Rec'd. The North Carolinian. n. from Mr. Sec. of State. 10187.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY
H. L. HOLMES.

TERMS—$2 50 per annum, if paid in advance; $3 if paid at the end of six months; or $3 50 at the expiration of the year. Advertisements inserted at the rate of sixty cents per square for the first, and thirty cents for each subsequent insertion.

☞ Letters on business connected with this establishment, must be addressed—H. L. Holmes, Editor of the North-Carolinian, and in all cases post-paid.

The North-Carolinian.

"Character is as important to States, as it is to individuals; and the glory of the State, is the common property of its citizens."

VOL. I. FAYETTEVILLE, SATURDAY, MARCH 9, 1839. No. 2.

IMPORTED FLATTERER; (Winner of the Grand Duke Michael Stakes, at New Market, England, first October Meeting of 1834.)—Having undertaken the management of this splendid English Race Horse, he will make the ensuing Season under my direction, at my Stable in the Town of Fayetteville, and will be let to mares at $50 the Season, $75 to insure, and fifty cents to the Groom. The Season commences on the 1st of March and end 1st July. Extensive and excellent pasturage provided for mares, and separate lots for such as may have young foals, and mares well fed with grain for thirty cents per day. Every care will be taken to guard against accidents, but no responsibility will be assumed for any that may occur, nor for escapes. The Season money will be due and payable when the mares are taken away.

PEDIGREE.

FLATTERER was got by Muley, (son of Orville and the famous mare Eleanour,) his dam, Clare, (bred by Lord Egremont in 1824) was got by Marmion, grand dam Harpalice by Gohanna, great grand dam Amazon by Driver—Fractious by Mercury—Woodpecker mare—Everlasting by *Eclipse*—Hyena by Snap—Miss Belsea by Regulus—Honeywood's Arabian—Byerly Turk mare, dam of the two True Blues.

MULEY, the sire of Flatterer, was the best bred son of Orville, who was a winner of the St. Leger, and a most capital Stallion, having covered at as high as 52*l.* Orville's is not only the most fashionable, but is also considered the best stock in England. Orville is the sire of Emilus, covering at 50 sovereigns, and, through him, imp. Priam, covering in this country at $150—of Plenipo, covering at 25 sovs. (all three winners of the Derby)—Oxygen, winner of the Oaks—imp. Sarpeden—imp. Merman—imp. Tranby, &c. *Muley* is also sire of Vespa, winner of the Oaks—of Muley Moloch—imp. *Leviathan*—imp. Margrave, &c. *Muley* is out of *Eleanour*, the best bred mare of her day, who won both the Derby and the Oaks, and who is the only nag that has accomplished that great feat. Eleanour (by Whiskey, that famous getter of the stout sort, out of that splendid brood mare Young Giantess by Diomed,) is the grand dam of imp. Luzborough, and is full sister to Julia, dam. of imp. Priam—and half sister to the Walton filly, dam of Langar, all distinguished runners.

Clare, dam of Flatterer, was out of Harpalice by Gohanna, the best four mile horse of his day, and as a Stallion *equal to any of any age*. Harpalice, g. d. of Flatterer, was bred by the Earl of Egremont, [who has bred a greater number of game horses than any other turf-man in England during the last forty years,] and was got by Gohanna, her dam by Herod, she was the dam of Precipitate, out of Maiden by Matchem, from Mr. Pratt's old Squirt mare, Mercury, sire of Gohanna, was got by the invincible *Eclipse*, out of Mr. O'Kelly's old Tartar mare, g. d. Amazon, by Driver. This mare, herself the dam of racers, was full sister to Hannibal, winner of the Derby, and Carthage, a distinguished racer and brood mare. Young Amazon, full sister to Harpalice, was the dam of Belwire, Tinwire, Goldwire, Trinket and Sharper, all distinguished on the Turf. This last, Sharper, so famous for bottom, was selected to run a 49 mile race in Russia, against the Cossack horses—he was sent there, run, and won easily, under great disadvantage of weight. G. g. d Fractious, by Mercury, is the g. g. d. of Lapdog and Spaniel, both winners of the Derby—perhaps the only instance where two colts from the same mare have won that great race. The whole pedigree of Harpalice presents a long list of spiendid racers. From this same maternal line was descended the famous English Stallion Tramp, whose dam was got by Gohanna, and almost full sister to Harpalice. Hart's old Medley traces to the same source; Chateau Margaux and Cetus, both imported, and among the best, too, are from Gohanna mares, with much of the same blood as the g. d. of Flatterer. Indeed, Chateau Margaux, with the exception of one cross, has precisely the same pedigree. Mr. Pratt's old Squirt mare; Sir C. Bunbury's Young Giantess, and Mr. O'Kelly's old Tartar mare, to whom Flatterer is closely allied by blood, with the Duke of Grafton's Prunella, are regarded by the best sportsmen and breeders as the best mares in England.

FLATTERER, like his sire Muley, who was said to be the largest boned thorough-bred in the Kingdom, and to be equal to 20 stone, (280 lbs!) is a horse of the largest size, full sixteen hands high, of immense power, large bone, great substance, good action, long stride, sound constitution, and excellent temper. His colour is a fine brown, without white. It will be seen that his pedigree runs back to the famous old English Eclipse, in an extremely short, and as rich a line as could be desired.

☞ The extraordinary performances of the three year old filly *Vashti*, by Flatterer's half-brother *Leviathan*, of Tennessee, at the Raleigh and other Courses in this State last Fall, and of many others of that horse's get at the South and South West, recommend his Stock to the favorable attention of breeders. Flatterer has proved a very sure horse. SAMUEL MIMS.

March 2, 1839. 1—tf

HOTEL.—It is with much pleasure I inform the public, that I have taken charge of the LAFAYETTE HOTEL, in the Town of CLINTON, Sampsnn county, North Carolina. It is with equal pleasure that I assure the public, that no pains or exertions shall be dispensed with, necessary to the comfort and ease of those who may feel inclined to patronize me. My TABLE will at all times be supplied with the best viands this country can afford.

Families travelling East and West, North and South, will find the accommodations in the Lafayette Hotel inferior to none in the Southern country. Viaticum for their journey will be neatly provided when required.

The members of our Bar will meet with a most kind and hospitable reception;—every facility will be afforded them for counselling with their clients.

B. STITH, *M. D.*

March 2, 1839. 1—tf

THIS is to caution all persons from trading with my wife Catharine, as I am resolved not to pay any debts of her contracting; she having left me without any just cause.

MOSES EDWARDS.

March 2, 1839. 1-1t

JUST received by Steamer Henrietta,
100,000 best SPANISH CIGARS,
50 boxes bunch RAISINS,
20 barrels BUTTER CRACKERS,
Also, a variety of SWEETMEATS.

A. M. CAMPBELL.

March 2, 1839. 1—tf

STABLES TO RENT on Hillsborough Street, a few yards below my Store.

T. S. LUTTERLOH.

March 2, 1839. 1-3w

TIN, Copper, and Sheet Iron MANUFACTORY.—The subscriber informs his friends and the public that he has on hand and continues to manufacture at his old establishment, Hay Street, near the Post Office, every article in the above line, and has on hand a large assortment of Tin and Jappanned Ware, Copper Stills, Worms, Hatter's Kettles, Dye Wash Kettles, Brass Kettles and Tea Kettles.

Also a large assortment of STOVES and Stove PIPE, consisting of Fireplace and Pipe Franklins, Cooking, Boiling and Baking Stoves, Six plate and Box Stoves, Sheet Iron & Foot Stoves; and keeps constantly on hand Tin Plate 13 X and extra sizes, Brass & Iron Wire, Sheet and Bolt Copper, Sheet Brass, Iron, Steel and Zinck; Sheet, Bar and Pig Lead, Spelter, Round and Hoop Iron; Nail and Spike Rods; Thick Planished Steel; first quality Mill and Cross Cut Saws, with a general assortment of other articles in his line, which he would respectfully invite the attention of country merchants and others to examine. He will sell as low as can be bought in this place.

JAMES MARTINE.

Fayetteville, March 2, 1839. 1-3m

MONUMENTAL

Marble Factory,

By JAMES FOSTER,

LIBERTY POINT—FAYETTEVILLE—OPPOSITE *The Jackson Hotel.*

Morch 2, 1839. 1-6w

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, *Sampson County.*

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, February Term, 1839.

John Robinson vs. Logan Matthews. } Constable's Levy on Land.

IT appearing to the satisfaction of the Court that the Defendant hath removed from this State, so that a personal notice of said levy cannot be served on him, it is therefore *Ordered* by the Court, that publication be made in The North Carolinian for 6 weeks, notifying said Defendant of said levy on his land, and requiring him to appear at the next Term of said Court, and shew cause against the same, or an order will be made by said Court for the sale of the lands levied on as aforesaid, for the satisfaction of Plaintiff's demand.

Witness, Thomas I. Faison, Clerk of said Court, at office in Clinton, the third Monday in February, A. D. 1839, and of American Independence, the 63rd. THOS. I. FAISON, Clerk.

March 2, 1839. 1—6w

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, *Sampson County.*

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, February Term, 1839.

William C. Draughon vs. Jordon Wooton. } Levy on Land.

IT appearing to the satisfaction of the Court that the Defendant hath removed from this State, so that a personal notice of said levy cannot be served on him, it is therefore *Ordered* by the Court that publication be made in The North Carolinian for 6 weeks, notifying the said Defendant of said levy on his land, and requiring him to appear at the next Term of the Court, and shew cause against the same, or an order will be made by said Court for the sale of the lands levied on as aforesaid for the satisfaction of Plaintiff's demand.

Witness, Thomas I. Faison, Clerk of said Court, at office, in Clinton, the third Monday in February, A. D. 1839, and of American Independence, the 63rd. THOS. I. FAISON, Clerk,

March 2, 1839. 1—6w

STATE OF NORTH-CAROLINA, *Sampson County.*

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, February Term, 1839,

Jonathan Carr, Executor of Jonathan Carr, deceased, vs. Everet Carr. } Caveat of the will of the dec'd, and issue thereupon of "devisavit vel non."

A Paper writing, purporting to be the last will and testament of Jonathan Carr, deceased, being exhibited in open court and offered for probate, by Jonathan Carr the Executor therein constituted, and the defendant Everet Carr having entered a coveat against the probate thereof, an issue was thereupon made up to be tried by a jury of the country. Whether the said paper writing is the last will and testament of the said Jonathan Carr, dec'd.; and it appearing to the court that Hardy A. Carr, Alfred Turner—and his wife Anne, and Mary Ann, Elizabeth, Margaret and Rachel Rowles, interested as the next of kin of the deceased, are not inhabitants of this State, It is ordered by the Court that publication be made in "The North-Carolinian" for eight weeks, notifying the said parties and next of kin, to appear at the next Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, to be held for the County of Sampson, at the Court House in Clinton, on the 3d Monday in May next, then and there to make themselves parties of record to the suit on the trial of the said issue, otherwise they will be precluded from all right thereafter of coveating or otherwise hindering the probate of said will.

Witness, Thomas I. Faison, Clerk of said Court, at office, in Clinton, the third Monday in February, A. D. 1839, and of American Independence the 63d.

THOS. I. FAISON, *Clerk.*

March 2. 1839. 1—8w

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, *Sampson County.*

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, February Term, 1839.

William Tew vs: Logan Matthews. } Original Attachment levied on the lands of the Defendant.

IT appearing to the satisfaction of the Court that the Defendant hath removed beyond the limits of this State, so that the ordinary process of law cannot be served on him, it is therefore *Ordered* by the Court, that publication be made for eight weeks in The North Carolinian, notifying said Defendant of the levy of said attachment, and requiring him to appear, replevy and plead at the next term of this Court, or judgment, by default, will be awarded against him, and the lands levied on will be condemned to the satisfaction of Plantiff's demand.

Witness, Thomas I. Faison, Clerk of said Court, at office, in Clinton, the third Monday in February, A. D. 1839, and of American Independence, the 63rd. THOS. I. FAISON, Clerk.

March 2, 1839. 1—8w

DEBATE IN CONGRESS.

SPEECH OF MR. STRANGE, OF NORTH CAROLINA,

In Senate of U. States, February 13, 1839—On the bill to prevent the interference of certain Federal officers with elections.

Mr. STRANGE said: Mr. President, I am not a volunteer in this debate. At the beginning of the session, the Senate thought proper to assign me a place on an important committee, to which the subject now under consideration was referred, and upon it the chairman of that committee presented a long and able report. To the credit of the exclusive authorship of that report, the chairman is entitled. Both its substance and its language are his own. But although I lay no claim to any part of the authorship of the report, I yielded it my hearty assent, and it is due to myself to show that I did not yield that assent hastily, or upon insufficient reasons. Upon the report the most extraordinary attack has been made; perhaps the most violent to be found in the history of this body. I had not the good fortune to hear the remarks made by the Senator from Kentucky, [Mr. CRITTENDEN,] but I listened attentively to the assault made upon the report by the Senator from Virginia, [Mr. RIVES,] who appeared to me to have wrought himself up to a most extravagant pitch of excitement. He spoke of the report as fraught with doctrines subversive of liberty, and so corrupting in their nature, that the Senate ought to undergo a lustration to purify itself from their contaminating effects. I listened to the Senator with equal surprise and disappointment. Surprise, at the fury into which he seemed to have wrought himself, and disappointment, at the result of his argument. I was not prepared to find his extravagant promises fall so far short of fulfilment, and little expected to see an advocacy of the bill result in its total abandonment.

The Senator stated, he was so much surprised and bewildered at the reading of the report, that he was at a loss to know whether he was in the Senate of the United States or in the kingdom of France or of England. I am not at all disposed to question the truth of this statement, for it furnishes the only mode known to me of accounting for the strange statements made by the Senator in relation to the report. No man in his sober sense—in the full possession of all his faculties, could take up that report, and extract from it the doctrines ascribed to it by the Senator from Virginia. Those high faculties, that good sense which usually characterize that Senator, were for some reason in abeyance. He must have been, as he himself declares, bewildered, for I cannot suppose (the only remaining alternative) that the Senator would [illegible] he really understood. So perfect was the Senator's bewilderment, that he not only asserted that certain doctrines were set forth in the report, which I insist are not to be found there, but pledged himself to the proof, and proceeded to read therefrom certain passages for that purpose. His first allegation is, that the report inculcates on the office holders of the General Government the duty of intermeddling with the elections of the country, and is calculated to stir them up to greater exertions. If any one will take the trouble to examine that report he will find that, so far from inculcating upon the office holders of the Government improper intermeddling with the elections, its tendency is directly the other way. The following is one of the passages it contains, which is, I think, any thing but a persuasion to intermeddle improperly in elections:

"That elections ought to be pure and incorrupt is a principle admitted by all, and no language can be too strong to express the abhorrence felt by the committee against any attempt to destroy this freedom and purity.—He who is guilty of either, by bribing or corrupting voters, violating the ballot box, or setting at nought its voice, forging or suppressing returns, or disobeying the laws enacted for securing any elective right, is guilty of treason against Republican institutions, and ought to be regarded by all as a dangerous foe to liberty."

I will now proceed to review the passages cited by the Senator, and, so far as my memory serves me, read them all over again to the Senate. The first is as follows:

"The foundation of representative Government is based upon the intelligence of the citizen, and to insure that intelligence, it is both the right and the duty of every one, freely to discuss and communicate, both publicly and privately, such matters as he may suppose will advance the public interest, or inform the public mind. One of the most salutary and effectual agents, to promote such interest, is an enlightened public opinion. To evolve such opinion, and to give form and direction to the general course of national policy, and the future destinies of all, every citizen, whether intrusted with public office or not, has a like deep, abiding, and active interest, and no citizen is at liberty to withdraw himself from this high responsibility, inseparably connected with Republican institutions. One of the most celebrated law makers of one of the ancient Republics, declared every citizen infamous, who refused to take part in the affairs of his country; and the word *idiot*, derived from the language of that Republic, bears through all times this impress of their institutions, denoting one who was destitute of the spirit or intelligence requisite for the discharge of this highest duty of a citizen.

"The elective right is not conferred by the Constitution of the United States, but belongs to representative Government, and springs from its very nature; and the very essence of that right, under our institutions, is the right of electing the members of the General and State Governments. The value and the advantages of this right, so far as respects the public, depend upon the knowledge of public measures, and of the qualifications of candidates for public trust, and, consequently, upon the equal and unrestricted freedom of discussing their comparative merits and demerits. The citizen who, by the choice of his fellows, is distinguished by being selected to perform official duties and trusts, is not thereby elevated above them, nor degraded below them.—He parts with no rights of citizenship, but remains an equal among equals; still connected with them by the strong and enduring ligaments of mutuality of rights and privileges.

Under our constitution, the people, not the Government, possess the sovereignty; and the doors of office can be opened only by the powerful charm of the public voice, and no degrading sacrifice of any of the privileges of citizenship, or any separation from the community of rights, feelings, and interests, which bind the people to the Government, is required.

These positions are all general, including every citizen, and not asserting any peculiar rights or duties as belonging to office holders in relation to elections. Can any dispassionate man discover any thing, in any part of the foregoing passage, inciting office holders to the exercise of improper influence in elections? Is it not true that enlightened public opinion is the basis upon which our institutions rest? Is it not true that free discussion is important to the formation of sound public opinion? And is it not the duty of every man, whether he holds an office or not, to contribute his mite towards enlightening the public mind, and giving to public opinion a direct and healthy current? And is it not also true, that those who shrink from that duty are, for the most part, *idiots*, in the more modern acceptation of that word, or men so thoroughly selfish as to be indifferent to every thing but their own private concerns? Men so indolent by nature as to decline every species of exertion, or so devoted to the acquisition of fortune as to be totally unmindful of the public weal, so that affairs are so conducted as to enable them to feather well their own nests? The report goes on to say: "The object of the bill is to render what is lawful and praiseworthy, and in strict conformity with both the letter and spirit of our institutions, for all citizens, criminal in a particular class, who have been honored by the confidence of the people of the whole States." Where is the incentive in that passage to office holders to intermeddle with elections? What is there in it not accordant with the strictest propriety? It states what every man must see to be the effect of the bill. It contains solemn truth, which no man can doubt who is not wilfully blind. The next passage to which the Senator calls our attention is:

"It is as well his inherent right as his duty to discuss and promulgate freely the measures [illegible] conduct of those who support or oppose it, as well to control them by the censorship of public opinion, as to subject them to the test of the Constitution. In doing so, he may win the confidence of his fellow-citizens by his declared opinions, or may become indentified with some great principle which conciliates their support. All this is innocent and praiseworthy, even if the motive is the acquisition of office, because it promotes the public good. Can it be wise, or even just, to punish as a crime, when a citizen attains office, what was patriotic and praiseworthy while he was seeking it? Yet why should office seeking and office holding be thus separated by arbitrary enactments, which bestow honors and confidence upon the one, and penalty and ignominy upon the other, for doing the same act?"

Now is not all this just and true? Is it not sound doctrine? And would it be pretended by any one that a free discussion of public men and public measures should be forbidden to any citizen? Would any bill containing such a proposal, in plain and undisguised terms, meet with favor from any quarter? And yet all that is asserted in the passage quoted is, in substance, that no such restriction ought to be imposed. The next passage quoted in support of the first charge is the following:

"The committee can perceive no reason for the adoption by Congress of any restriction upon any of what they deem the inherent and unalienable rights of every class of citizens, merely because they have been honored with the confidence of the people."

And does any man see a reason why a citizen should be deprived of his inherent and unalienable rights, merely because he has been appointed to office? I challenge any man in the Senate to assume such ground.—Neither the Senator from Virginia, nor any other member, dare assume it. And shall the report be denounced for asserting its untenability? Upon these passages it is that the Senator from Virginia has based his assertion that the report urges the office holders to an improper interference in the elections of the country. And does not the bare reading of these passages dispel at once the plausibility of the charge? I have said I was surprised that the charge should have been made. But I admit I ought not to have been surprised.—After what has occurred under my own observation, my capacity for surprise at any opinion uttered, or any language used by the Senator upon a political subject, should have been exhausted.

And now, having utterly failed to prove the dangerous nature of the report, the Senator goes on to say that he would not have felt himself so imperatively called upon to assail it, could he consider it as the mere work of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, or even as the production of all the committee; but he regards it as an exposition of the opinions and sentiments of a whole political party—by which he evidently meant what is called the Administration party. Now, if the Senator intended to insinuate that any sentiment contained in the report was supplied from any source extraneous to the committee, that it was dictated by that Executive of whom the Senator seems to have conceived such a sudden, violent, and holy horror, he does great injustice to the committee, to the chairman, and still greater injustice to himself. But if he means no more than to assert that the report contains only such doctrines and opinions as are entertained by a great political party of this country, he asserts what is strictly true. It does contain, upon the subject of which it treats, the opinions and doctrines of the purest party of which this country will ever boast; a party of which any man may feel proud to be a member; a party numbering in its ranks a Franklin, a Jefferson, a Madison; a Taylor, a Jackson, and a host of orher stars which have shone the brightest in the political galaxy of our country.

But the Senator further imputes to the report an attempt to degrade the States, and put them upon a level with the private corporations of their own creation. This charge seems to me to be quite as baseless and gratuitous as the one which preceded it. The Senator does not, as in the former case, cite the passages in which he fancies this lurking vice is to be found, but contents himself with making the charge; and I defy any man to point out a portion of the report that at all justifies the imputation. I have, for the purpose of detecting such a vice, if it exists, in vain ransacked the report from end to end. But two or three times are the State Governments and corporations mentioned in connection, and in every instance, I believe the Federal Government is found in the same company; so that if the levelling process is introduced at all, it is by levelling up as well as levelling down. But let the passages speak for themselves:

"While one set of functionaries under the Federal Government, and all those of the State Governments, and the officers of the corporations of associated wealth, are left with an unrestricted freedom of speech and of the press, this bill puts gags and fetters upon a few proscribed men, in respect to public men and public measures. Why this discrimination? Are the proscribed officers more corrupt or liable to corruption than other office holders? Is it to guard against the corrupting influence and patronage of the Federal Administration? If so, the effect of the bill would be still more objectionable, as in degrading them by taking from them the rights common to all others, it would prepare them to become the willing instruments of corruption or ambition. The bill would create a caste among office holders, deriving their authority from the same high source, the people, and requiring the same high qualifications to discharge their duties."

Now is there any thing in this paragraph drawing a distinction between any classes of officers degrading to the governments of the States? Is it not, on the contrary, the drift of the passage to assert the equality and the innocence and distinctions which it alleges the bill will create?

"Why [says the report in another place] should those officers be rendered aliens, and be prohibited from the enjoyment of the social rights of discussing political subjects, even under the protection of their own household gods, while the other functionaries of the Federal and State Governments, and the officers of the corporations of associated wealth, and the employees of private persons, are permitted to retain the full rights of citizens? This bill degrades the right of suffrage, the guardian of all political rights, by meting it out as a boon in different portions to different citizens, all equally worthy of trust, and distinguished by popular favor, and by placing it under an odious espionage."

Are there here any invidious distinctions or degrading comparisons drawn; on the contrary, are they not, as before, disapproved and complained of? The report goes on to say:

"The committee can find no scales in the Constitution in which to weigh the relative patriotism, integrity, and independence of the functionaries of the Federal and State governments, and the officers of corporations, or the employees of individuals. They cannot believe that the employees of the Federal Government are more corrupt or corrupting than those of other bodies corporate or politic, or of individuals."

Is not this precisely the reverse of what is charged? The report declares that greater honesty is not to be found in one class of citizens than another, or, if so, that the committee know of no means of ascertaining its existence; so far is it from placing the officers of the Federal Government upon any point of peculiar elevation, or degrading the State officers and those of corporations to a level below them, as is most unjustly charged by the Senator from Virginia.

From this topic the Senator launches forth into a philippic against what he is pleased to call modern democracy, one of whose characteristics he charges to be a tendency to curtail Legislative power and to extend Executive. Democracy is just what it always has been under our institutions. Its distinctive principles consist in tracing the political power to its true source, and circumscribing all the departments of the government strictly within their constitutional limits; and, as experience has shown that legislative usurpation is of much more frequent occurrence than executive, against the former has its efforts, through the whole history of our country, been chiefly directed.

The Senator speaks of his early democracy, and dates it back, I believe, as far as the year 1798, when, without meaning to compliment, I am sure the Senator must have been a very young politician. Against which, then, I pray you, were the celebrated resolutions of that period directed, legislative or executive usurpation? Was it not against the former? Was it not against a law passed by Congress, and not against any supposed misapplication, by the executive, of power conferred by that law? Every one acquainted with the history of that transaction knows it is so. And we may be well assured, that while we are able to preserve the Constitution from legislative encroachment, we have nothing to fear from the Executive. If a despot should ever complete the overthrow of the institutions of American liberty, it must be when legislative violence has diminished their strength. And of the latter it is that democracy is justly and particularly watchful. Its principles are now the same that they ever have been. Men may change, Mr. President, but principles never. Yea, men do change, and to justify or conceal their changes, endeavor to create confusion in principles themselves. The principles of the democracy are now what they were in 1798, and the principles of its opponents are the same, also, however they may seek to disguise them under new names. The principles that distinguished the opponents of democracy then, are the principles that distinguish them now; and what would have made a federalist of that day, and subsequently a federal republican, and still later a national republican, makes a whig now. Men may change their principles, and thus the federalist of one day may be the democrat of another. But it is only by changing his principles, that a man becomes the one, from having been the other. The principles themselves are as immutable as truth.

The Senator next goes on to charge the report with stirring up the people to rebellion against the law; and to establish that charge, cites from it the following passage:

"It deserves serious consideration, [says the report] whether a law like this bill could ever be carried into execution at this day, and under our free institutions—a law which prostrates the freedom of thought, of action, of speech, and of the press, so far as respects a large portion of the most intelligent, respected, and meritorious of our citizens. The great body of the functionaries whom this bill would affect have been honored by the selection of the people, to discharge responsible duties, for their honesty, capacity, and fidelity to the Constitution. The habitual reviler of republican institutions, and of the capacity of the people for self-government, may in vain attempt to fix a stigma upon all officers who derive their appointments from the people, for the purpose of thus gradually undermining their confidence in the government of their choice; but the people will always be found true to themselves, and will never submit to the execution of a law which deprives their fellow-citizen of his inherent, common, and equal rights, simply because they had distinguished him by their favor and preference."

What is there here in the nature of an exhortation to the people to rebellion? What were the famous resolutions of '98, but an appeal to the people to restore the breaches of the Constitution, not by force and violence, but by the exercise of their sovereign and constitutional powers? And does the Senator venture to complain of those resolutions? But this report does not go even so far as the resolutions; it makes no appeal to the people, but merely utters the voice of warning to this body against the passage of the proposed bill. By the will of our constituents we all profess to be governed, and the report only declares what its framer believes to be the immovable will of our common constituents.

But the Senator chooses to [illegible] the people, and this he denominates *Loco Focoism.* Now, whether it is *Loco Focoism*, or not, it is solemn truth. This word Loco-Foco is one of those cabalistic terms which a cetain class of politicians use to conjure up any accusation it may suit their convenience to fasten upon their adversaries. Its acknowledged unintelligibility relieves them from all obligation to explain, and it fixes a sort of undefined odium upon whomsoever they choose to denounce. Those who use it seem to attach to it no other idea than that of a *nomen generale* of whatsoever is odious and detestable to them in politics. At one time it is Agrarianism; at another, a general community of every thing, unregulated by law; at a third, hostility to corporations; and, at a fourth, it is made to signify a seditious stirring up of the people.

But the Senator doubts whether he is a competent judge of Federalism and Loco Focoism. Now I admit, in a philogical sense, no man is competent to define Loco Focoism; but if it is to be taken as the proper name of any political party in the country, the Senator is, I think, altogether too modest in disavowing his competency to speak of it. If there is any truth in the maxim, *experientia docet*, (experience teaches,) the Senator is unusually well qualified to speak of the parties of this country and to define them. He has avowedly belonged to two, and the evidences are pretty strong that he is now uniting himself with a third. He ought, therefore, to be well acquainted with what lies upon the surface of things, palpable to the eye of any discerning man; and if there be any party secrets or mysteries in any of the parties of this country, they, also, cannot fail to be known to him who has been initiated into all.

But, after all, these violent assaults upon the report of the committee are not so much to be wondered at. The report has been very troublesome to the gentlemen on the other side. It so far shook the confidence of the Senator who introduced the bill, as to induce him to propose an amendment, changing materially its character; and the Senator from Virginia is for abandoning the bill altogether, and substituting in its place a string of resolutions. A general must be much dissatisfied with his position who changes it in the face of an enemy. But this our adversaries ought not to be allowed to do; they have made an issue before the country, and they ought to be required to meet it. It is one of the artifices of war, when a party is weak at home to endeavor to transfer the scene of strife to the territory of the enemy, and by a similar artifice do the gentlemen seek to turn away observation from the enormities of the bill, by directing it to the supposed defects in the report. But to little purpose is it adopted. The report scarcely admits of defence, because, in truth, it has no assailable point. The Senator from Virginia is unqestionably a gentleman of ingenunity and talent, and has come to the onset with a hearty will, if possible, to demolish the report. But every assault made by him has signally failed. His blows were dealt with dexterity enough, but they were unaccompanied with the force of truth. The bill, on the other hand, is assailable at every position, and were a shot directed against every weak point, it would be converted into