

SPEECH OF MR. WEBSTER,

On Mr. Foot's Resolution,
IN SENATE—JAN. 26, 1830.

(CONTINUED.)

But, after all, this is not the point of the debate; and I must bring the gentleman back to that which is the point.

The real question between me and him, is where the doctrine being advanced, at the South or the East, that the population of the West should be retarded, or at least, need not be hastened on account of its effect to drain off the people from the Atlantic States? Is this doctrine, as has been alleged, of Eastern origin? This is the question. Has the gentleman found any thing by which he can make good his accusation? I submit to the Senate, that he has not; and as far as this debate has shown, the only person who has advanced such sentiments, is a gentleman from South Carolina, and a friend to the honorable member himself. The honorable gentleman has given no answer to this; there is none which can be given. The simple fact, while it requires no comment to enforce it, defies all argument to refute it. I could refer to the speeches of another Southern gentleman, in years before, of the same general character and to the same effect, as that which has been quoted; but I will not consume the time of the Senate by the reading of them.

So then, Sir, New England is guilty of the policy of retarding Western population, and of all envy and jealousy of the growth of the New States. Whatever there be of that policy in the country, no part of it is here. If it has a local habitation, the honorable member has probably seen, by this time, where he is to look for it; and if it now has received a name, he has himself christened it.

We approach, at length, Sir, to a more important part of the honorable gentleman's observations—since it does not accord with my views of justice & policy to give a way the public lands altogether, as mere matter of gratuity, I am asked by the honorable gentleman on what ground it is, that I consent to vote them away in particular instances?—How, he inquires, do I reconcile, with these professed sentiments, my support of measures appropriating portions of the lands to particular rivers, and particular institutions in the West? This leads Sir, to the real and wide difference in political opinions between the honorable gentleman and myself. On my part, I look upon all these objects as connected with the common good, fairly embraced in its objects; he, on the contrary, deems them all, if good at all, only local good. This is our difference. The interrogatory, which he proceeded to put, at once explains this difference. "What interest," asks he, "has South Carolina in a Canal in Ohio?" Sir, this very question is full of significance. It develops the gentleman's whole political system; and its answer expounds mine. If we do not differ, *loco*, I look upon a road over the Alleghany, a Canal round the Falls of the Ohio, or a Canal or Railway from the Atlantic to the Western waters, as being objects large and extensive enough to be fairly said to be for the common benefit. The gentleman thinks otherwise, and this is the key to open his construction of the powers of the Government. He may ask, upon his system, what interest has South Carolina in a Canal in Ohio? On that system, it is true, she has no interest. On that system, Ohio and Carolina are different Governments, and different countries, connected here, it is true, by some slight and ill defined bond of Union, but in all main respects, separate and diverse. On that system, Carolina has no more interest in a Canal in Ohio than Mexico. The gentleman, therefore, only follows out his own principles; he does no more than arrive at the natural conclusions of his own doctrines; he only announces the true results of that creed which he has adopted himself, and would persuade others to adopt, when he thus declares that South Carolina has no interest in a public work in Ohio. Sir, we narrow minded people of New England do not reason thus. Our notion of things is entirely different. We look upon the States not as separated, but as united. We love to dwell on that Union, and on the mutual happiness which it has so much promoted, and the common renown which it has so greatly contributed to acquire. In our contemplation, Carolina and Ohio are parts of the same country; States, united under the same General Government, having interests, common, associated, intermingled. In whatever is within the proper sphere of the constitutional power of this Government, we look upon the States as one. We do not impose geographical limits, to our patriotic feeling or regard; we do not follow rivers and mountains, and lines of latitude, to find boundaries between which public improvements do not benefit us.

We who come here, as free and equal men of New England, consider ourselves as bound to regard, with equal eye, the good of the whole, in whatever is within our power of legislation. Sir, if a rail road or canal, beginning in South Carolina, and ending in South Carolina, appeared to me to be of national magnitude, believing, as I do, that the power of Government extends to the encouragement of works of that description, if I were to stand up here, and ask, what interest has Massachusetts in a rail road in South Carolina, I should not be willing to face my constituents. These same narrow minded men would tell me, that they sent me to act for the whole country, and that one who had possessed too little comprehension, either of intellect or feeling, one who was not large enough, in mind and heart, to embrace the whole, was not fit to be entrusted with the interest of any part. Sir, I do not desire to enlarge the powers of the Government, by unjustifiable construction; nor to exercise any not within a fair interpretation. But when it is believed that a power does exist, then it is, in my judgment, to be exercised for the general benefit of the whole: so far as respects the exercise of such a power, the States are one. It was the very object of the constitution to create unity of interests to the extent of the powers of the General Government. In war and peace, we are one; in commerce, one; because the authority of the General Government reaches to war and peace, and to the regulation of commerce. I have never seen any more difficulty in erecting light houses on the Lakes, than on the Ocean: in improving the harbors of inland seas, than if they were within the ebb and flow of the tide; or of removing obstructions in the vast stream of the West, more than in any work to facilitate commerce, on the Atlantic coast. If there be power for one, here is power also for the other; and they are all equally for the country.

There are other objects, apparently more local, or the benefit of which is less general, towards which, nevertheless, I have concurred with others to give aid, by donations of land. It is proposed to construct a road in or through one of the new States in which this Government possesses large quantities of land. Have the United States no right, as a great and untaxed proprietor, are they under no obligation to contribute to an object thus calculated to promote the common good of all the proprietors, themselves included? And even with respect to education, which is the extreme case, let the question be considered. In the first place, as we have seen, it was made matter of compact with these States, that they should do their part to promote education. In the next place, our whole system of land laws proceeds on the idea that education is for the common good; because, in every division, a certain portion is uniformly reserved and appropriated for the use of schools. And, finally, have not these new States singularly strong claims, founded on the ground already stated, that the government is a great untaxed proprietor in the ownership of the soil. It is a consideration of great importance, that probably there is in no part of the country, or of the world, so great a call for the means of education as in those new States; owing to the vast numbers of persons within those ages, in which education and instruction are usually received, if received at all. This is the natural consequence of recency of settlement and rapid increase. The census of these States shows how

great a proportion of the whole population occupies the classes between infancy and adulthood. These are the wide fields, and here is the deep and quick soil for the seeds of knowledge and virtue; and this is the favored season, the spring time for sowing them. Let them be disseminated, without stint. Let them be scattered, with a bountiful, broad cast. Whatever the Government can fairly do towards these objects, in my opinion, ought to be done.

These, Sir, are the grounds, succinctly stated, on which my votes for grants of lands for particular objects rests; while I maintain, at the same time, that it is all a common fund for the common benefit. And reasons like these, I presume, have influenced the votes of other gentlemen from New England. Those who have a different view of the powers of the Government, of course come to different conclusions, on these, as on other questions. I observed, when speaking on this subject before, that if we looked to any measure, whether for a road, a canal, or any thing else, intended for the improvement of the West, it would be found, that if the New England eyes were struck out of the list of votes, the Southern ones would always have rejected the measure. The truth of this has not been denied, and cannot be denied. In stating this I thought it just to ascribe it to the constitutional scruples of the South, rather than to any other less favorable or less charitable cause. But no sooner had I done this, than the honorable gentleman asks, if I reproach him, and his friends with their constitutional scruples? Sir, I reproach nobody. I stated a fact, and gave the most respectful reason for it that occurred to me. The gentleman cannot deny the fact; he may, if he chooses, disclaim the reason. It is not long since I had occasion in presenting a petition from his own State, to account for its being entrusted to my hands, by saying, that the constitutional opinions of the gentleman and his worthy colleague, prevented them from supporting it. Sir, did I state this as a matter of reproach? Far from it. Did I attempt to find any other cause than an honest one for these scruples? Sir, I did not. It did not become me to doubt nor to insinuate that the gentleman had either changed his sentiments, or that he had made up a set of constitutional opinions, accommodated to any particular combination of political occurrences. Had I done so, I should have felt, that while I was entitled to little respect in thus questioning other people's motives, I justified the whole world in suspecting my own. But how has the gentleman returned this respect for other's opinions? His own candor and justice, how have they been exhibited towards the motives of others while he has been at so much pains to maintain, what nobody has disputed, the purity of his own? Why, Sir, he has asked again, and how, and why, New England votes were found going for measures favorable to the West, he has demanded to be informed whether all this did not begin in 1825, and while the election of President was depending? Sir, to these questions I would have answered, and in both cogent, and at hand. Nevertheless, I will answer the inquiry not by retort, but by fact. I will tell the gentleman when, and how, and why, New England has supported measures favorable to the West. I have already referred to the early history of the Government—the first acquisition of the land—to the original laws for disposing of them, and for governing the territories where they lie; and have shown the influence of New England men and New England principles in all these leading measures. I should not be pardoned were I to go over that ground again. Coming to more recent times; and to measures of less general character, I have endeavored to prove that every thing of this kind, designed for Western improvement, has depended on the votes of New England, all this is true beyond the power of contradiction.

And now, Sir, there are two measures to which I will refer, not so ancient as to belong to the early history of the public lands, and not so recent as to be on this side of the period when the gentleman charitably imagines a new direction may have been given to New England feeling, and New England votes. These measures, and the N. England votes in support of them, may be taken as samples and specimens of all the rest.

In 1820, observe, Mr. President, in 1820, the people of the West besought Congress for a reduction in the price of lands. In favor of that reduction, N. England with a delegation of forty members in the other House, gave thirty three votes, and one only against it. The four Southern States with fifty members, gave thirty two votes for it, and seven against it. Again, in 1821, (observe again, Sir, the time,) the law passed for the relief of the purchasers of the public lands. This was a measure of vital importance to the West, and more especially to the S. West. It authorized the relinquishment of contracts for lands, which had been entered into at high prices, and a reduction in other cases, at no less than 37 per cent on the purchase money. Many millions of dollars, six or seven, I believe, at least, probably much more, were relinquished by this law. On this bill, N. England, with her forty members, gave more affirmative votes than the four Southern States, with their fifty two or three members. These two are far the most important measures, respecting the public lands, which have been adopted within the last 20 years. They took place in 1820 and 1821. That is the time when, and as to the manner how, the gentleman already sees that it was by voting in solid column, for the required relief; and lastly, as to the cause why, I tell the gentleman it was because the members from N. England thought the measures just and salutary; because they entertained towards the West neither envy, hatred, or malice; because they deemed it becoming them, as just and enlightened public men, to meet the exigency which had arisen in the West, with the appropriate measure of relief, because they felt it due to their own characters, and the characters of their N. England predecessors in this Government, to act towards the new States in the spirit of a liberal, patronizing, magnanimous policy. So much, Sir, for the cause why, and I hope that by this time, the honorable gentleman is satisfied; if not, I do not know when or how, or why, he ever will be.

Having referred to these two important measures, in answer to the gentleman's inquiries, I must now beg permission to go back to a point still something earlier, for the purpose still to be of showing how much, or rather, how little reason there is for the gentleman's insinuation, that political hopes or fears, or party associations were the grounds of these New England votes. And after what has been said, I hope it may be forgiven me, if I allude to some political opinions and votes of my own, of very little importance, certainly, but which, from the time at which they were given and expressed, may pass for good witnesses on this occasion.

This Government, Mr. President, from its origin to the peace of 1815, had been too much engrossed with various other important concerns, to be able to turn its thoughts inward, and look to the development of its vast internal resources.—In the early part of President Washington's administration, it was fully occupied with organizing the Government, providing for the public debt, defending the frontiers, and maintaining domestic peace. Before the termination of that administration, the fires of the French Revolution blazed forth, as from a new opened volcano, and the whole breadth of the ocean did not entirely secure us from its effects. The smoke and the cinders reached us though not the burning lava. Difficult and agitating questions, embarrassing to Government, and dividing public opinion, sprung out of the new state of our foreign relations, and were succeeded by others, and yet again by others, equally embarrassing, and equally exciting division and discord, through the long series of 20 years, till they finally issued in the war with England. Down to the close of that war, no distinct, marked, and deliberate attention had been given, or could have been given, to the internal condition of the country, its capacities of improvement, or the constitutional power of the Government, in regard to objects connected with such improvement.

The peace, Mr. President, brought about an entirely new and a most interesting state of things; it opened to us other prospects, and suggested other

duties; we ourselves were changed, and the whole world was changed. The pacification of Europe, after June 1815, assumed a firm and permanent aspect. The nations evidently manifested that they were disposed for peace, some agitation of the waves might be expected, even after the storm had subsided, but the tendency was, strongly and rapidly, towards settled repose.

It so happened, Sir, that I was at that time a member of Congress, and like others, naturally turned my attention to the contemplation of the newly altered condition of the country, and of the world. It appeared plainly enough to me, as well as to wiser and more experienced men, that the policy of the Government would necessarily take a start, in a new direction; because new directions would necessarily be given to the pursuits and occupations of the people. We had pushed our commerce far and fast, under the advantage of a neutral flag. But there were now no longer flags, either neutral or belligerent. The harvest of neutrality had been great, but we had gathered it all. With the peace of Europe, it was obvious there would spring up in her circle of nations, a revived and invigorated spirit of trade, and a new activity in all the business and objects of civilized life. Hereafter, our commercial gains were to be earned only by success in a close and intense competition. Other nations would produce for themselves, and carry for themselves, and manufacture for themselves, to the full extent of their abilities. The crops of our plains would no longer sustain European armies, nor our ships longer supply those whom war had rendered unable to supply themselves. It was obvious, that, under these circumstances, the country would begin to survey itself, and to estimate its own capacity of improvement. And this improvement, how was it to be accomplished, and who was to accomplish it? We were ten or twelve millions of people, spread over half a world. We were twenty four States, some stretching along the same seaboard, some along the same line of inland frontier, and others on opposite banks of the same vast rivers. Two considerations at once presented themselves in looking at this state of things, with great force. One was, that that great branch of improvement, which consisted in furnishing new facilities of intercourse, necessarily ran into different States in every leading instance, and would benefit the citizens of all such States. No one State therefore, in such cases, would assume the whole expense, nor was the co-operation of several States to be expected. Take the instance of the Delaware Break-water. It will cost several millions of money. Would Pennsylvania alone have ever constructed it? Certainly never while this Union lasts, because it is not for her sole benefit.

They enjoy the revenues derived from commerce, and the States have no abundant and easy sources of public income. The custom houses fill the general treasury, while the States have scanty resources, except by resort to heavy direct taxes. Under this view of things, I thought it necessary to settle at least for myself, some definite notions, with respect to the powers of Government, in regard to internal affairs. It may not seem too much of self commendation to remark, that with this object, I considered the constitution, its judicial construction, its extant precedents, and the whole history of the legislation of Congress under it; and I arrived at the conclusion, that Government had power to accomplish sundry objects, or aid in their accomplishment, which are now commonly spoken of as *Internal Improvements*.

That conclusion, Sir, may have been right, or it may have been wrong. I am not about to argue the grounds of it at large. I say only that it was adopted, and acted on, even so early as in 1816. Yes, Mr. President, I made up my opinion, and determined on my intended course of political conduct on these subjects, in the 14th Congress, in 1816. And now, Mr. President, I have further to say; that I made up these opinions, and entered on this course of political conduct, *Tenno Duce*. Yes, Sir, I pursued, in all this, a South Carolina track. On the doctrines of Internal Improvement, South Carolina, as she was then represented in the other House, voted, in 1816, under a fresh and leading breeze, set forth in 1816, under a fresh and leading breeze, and I was among the followers. But if my leader and new lights, also, I kept straight on in the same path. I repeat, that leading gentleman from South Carolina was first and foremost in behalf of the doctrines of Internal Improvements, when these doctrines first came to be considered and acted upon in Congress. The debate on the Bank question on the Tariff of 1816, and on the District Tax, will show who was who, and what was what, at that time. The Tariff of 1816, one of the plain cases of oppression and usurpation from which, if the Government does not recede, individual States may justly secede from the government, is, Sir, in truth, a South Carolina Tariff, supported by South Carolina votes. But for those votes, it could not have passed in the form in which it did pass; whereas if it had depended on Massachusetts votes, it would have been lost. Does not the honorable gentleman well know all this? There are certainly those who do, full well know it all. I do not say this to reproach South Carolina; I only state the fact, and I think it will appear to be true, that among the earliest and boldest advocates of the Tariff, as a measure of protection, and on the plain case of oppression, were leading gentlemen from South Carolina in Congress. I did not then, and cannot now, understand their language in any other sense. While this Tariff of 1816 was under discussion in the House of Representatives, an honorable gentleman from Georgia, now in this House, (Mr. Forsyth) moved to reduce the proposed duty on cotton. He failed by four votes, South Carolina giving three votes, (enough to have turned the scale) against his motion. The act, Sir, then passed, and received on its passage the support of a majority of the Representatives of S. C. present and voting. This act is the first, in the order of those now denounced as plain usurpations. We see it daily in the list by the side of those of 1824, and 1828, as cases of manifest oppression, justifying disunion. I put it home to the honorable member from South Carolina, that his own State was not only "art and part" in this measure, but the cause.

Without her aid, this seminal principle of mischief, this root of Upas, could not have been planted. I have already said, and it is true, that this act proceeded on the ground of protection. It interfered, directly, with existing interests of great value and amount. It cut up the Calcutta cotton trade by the roots. But it passed, nevertheless, and it passed on the principle of protecting manufactures, on the principle of allowing free trade, on the principle opposed to that which lets a slave be a slave.—Note 2.

Such, Mr. President, were the opinions of important and leading gentlemen from South Carolina on the subject of Internal Improvement, in 1816. I went out of Congress the next year, returning again in 1823, though I found South Carolina where I had left her. I really supposed that all things remained as they were, and that the South Carolina doctrine of Internal Improvements would be defended by the same eloquent voices, and the same strong arms, as formerly. In the lapse of these six years, it is true, political associations had assumed a new aspect, and new divisions. A party had arisen in the South, hostile to the doctrine of Internal Improvements, and had vigorously attacked that doctrine. Anti-consolidation was a slogan, under which this party fought, and its supporters inveighed against Internal Improvements, much after the manner in which the honorable gentleman has now inveighed against them, as part and parcel of the system of consolidation. Whether this party arose in South Carolina herself or in her neighborhood, is more than I know. I think the latter. However that may have been, there were those found in South Carolina ready to make war upon it, and who did make intrepid war upon it. Names being regarded as things in such controversies, they bestowed on the anti-improvement gentlemen the appellation of Radicals. Yes, Sir, the name of Radicals, as a term of distinction, applicable and applied to those who denied the liberal doctrines of Internal Improvements, originated, according to the best of my recollection, somewhere between North Carolina and Georgia. Well, Sir, those mischievous Radicals were to be put down, and the strong arm of South Carolina was stretched out to put them down. About this time, Sir, I returned to Congress. The battle with the Radicals had been fought, and our South Carolina champions of the

doctrines of Internal Improvements had nobly maintained their ground, and were understood to have achieved a victory. They had driven back the enemy with discomfiting things by the way, Sir, which is not always performed when it is promised. A gentleman, to whom I have already referred, in this debate, had come into Congress during my absence from it, from South Carolina, and had brought with him a high reputation for ability. He came from a school with which he had been acquainted, *et noscitur a sociis*. I hold in my hand, Sir, a printed speech of this distinguished gentleman, (Mr. McDuffie) "ON INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS," delivered about the period to which I now refer, and printed with a few introductory remarks upon consolidation; in which, Sir, I think he quite consolidated the arguments of his opponents, the Radicals, if to crush be to consolidate. I give you a short but substantive quotation from these remarks. He is speaking of a pamphlet, then recently published, entitled "Consolidation;" and having alluded to the question of rechartering the former Bank of the United States, he says: "Moreover, in the early history of parties, and when Mr. Crawford advocated the removal of the old charter, it was considered a federal measure; which Internal Improvements *never* was, as this author erroneously states. This latter measure originated in the administration of Mr. Jefferson, with the appropriation for the Cumberland Road; and was first proposed, as a system, by Mr. Calhoun, and carried through the House of Representatives by a large majority of the republicans, including almost every one of the leading men who carried us through the late war."

So then, Internal Improvement is not one of the Federal heresies. One paragraph more, Sir—"The author in general, not content with denouncing as Federalists, General Jackson, Mr. Adams, Mr. Calhoun, and the majority of the declaration of the Carolina delegation in Congress, modestly extends the declaration to Mr. Monroe and the whole Republican party." Here are his words, "During the administration of Mr. Monroe, much has passed which the republican party would be glad to approve, if they could! But the principle feature, and that which has chiefly elicited these observations, is the renewal of the system of Internal Improvements." Now, this measure was adopted by a vote of 115 to 86, of a republican Congress, and sanctioned by a republican President. Who, then, is this author, who assumes the high prerogative of denouncing, in the name of the country, a republican administration of the country? A denunciation including within its sweep, Calhoun, Lowndes, and Cheves; men who will be regarded as the brightest ornaments of South Carolina, and the strongest pillars of the republican party, as long as the late war shall be remembered, and talents and patriotism shall be regarded as the proper objects of the admiration and gratitude of a free people!"

Such are the opinions, Sir, which were maintained by South Carolina gentlemen in the House of Representatives, on the subject of Internal Improvement, when I took my seat there as a member from Massachusetts, in 1823. But this is not all: we had an act to procure the necessary surveys, plans, and estimates, upon the subject of Roads and Canals. It authorized the President to cause surveys and estimates to be made of the routes of such Roads and Canals as he might deem of National importance, in a commercial or military point of view, or for the transportation of the mail; and appropriated thirty thousand dollars out of the Treasury, to defray the expense. This act, though preliminary in its nature, covered the whole ground. I took for granted the complete power of Internal Improvement, as far as any of its advocates had ever contended for it. Having passed the other House, the bill came up to the Senate, and was here considered and debated in April 1824. The Honorable member from South Carolina was a member of the Senate at that time. While the bill was under consideration here, a motion was made to add the following proviso:—"Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to affirm or admit a power in congress, on their own authority, to make Roads or Canals, within any of the States of the Union."

The yeas and nays were taken on the proviso, and the honorable member voted in the negative. The proviso failed.

A motion was then made to add this proviso, viz:—"Provided, That the faith of the United States is, hereby pledged, that no such road or canal shall be expended, for roads or canals, except it shall be among the several States, and in proportion as direct taxes are laid and assessed by the provisions of the constitution."

The honorable member voted against this proviso also, and it failed.

The bill was then put on its passage, and the honorable member voted for it, and it passed, and became a law. Now, it strikes me, Sir, that there is no maintaining these votes, but upon the power of internal improvement, in its broadest sense. In truth, these bills for surveys and estimates have always been construed as test questions. They show who is for, and who against internal improvement. This law itself went the whole length, and assumed the full and complete power. The gentleman's votes sustained that power, in every form, in which the various propositions to amend presented it. He sustained the power, as restrained authority, without consulting the States, and without assenting to any proportionate distribution. And now, suffer me to remind you, Mr. President, that it is this very same power, thus sanctioned, in every form, by the gentleman's own opinion, that is so plain and manifest a case of usurpation, and that the State of South Carolina is supposed to be justified in refusing submission to any law carrying the power into effect. Truly, Sir, is not this a little too hard?—May we not crave more mercy, under favor and protection of the gentleman's own authority?—Admitting that a road or canal must be written down that usurpation as such, may we find no mitigation in our respect for his place, and his vote, as one that knows the law?

The Tariff, which South Carolina had an efficient hand in establishing, in 1816, and this asserted power of internal improvement, advanced by her in the same year, and as we have seen, which the gentleman and his friends in the House of Representatives in 1824, these two measures are the great grounds on which she is now thought to be justified in breaking up the Union, if she sees fit to break it up!

I may now safely say, I think, that we have had the authority of leading and distinguished gentlemen from South Carolina in support of the doctrine of internal improvement. I repeat, that up to 1824, I for one followed South Carolina; but when that star, in its ascension, veered off in an unexpected direction, I relied on its light no longer. (Here the Vice President, seeing the chair understand the gentleman from Massachusetts, to say that the person now speaking of internal improvement, had changed his opinions on the subject of internal improvement.) From nothing ever said to me, Sir, I have had reason to know of any change in the opinions of the person filling the chair of the Senate. If such change has taken place, I repeat, I speak generally of the State of South Carolina. Individuals may now here and there, who hold opinions favorable to the power. An application for its exercise, in behalf of a public work in South Carolina itself, is now pending. I believe, in the other House, presented by members from that State, and I am in error, or I am in error, in my subject of internal improvements, low, and in what company I fell into that error. If I am wrong, it is apparent who misled me.

I go to other remarks of the honorable member—and I have complaint of an entire misapprehension of what I said, on the subject of the national debt. Though I can hardly perceive how any one could misunderstand me. What I said was, not that I wished to put off the payment of the debt, but, on the contrary, that I had always voted for every measure for its reduction, as uniformly as the gentleman himself. He seems to me the exclusive merit of a disposition to reduce the public debt. I do not allow it to him. As a debt, I was, I am, for paying it; because it is a charge on our finances, and on the industry of the country. But, I observed, that I thought I perceived a morbid fever on that subject; an excessive anxiety to pay off the debt, not so much because it is a debt simply, as because, while it lasts, it furnishes one objection to disunion. It is a debt of common interest while it lasts, and I did not impute such motive to the honorable member himself, but that there is such a feeling in existence, I have not a particle of doubt. The most I said was, that if one effect of the debt was to strengthen our Union, that effect was not regretted by me; and that, while it lasts, it furnishes one objection to disunion. I am in error, or I am in error, in my subject of internal improvements, low, and in what company I fell into that error. If I am wrong, it is apparent who misled me.

terms, that I wished not to the slightest degree, to augment the powers of the government; that my object was to preserve, not to enlarge; and that by consulting the Union, and representing it. Having been thus explicit; having thus read from my text book, the precise words which I adopted, expressing in most unequivocal terms, my opinion on the subject, how can any man understand me as containing, or an extension of the powers of the government, or for consolidation, in that cautious sense, in which it means an accumulation in the federal government, of the powers properly belonging to the States.

I repeat it, Sir, that, in adopting the sentiment of the framers of the constitution, I read their language audibly, and word for word now done, between the consolidation of the Union and that other obnoxious consolidation, which I disclaim, and which the honorable member misunderstands me. The gentleman had said that he wished for no fixed revenue—not a shilling. If a word like this could convert the Capitol into gold, he would not do it. Why all this fear of revenue? Why, Sir, because, as the gentleman told us, it tends to consolidation. Now, this can mean neither more nor less than a common revenue in a common interest, and that all common interests tend to hold the Union of the States together. I confess, I like that tendency; if we mean to dissent to the Tariff in 1824 and my vote in 1823, it is labor lost. He pays unduly, and I am in a question in 1824; but it is to raise me high, that I must keep low, and in 1828, may be the more signal. Sir, there was no fall at all. Between the ground I stood on in 1824, and that I took in 1828, there was not only no precipice, but no declivity. It was a change of position, not a change of ground, but on the same level. A plain tale explains the whole matter. In 1816 I had not acquiesced in the Tariff, then supported by South Carolina. To some parts of it, especially, I felt and expressed great repugnance. I held the same opinions in 1821, 1822, and 1823, in Federal Hall, to which the gentleman has alluded. I said then, and say now, that it was an original question, the authority of Congress to exercise the power, with direct reference to the protection of manufactures, a questionable authority, far more questionable, in my judgment, than, in one respect, some impression has been made on my opinion lately. Mr. Madison's opinion has been made on it, in a very strong light. He has placed it, I put the power, edge on a ground of construction and argument, which seem repugnant. But, even if the power were doubtful, on the face of the constitution itself, it had been assumed and asserted; and, on this ground, as a matter settled by long and consistent practice, I had refrained from expressing the opinion that the Tariff laws transcended constitutional limits, as the gentleman has done. What I did say, was, that I was in a question in the first revenue law ever passed under that constitution; and, on this ground, as a matter settled by long and consistent practice, I had refrained from expressing the opinion that the Tariff laws transcended constitutional limits, as the gentleman has done. What I did say, was, that I was in a question in the first revenue law ever passed under that constitution; and, on this ground, as a matter settled by long and consistent practice, I had refrained from expressing the opinion that the Tariff laws transcended constitutional limits, as the gentleman has done.

With a great majority of the Representatives of Massachusetts, I voted against the Tariff of 1824. My reasons were stated, given, and I will not now repeat them. But, notwithstanding my dissent, the great States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky voted for it, in almost unbroken column, and it passed. Congress and the President assented to it, and it became the law of the land. What, then, were we to do? Our only option was either to fall in with this settled law, and acquiesce in it, or to combat it, and endeavor to repeal it, as well as we could, or to combat it, and endeavor to repeal it, as well as we could, or to combat it, and endeavor to repeal it, as well as we could. This last alternative did not suit our principles, and of course, we adopted the former. In 1827, the subject came again before Congress, on a proposition favorable to wool growers. We looked upon the system of protection as being fixed and settled. The law of 1824 was to remain, and go into full operation, and in regard to some objects, we felt, by perhaps most of them, had produced all its expected effects. No man proposed to repeal it, no man attempted to alter the general construction on its principle. But, owing to subsequent and unforeseen occurrences, the benefit intended by it to wool and woollen fabrics, had not been realized, as we now know here when the law passed, had taken place, which defeated its object in that particular respect. A measure was accordingly brought forward to meet this precise deficiency, to remedy this particular defect, and it was limited to wool and woollens. Was ever any thing more reasonable, and more in accordance with the policy of the Tariff laws had become established in principle, and the permanent policy of the Government, should they not be amended, and made equal, like other laws, as exigencies should arise, or justice require? Or, would we attempt its repeal? And this, Sir, is the inconsistency to which I allude. I had voted against the Tariff of 1824—but it is essential to the interest of my constituents, and is the inconsistency? Could I do otherwise? Sir, does not policy consist in always giving negative votes? Does it require of a public man to refuse to concur in amending laws, passed against his constituents? Having voted against the Tariff originally, does he not feel himself bound to do all in his power to maintain an unequal, burdensome to my own constituents, in many respects, favorable to none? To consistency of that sort, I lay no claim—and I am not a man of consistency, by which I lay no claim—and that is a kind bound to oppose a proposition after it has become the law of the land, as before.

The bill of 1827, limited, as I have said, to the single object which the tariff of 1824, had manifestly failed in its effect, passed the House of Representatives but was lost here. We passed the bill of 1827 and 1828, I voted to amend it, in a point essential to the interest of my constituents, and is the inconsistency? Could I do otherwise? Sir, does not policy consist in always giving negative votes? Does it require of a public man to refuse to concur in amending laws, passed against his constituents? Having voted against the Tariff originally, does he not feel himself bound to do all in his power to maintain an unequal, burdensome to my own constituents, in many respects, favorable to none? To consistency of that sort, I lay no claim—and I am not a man of consistency, by which I lay no claim—and that is a kind bound to oppose a proposition after it has become the law of the land, as before.

Sir, as to the general subject of the Tariff, I have little now to say. Another opportunity may be presented. I remain, as the other day, that this policy did not begin with us in New England, and yet Sir, New England is charged with vehemence against it, as being favorable, or charged with equal vehemence unfavorable to the Tariff policy. It is a question of the credit of the public has been put to its capacity of false impression, extreme relative to her conduct in this particular.—England policy, and a New England administration, that was afflicting the country with a Tariff policy, with an endurance, while on the other side of the Alleghany, even the aid of the South, the very sublimated essence of oppression according to the gentleman's own opinion, was pronounced to be one of those blessings, for which the West was indebted to the "generous South."

With large investments in manufactures, and dependent on many and various interests connected with New England, and more than other portions of the country, will now consent to any Government, at the present time, in destructive or highly dangerous, to not to destroy; to maintain the peace, and to be preserved; and for one, I shall feel it an indispensable obligation to hold it steady, as far as in my power, to that degree of protection which it has undertaken to bestow. No more of the Tariff

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

DR. WILLIAM JUDKINS' PATENT OINTMENT.

FOR the cure of White Swellings, Sore Legs, Ulcers, Glandular Tumors and Swellings, Rheumatic Pains, Sprains and Bruises, Burns, Scalds, Old and Fresh Wounds, Inflammation, Women's Breasts, Chilblains, Tetters, Ring Worms, Eruptions, &c.—For sale by

WILLIAM W. GRAY, Governor Street, Richmond.

RICHMOND, 2d Mo. 26th, 1830.

WILLIAM W. GRAY has been instructed in the business of making "Dr. Judkins' Patent" Ointment, by Nathan Shepherd, late a partner with Dr. Judkins of Ohio—I also profess a perfect knowledge of making this Ointment, obtained from Dr. Judkins himself, having long assisted him in the business.—Having had occasion to pass thro' Richmond, (on my return to Ohio from N. Carolina,) I remained with friend Gray two days, and assisted him in making a further supply of this Ointment, as being genuine, and one of the best ingredients. THOMAS PATTERSON, Of Belmont County, Ohio.