

The Rutland Herald.

"LIBERTY AND UNION, NOW AND FOREVER ONE AND INSEPARABLE."—JEFFERSON.

VOLUME XLII.

RUTLAND, Tuesday, March 15, 1836.

NUMBER 19.

The Rutland Herald.

PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY, AT RUTLAND, VT., BY
WILLIAM FAY.

THE RUTLAND HERALD.



NATIONAL TICKET.

FOR PRESIDENT OF THE U. S.
WM. H. HARRISON,
OF OHIO.
FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
Francis Granger,
OF NEW YORK.

Public Sentiment.

In order to manifest to our readers the unexampled unanimity which apparently pervades the State in relation to the proceedings of the late Conventions, held at Montpelier, we copy below the views entertained by our brother Editors.

If this expression is a true index to public feeling on this important subject, and we have no doubt but it is, then we say the few refractory spirits who are seeking for "the spoils" and the two or three treacherous editors who have deserted their old standard and who are attempting to stifle this feeling, by exhibiting false colors, and by the most absurd and preposterous subterfuges, for sinister purposes, may flounce and flounder, and wring and twist into as many shapes as they please, and it will all avail them nothing. The voice of the people, when universally expressed, will be like a mighty torrent, carry all before it.

From the Spirit of Green Mountain.

THE VOICE OF THE GREEN MOUNTAIN BOYS.—The Convention, which met at Montpelier on the 24th ult., succeeded in bringing out their nominations for State officers, and candidate for the two highest national offices.

We consider these nominations as the expressed will of the good people of Vermont, unswayed by the corrupt influence of men in authority—unshackled by the collar of party dictation, unbought by the bribes of the "spoils holders." The names of William Henry Harrison and Francis Granger, are presented to the public, as the choice of the Vermont whigs. To this choice, made in a free and republican manner, we cheerfully assent. It is, and should be, irrevocable only by more complete and full expression of opinion and will.—Opposed to Andrew Jackson, and his nominated pet successor, Martin Van Buren, we shall take great pleasure in presenting to our fellow citizens the names of Harrison and Granger. Contrast the miserable conclave of office-holders at Baltimore, echoing the voice of Jackson, with the assemblies of unassuming, peaceful citizens meeting in their respective states, to express their will in their own way in these matters. Fear, favor, Executive influence and interference—hereditary succession on the one hand; courage, independence, self respect, republican honesty on the other. Where may we look for independent thought and action, if it may not be found with the People. And here it is found—here, among the snowey hill-tops of Vermont, and there, among the independent republicans of Pennsylvania and Ohio. We are not mistaken. Harrison and Granger are the choice of our freemen.

From the Vergennes Palladium.

THE PRESIDENT.—We present to our readers the Hon. WM. H. HARRISON, for President, and FRANCIS GRANGER for Vice President. We have confidently anticipated that DANIEL WEBSTER would have received the nomination and electoral vote of Vermont. But however much we regret the lack of attention paid to this great and distinguished man, we believe that the People of Vermont, esteem him a man on whom they can safely rely, and thought not filling the important station for which he is pre-eminently qualified, we hail him as the oracle of a nation! In times like the present, personal preference, should not be suffered to defeat the objects of a common interest, and a common cause. If General Harrison is the most available candidate, we go for him heart and hand. To suppress Van Burenism, and to defeat the base purpose of a powerful junta and treacherous renegade, be not an object worthy the patriot, our country and her interest are alike unworthy consideration, and sink to puny insignificance!

We presume the two Conventions (Antimasonic and Whig) were actuated by purely patriotic motives, and acted with reference to the alarming state of affairs now existing. The misrule of Jacksonism, the threatenings of Van Burenism stared them in the face,—violation and outrage had been practiced upon the Constitution,—and a Successor appointed, pledged to carry out repeated injuries, kindled a blaze of honest indignation in the bosom of patriots! The question, then, Around whom shall the freemen of Vermont rally? The response meets our ear, HARRISON AND GRANGER,—and is echoed through the land. Here then we hang our hopes. Let Freemen do their duty—PRESERVE—and the country's saved!

From the Bellows Falls Journal.

CONVENTION. In another column we give the proceedings of the Whig Convention held at Montpelier the 24th and 25th ult. The Antimasonic convention nominated the candidates which were seconded by the Whig convention. An effort was made by Barber, Flint & a few others, to prevent any nomination at that time, and if a nomination must be made, to nominate Van Buren. Runners were out the weeks before, to hunt up Antimasonic Van Burenites and get them delegated for the occasion. In some instances an express was

sent 40 miles after the "true blues" and they were taken to another town and there clothed with a little brief authority and sent forth to labor. But it would "no go." With all their whistling and piping they did raise the enormous number of "immortal 27," dying for present use. This "little band" after the convention adjourned, got together and—elected—not exactly—nominated Van Buren, and their set of electors. Who can now doubt, after this display, that Vermont is not hitched on to a Van Buren button? We doubt it—Vermont never has and never will support Van Buren or his measures. Mark that. The hardy yeomanry of Vermont will never bow to Mr Van Buren, no how Barber and his colleagues can fix it.

From the State (Antimasonic) Journal.

The following is the official account of the doings of the Whigs at their State Convention last week. It will be perceived that one of their resolutions is in opposition to all secret societies—say, and all monopolies "particularly a monopoly of the patronage of the Government for party purposes." In adopting as they have done, all the nominations of the Antimasons, the Whigs have evinced a spirit of liberality which is highly creditable to them, and which demands a respectful recognition at our hands. The Jackson party, if they want to put down "secret societies and open monopolies," would do well to lay aside their ultra federal propensities, and go the same ticket, and thus "redeem the lost character of the State."

From the Burlington Free Press.

The proceedings of the two conventions which met at Montpelier on the 24th ult. will be found in our columns to-day, and we refer to them with pride and satisfaction, as proving to the world—that we have never doubted—that Vermont is true to herself, true to the country, and true to the principles which moved our fathers to resist oppression. The same spirit which nerved their arms to resist encroachments of New York upon our territory, still exists, among their sons, and will repel with equal scorn the present and all future attempts to palm upon us the corrupt system of New York politics. Be it therefore known to you, O powers that be, we, the People of Vermont worship not your dole—we covet not your "spoils."

It now only remains for the several counties to effect an immediate organization for the campaign and carry it out in the spirit it has commenced, to secure a triumph worthy the palmy days of Allen and Warner. We promise good account from old Chittenden.

From the (Bennington) Vermonter.

We insert, to-day, the nomination of the Hon. Wm. Henry Harrison as candidate for the Presidency, and of Francis Granger as candidate for the Vice Presidency of the U. S. at the approaching election. We have not delayed an insertion of the foregoing ticket, to the time, because it does not meet our views of expediency, or policy, or because we hesitate to give our cordial support. On the contrary, we do firmly believe that a more suitable selection could not have been made, and so far as our views are deserving any consideration, we shall consider it a duty which we owe to the country, to advocate the cause of both these candidates. In doing this, we would not detract any thing from the fair reputation of Mr Webster. His talents are of a brilliant character, and eminently qualify him for any station to which the people may call him.—During a long life, he has made the laws of his country, and the constitution his favorite study, and while he has uniformly ranked at the head of the expounders of one, and defenders of the other, his character has been unswayed by the breath of slander. But a large majority of the people of Vermont it appears prefer Mr. Harrison. We in common with the Antimasons dread the election of Mr Van Buren as an event fraught with danger to our liberties. United as we are, in this very important point, let there be a still nearer union between us, in the support of the Constitution, the Judiciary, the protective system, and the public faith. United we stand, but divided we fall, and the common enemy triumphs over us. We ask you then to render your opposition to Van Buren efficient and available, by helping us to sustain Gen. Harrison. If our friends who prefer Mr Webster do this HE CAN BE ELECTED WITHOUT DIFFICULTY.

MASSACHUSETTS ANTIMASONRY.

At a meeting of the Antimasonic members of the Legislature, opposed to the nomination of Martin Van Buren as a candidate for the next Presidency, held at the State House, Feb. 29, 1836.—The following Preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

Whereas, a meeting was held at the State House in Boston on the 29th of January last, purporting to be an Antimasonic Convention of members of the Legislature, and delegates from the city of Boston, and neighboring towns, at which meeting resolutions were adopted, recommending Martin Van Buren as a candidate for the support of the Antimasons of Massachusetts at the approaching Presidential Election; and whereas the proceedings of that meeting having been published, and being now before the people, and liable to be received for what they purport to be,—the unanimous voice of the Antimasonic members of the Legislature; the members of this meeting believe it not only their privilege but their duty to state to their constituents and the people generally, that from the beginning they considered that meeting a Van Buren Convention, and in no other way connected with Antimasonry than as being the grand consummation of a long series of plans and intrigues formed for the purpose of transferring the Antimasons of this Commonwealth to the Van Buren interest; and for these reasons the members composing this meeting forebore taking any part therein. Believing, however, that a great majority of the original Antimasons of Massachusetts cannot conscientiously, and therefore will not lend their aid or support to promote the election of Martin Van Buren, and being now desirous of obtaining a general expression of opinion entertained by them in regard to the approaching Presidential Election,—therefore,

Resolved, That the Chairman and Secretaries of this meeting be requested to notify a meeting of

such members of the Legislature and such citizens of Boston and vicinity as feel friendly to the objects of such meeting, to be held at the State House on Wednesday, the 9th day of March next, at 6 o'clock, P. M., for the purpose of having a further interchange of opinions, and of making a more full expression of their views and feelings, in regard to a candidate for the next Presidency. Also, to take such measures and adopt such resolutions as may then be considered proper and expedient.

THOMAS LONGLEY, Chairman.

S. H. REED, }
W. LUTHER, } Secretaries.

24th Congress—1st Session.

Speech of Mr. Wise,

[CONCLUDED.]

But to return from this digression. The three millions amendment passed; and after disagreement, the Senate adhered. Was it disrespectful to adhere? The gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Adams,) who I thought was "in a stew" all that dreadful night seems now to have a holy horror of the word "adhere." I understood the Senate, sir, was strongly asserting only the doctrine of specific appropriation; not as dissenting from the ordinary items of the bill, and not as objecting to a reasonable amount of additional appropriation formally enacted. The Senate, sir, did not know the secrets! And shall the Senators—among the rest an honored Senator from Tennessee, (Mr. White,) who knows his duty generally as any man without being told, who was once trusted by the President of any, and deserves now to be trusted with his confidence more than all his present friends, who, when he was in confidence, kept it honorably, and the confidence itself was honorable and patriotic—shall they, shall he, be accused and contemned for not knowing without hearing the Executive secret? Shall he be required to know without being told—to vote without knowing why? Why, sir, the service is hard enough to do the sovereign will and good pleasure of potentates when the bidding comes loud and authoritatively, and that Senator is not one who is likely to obey orders from any power but that of his own People and their Legislature; but to do the will of his master without bidding and to know that will without being told, is two much to expect of any slave. If this is a sin, I hope sir, that he and his friends will ever have to plead guilty. Sir, the Senate knew no "why or wherefore" whatever for the passage of that amendment—they were taken by surprise—they respectfully disagreed. The House refused to recede, and insisted. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) voted to recede from the three millions amendment, and yet yesterday he asserted that any one "who would refuse to vote for that amendment had but one other step to take, and that step would be to join the enemy and assist in battering down the walls of the Capitol!"

[Mr. Adams here rose to explain. He had made no personal allusion, he said, to any member of the Congress, nor to any individual member of the last Congress. He had personified a sentiment, and his remarks were applied to that personification.]

Mr. Wise. I am glad to stand corrected, I quoted the language in order to be put right. "The personification of a sentiment!" I see it, sir, I can give it form, size, color—a skin, muscle, bone and sinew. I can make it a palpable man, whose cranium the phrenologists would mark as very intellectual. I understand now that this is a Massachusetts war, and it is not for me, sir, to meddle with it. If I understand the gentleman's explanation for receding, it was to prevent the loss of the bill; and yet sir, when the House was for adhering, did he not adhere too? [Mr. Adams shook his head.] So it is, the gentleman did vote for once—twice to recede. Generally, if any man does adhere, adhere, and adhere, it is he! I voted for the amendment and adhered to it throughout.—I was not in the secret. I was on the verge of a precipice, and I might have had to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. A., for a vote which might have saved me from an awful plunge into error.

When the House asked for a conference, the Senate readily agreed, and appointed conferences on its part. The conferees of the two Houses agreed on reducing the appropriation from three millions to eight hundred thousand dollars, and on making it more specific. And I now again ask the honorable gentleman from N. Y. (Mr. Cambreleng) the chairman of the conferees of the House, whether, when he left the conference after agreement to report, he did not attend? Why did he not report? Sir, I said yesterday there were two conjectures. I say now there are three modes of accounting for the failure of the honorable gentleman's intention. One is, that the report failed because of a word in the ear, whispered by two high functionaries between the conference room and that door, (pointing to the door next to the Speaker's room,) or the gentleman's seat in the House. Were there not two such "busy-bodies" in the way of the duty to report? Another is, sir, that there was a special communication, a billet-doux, handed to the honorable gentleman (Mr. Cambreleng) in his seat after he came in from the conference. Was there such a billet, and what was its purport? A third is, that there was a special visit in person from a certain distinguished Senator of "the party," (Mr. S—W—Jr.) What did he say? Was not the burden of all three, the whisper, the billet, and the special messenger—the Senator stooped low from his high degree, to become a runner between the two Houses—that the conferees of the House had done wrong to agree to reduce the sum? That eight hundred thousand dollars was a "poor, pitiful sum," which would not satisfy the President? That the President had risen up in wrath, and sworn that he would veto the bill, because the Senate had refused the whole grant of three millions and that they should be made to bear the loss of the whole bill? Did not the intrigue then issue a double aspect of policy, to ward off from the President the responsibility of vetoing the bill which he had sworn to veto, and throw the responsibility and odium of the failure of the bill on the Senate? This was the abominable game; it was too bad to juggle us first out of our independence of legislation, and then out of our

character! There are five high witnesses to attest these facts, if a committee be appointed to inquire, who may be called on. You may go to the first, second, third, fourth and fifth highest officers of your government, and sir, I should like to see them thoroughly cross-examined. We have had a most important fact disclosed lately. The secret journal of the Senate has been opened, and a certain endorsement of its clerk has been exposed.—Now, sir, that Secretary of the Senate is a most excellent, good, and pious man, with a high and due sense of propriety. He would be cautious to endorse nothing which was not only true but proper to be endorsed. But I must ask if all was endorsed which was said? I could not shut my eyes to the rumors which passed from seat to seat, that awful night. Suppose the Senate did send a message to the Executive that night, rejecting a certain nomination; and suppose, in reply, the President had told the Secretary, "I will receive no further communication from the d—d rascals, the Senate is defunct!" I am sure, sir, such an answer would have been undignified and unbecoming, and that the Secretary's strict sense of propriety, and of what was due to the President and to the Senate, would have prevented him from endorsing all that was said! And yet this committee, if raised, and it inquire faithfully, may bring out many such facts.

Sir, I repeat, that there was no disposition on the part of the Senate or of the House to defeat the fortification bill of the last session. Both Houses did their duty, and both are now equally interested to guard against such interference for the future as actually prevented both Houses, though ready and willing from doing their duty. Yes, sir; the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. R. M. Johnson) challenged me at the beginning of this session, to specify the acts of Executive intermeddling or interference with the independence of the legislation of Congress. I gave him, sir, one pretty strong case, but here is one still stronger. None could be stronger. On the last night of the last Congress, both Houses of Congress, I assert, and have proved, were not only ready and willing, but anxiously endeavoring, to pass a law, which the President himself says, and which I admit was very important to the public interests, with large majorities in each in favor of the law, and the two Houses agreeing, by special conference, and they could not and did not get the bill through, in consequence of the minions and pimps of the Executive tampering with their tools in the House of Representatives! Now, sir, if the gentleman wants a stronger case than that, I cannot imagine it. I know such was the fact; and though all "the Government" should swear to the contrary, I should know and believe the fact until the day or my death. It is to be borne, that some twenty or thirty of the trained band shall, by reducing us below a quorum—reduce a majority of both Houses of Congress below the foot of the Executive? Shall we be thus interrupted in our business by a fragment of "the party" doing the bidding of their idol? Is this an administration of the government, in the spirit and letter of the Constitution, which makes the legislative department independent of the executive, and intends that it shall be a check upon the executive? Will the people suffer this monstrous violence to the theory and practice of their government? Oh! that I could raise my voice to a pitch of remonstrance which could go forth throughout this land; which could reach every hamlet, every house, and every heart of the people; which could speak trumpet toned to every man who has in his bosom a spark of the spirit of the free! I would rouse a resistance to this misrule, this corruption, this patriicide of "the party," which would soon determine whether the many or the few shall rule the destinies of this republic!

Sir, the whole mass of power which is conferred by the Constitution on all the departments of this government is nearly as great as the whole power of any civilized people. But the theory of our government so distributes this power among different branches or departments as to check and counterbalance, restrain and control each other mutually. Power with us is so neutralized to do harm, and so well poised to do good, in all the theory of our Constitution, that the government was made free at the same time it was efficient. But, sir, the practice of the government has of late so perverted the theory of the Constitution, that through corruption, we are fast becoming bound hand and foot, and a single department absorbing the whole mass of power. The principle of the party is now warring upon one of the cardinal principles of the Constitution, to keep separate, distinct, and independent the legislative and the executive departments. That principle, without which this government cannot remain free, is totally undermined by the policy of parties to select legislators to support—that is, to do the will of—Presidents! Is there no jealousy of the executive left? No esprit du corps in Congress? gone! gone!

Sir, I must remind the House that on the Cumberland Road Bill there were 174 members present and voting. That the very next vote there was no quorum.

Here Mr. Wise read a list of the names of members who voted on the Cumberland Road Bill, and did not vote on the next vote, the Moore and Letcher resolution. There were 66 in number. Of these, Van Buren men 50; opposition and for White, 16.

On the Cumberland road Bill there were 174 votes. Of these were, Van Buren men, 87; opposition and for White, 87.

Parties were equal on that vote. On the Letcher resolution there were 113 votes. Van Buren men 33; opposition and for white 80.

Can this extraordinary desertion of Van Buren men be accounted for but by the supposition of design? And too, when it was known they were nearly all present in the House? While the opposition and White men had retained their numbers to 7, there was a falling off of Van Buren men of 54!—54 out of 87! While the opposition and White men continued in their places, giving their votes until the close of the session, the Van Buren men did not again, except a small majority in answer to their names.

On Mr. Jarvis's motion to adjourn, there were 118 votes. Van Buren men, 51,—opposition and for White, 77.

On Mr. Carmichael's motion to adjourn, there

were 111 votes. Van Buren men, 39; opposition and for White, 72.

Is not the conclusion irresistible that the chairman of the committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. Cambreleng, might, at any moment after his return from the conference, until the adjournment of the House, by a nod or a whisper, have summoned from their hiding places a quorum, and saved the loss of the fortification bill? Would not Rhoderick's men have risen up at the whistle? Does not the gentleman from New York know that he might at any time have had a quorum? Did he exert himself to get a quorum? Did he not, and did not you, Mr. Speaker busily endeavor to persuade members who had conscientiously scrupled not to vote to make a quorum? Did not Churchill C. Cambreleng protest, by speech on the floor, (see Globe of the 4th March, 1835) against the right to compel members to answer to the call for a quorum, which he all the time was voting himself? Did not Mr. Barringer, of North Carolina, charge the intrigue at the time, and offer to specify names? Was not Abijah Mann, Jr., of New York who refused to vote on every question from the last quorum to the adjournment, sitting in the House calling for the yeas and nays, when attempts would be made to get along without a call? Did not Mr. Barringer tell him he had no right to call for the yeas and nays, as he said he was no longer a member; and did he not claim to be as much a member as any body? Having pledged himself to vote for the Letcher resolution he could not then vote for it? And did not Letcher reply, "I knew the Van Buren colts would slip their bridles." When Samuel Beardsley refused to vote, did not the honorable gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Lea, move to expel him from the House? But there were nearly 150 members who actually voted upon the three calls of yeas and nays after 12 o'clock at night. Different squads would come in and vote at different times! The leaders—oh! yes—the leaders, were all present, were they not here, of course? That was one fitness; and the other was to march and counter-march the followers so that each one might claim to have voted. But the proof is positive that there was a quorum actually voting after the Cumberland road bill and 12 o'clock, to the last, but voting at different times! My name is among the number of those who voted on the Cumberland road bill, and failed to vote twice afterward. Mr. Gilmer's conduct struck me, and I hesitated to vote until I was satisfied by my colleague, Mr. Mercer; and when I saw the miserable infernal game which was playing, I would have voted at all hazards, and did vote as the journals will show, on the last vote of the session, to help make a quorum and against adjournment! And now, sir, what shall we say to these men of the immaculate—the only patriotic men, who would not for the world have had the fortification fail? Shall they not have meted out to them that measure of vituperation which they have meted to the Senate? Shall they not now be hunted down with theuries and scorpions of abuse, not only for failing to do a duty which was unpardonable in the Senate, but for a knowingly wilful false accusation? Hurrah for such patriots! They are for national defence! Oh shame! Oh honesty! Oh truth!

Sir, the gentlemen have got into a hornet's nest by troubling—impudently gasconading about the failure of that bill. They are bitten by their own dogs! Oh! yes, the hour had come for their beautiful trick. I would ask the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) if he never signed bills after 12 o'clock at night on the last of a session, when he was President? Sir, I can prove by the manuscript minutes of your clerk that there was a quorum in the House. Here is a book, the title of which is "23d Congress, 2d Session—Minutes of the House of Representatives." In this book we find this entry on Tuesday, March the 3d, when the main question was taken on the resolution to compensate Robert P. Letcher: "Ayes 113, noes 3. No quorum—many members declined to answer, though standing at the Clerk's desk, because it was supposed to be past 12 o'clock." Only seven members were wanting then, but three, afterward, to make a quorum, and many members declined to answer! Sir, there was a quorum, and a quorum or the command of "the party." Let it never hereafter be denied.

[Mr. Wise then gave a summary and review of material facts.]

Sir, what caused the Senate, to send us that message, which I deem so respectful, and which the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) deems so insolent? The Senate was warned of treachery? When that special messenger that senator, was seen dodging in and out—he was no ghost, sir—it one, he is a very red faced ghost, he is a cognise looking ghost!—(Here Mr. Wise paused, and glanced his eye around to see him in the hall.) The Senate, sir, was warned of treachery. They then reminded the house of the report of the conference. What less could that body do to defend itself from the Matchaveltian plot against it?

Was there such a spectacle exhibited in this capitol before, as a trap set for one branch of Congress? This message called out the jesuitical excuse that the hour had come—there was no quorum—"sorry, regretted very much, but the Senate must take the Senate must take the responsibility! Immediately the plot revealed itself! Sir, I hope that the condition of things, and this exposure, will stand a solitary warning to "the party," not to jeopard again the interests of the country, by its low, servile tricks of corruption! "The party" wished to say by resolution, in reply that we had finished our business when this bill was untouched. Hour after hour had the Senate politely waited for this fortification bill to be sent to them for their concurrence, and Mr. F. O. J. Smith moved to say to them—"We have completed our business!" And at last, sir, the house did ignobly adjourn without completing its business, including this bill. Sir, I have not to take back one word of what I said yesterday about the adjournment of the last Congress. Except on one solitary question I shall ever think of the last House of Representatives with disgust. We had a President at the last session bent, I think on war! The house was subservient, succumbing and servile to his wishes on every other question but that.

The temper and the example of the House on that question were noble, and worthy of imitation, for all time to come. The gentleman from Massachusetts may well claim it as one of the brightest!