to the Senate, by the Committee on Military Affairs, of which Mr. James Barbour, of Virginia, was chairman. The resolution was discussed in Committee of the Whole, and it is the action in this Committee of the Whole, separated from the responsible action of the Senate itself, which is unfairly cited alone, as evidence against the honor of General Harrison. The journals of the Senate show that, instead of striking out the name of General Harrison from the resolution, the Senate, by a vote of ayes and noes, refused to concur in the amendment of the Committee of the Whole to that effect; that is to say, the Senate, in the most formal manner, expressly rejected the proposition to strike out the name of General Harrison. After which, suspending for the present a final decision on the resolution, the Senate ordered it to be re-committed without change, to the Committee on Military Affairs for further consideration. This was on the 20th of April, 1816.

The objections to the adoption of the resolution at that time, on the part of certain of the members of the Senate, grew out of a groundless and malicious attack on the integrity of General Harrison by persons concerned in some of the army contracts for the supply of the Northwestern Army.

Upon the accusation being publicly made by the persons in question, General Harrison addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, demanding generally investigation of his conduct as to the expenditures in the Eighth Military District while under his com-

mand, which letter is to be found in the National Intelligencer of the 23d of March, 1816.

The House at first referred this letter to the Committee on Public Expenditures, and afterwards to the War Department, to have the facts investigated there, and then reported to Congress.

The answer of the War Department, containing the evidence which completely exonerated General Harrison, came in at the beginning of the next session of Congress; and the whole matter was referred to a select committee, consisting of Col. Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky, Mr. Creighton, of Ohio, Mr. Peter, of Maryland, Mr. Forney, of North Carolina, Mr. Smith, of Maryland, Mr. Hulbert, of New Hampshire, and Mr. Thomas M. Nelson, of Virginia.

The result of their investigations appears by the following entry on the journal of the House of the 23d of January, 1817.

"Mr. Johnson, of Kentucky, from the committee to which was referred the letter and report of the Acting Secretary of War, on the application of Major General William H. Harrison, respecting the expenditures of public money while commanding the Northwestern Army, made a report thereon, stating that the committee are unanimously of opinion that General Harrison stands above suspicion as to his having had any pecuniary or improper connexion with the officers of the commissariat for the supply of his army; that he did not wantonly or improperly interfere with the rights of the contractors; and that, in his whole conduct as the commander of the said army, he was governed by a laudable zeal for, and devotion to, the public service and interest. Which said report was read and considered, whereupon, it was

"Ordered, That the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject, and that the papers be returned to the Department of War.

All the documents from the War Department, and the report of the Committee of the House, may be found in the American State Papers, (Mil. Aff. vol. i, pp. 634 and 661.) They constitute a triumphant vindication of the fair fame of General Harrison from the imputations cast upon it then, and are equally conclusive in answer to the insinuations of censure, which his adversaries at the present time seek to extort from the attending circumstances, without venturing to revive directly the exploded charge itself.

As these imputations had been the occasion of suspending the action of Congress upon the proposed vote of thanks at the outset, subsequently, when it was thus proved that the imputations were false and unfounded, the resolution was again taken up in the Senate, and passed by that and the other House, with the unanimity which has been above stated.

These are the facts, in substance, as exhibited at length in the journals of Congress and in the public documents.

I might refer to the recollection of individuals, with whom I have conversed or corresponded on the subject, or to the newspapers, to show the views and feelings of the time, as these acted upon the events. But I prefer to adduce a piece of authentic contemporaneous evidence, in the following extract from the published speech of Mr. Barbour, of Virginia, delivered the 31st of March, 1818, on the proposition to pass a vote of thanks to Colonel Richard M. Johnson.

"As to the objection of time, it will at once be removed by reflecting on that which has just occurred, the vote of thanks which has been awarded in favor of General Harrison and Governor Shelby. It is not unknown that rumor, the result of envy, or some other bad passion, had attempted to throw a shade around the character of that distinguished commander. He felt as he ought, and sought an investigation, to vindicate his character from the foul aspersions which had been cast upon it. It, after some delay took place, and resulted in an honorable acquittal.— In the mean time the venerable Shelby was, at his own request, withheld from the notice of the nation, as it is regarded the distinguished services he had rendered—Shelby, a name which can never be mentioned without awakening, in every American bosom, emotions of gratitude. I see in this illustrious character a display of that love of country and chivalrous spirit which conceived and effected our independence; and unabated by age, it reappeared to vindicate those rights, to the establishment of which, in his more youthful days, he had so essentially contributed. But he is as generous as he is brave; and he refused to accept a tribute of respect whose indirect consequence might have been a reflection on the commander-in-chief, to whose zeal, patriotism, and capacity in conducting this campaign he always bore a cheerful testimony. Col. Johnson influenced by the same sensibility peremptorily refused to his friends the permission of bringing this subject before the Representatives of the People.

I, however, will barely remark, in regard to the commanding General, that, with the regrets which the delay of justice to this citizen must necessarily create, will be mingled some consolation, in the reflection that his character has been entirely purified from the censure which had been improperly cast upon it; and that the need now dispensed has the sanction of the deliberate judgment of the nation, unbiassed by passion or the false fire of the moment. He will now receive it with a grateful feeling, as the highest reward which freemen can give, or a freeman receive." Nat. Intelligencer of 4th April, 1818.

For me to enlarge upon the eloquent truth of plain and simple facts of the case, as I have collected them from the journals and debates of Congress would be the vain attempt to gild refined gold, or to hold a light to the sun.

I will, therefore, only add, that while it is very common for exalted services to encounter calumny,—and in this respect General Harrison has only shared the ordinary lot of greatness—it is not in every case that the groundlessness of a calumnious charge can be so amply proved, as it was in 1817, when his conduct as commander-in-chief of the Northwestern Army was indirectly called in question. All Congress gave its solemn judgment in his favor, not only by its vote on the charge itself, but also in then passing the resolution of thanks, as it were by acclamation.

I remain, very respectfully,  
C. CUSHING.