

"If the Treasury, the President of the United States had exercised only the ordinary power conferred on him by the Constitution, and fully sanctioned by precedent; and if also he had endeavored to establish from the beginning of the present Secretary of the Treasury, in order to facilitate the removal of the public deposits from the Bank of the United States, had done nothing that was novel or unprecedented, but that he had exerted a power over the funds of the government conferred upon him by law, and which his predecessors had used in like manner, and that he had assigned to this House good and sufficient reasons for so doing,

I shall now, with what brevity I may, proceed to examine the reasons adduced by him, together with the ob-

The first objection which have been urged against such an exercise of power.

The first objection which have been urged is of a popular character. It is said that in one week or two weeks, might seem to have accomplished what it is, that the removal was ordered with less than thirty days from the meeting of Congress. Why, it is asked, did not the Secretary wait? Why did he not only submit a petition of this moment to the Representatives of the People? Why did he not wait until the day when he remembered, that Congress, by the Charter of the Bank, had divested itself of all charge of the deposits, or control over them, and had vested it exclusively in the President of the United States, and the Treasury; and, therefore had not waited until the day when he should have perceived that this body been in session, and that the President should have had no power to interfere as to the place where the public monies should be deposited. Why, then, ought the Secretary to have waited? And for what? To send a letter to the House of Representatives, and to inform them that he had not been laughed to scorn, had not taken such a course? Would it not have been said—why, here is a high

financial officer of the Government who fears to take the responsibility which the law devolves upon him, and who

applies to others to stand before him as his shield, while in the discharge of his duty? Sir, it would justly have been so, if the People had not been told that they have been removed until he decided to give the order. His reasons for removing them are required by the charter of the House, and he may, or not, before, but subsequent to their removal. Well, sir, he has removed them, and said, had he removed the depositories three days after Congress had adjourned at the last session? Why, then we would have been told that the People had been removed by the representatives of the People had turned their backs; and this would have been said with still more reason than the order.

Suppose again that he had waited until three days after Congress had assembled. The popular argument then would have been, (though there would have been nothing to justify it,) that the People had been removed by the People's Representatives, venturing, without their concurrence or advice, upon this high-handed measure. The People would have been called. So that, as it seems to me, objection as to the time, might have been urged with equal, if not with greater force, had any other period been selected than that which was actually chosen.

It is true, that the People's Representatives were a fortunate one: it enabled the People's Representatives to consider the subject, and to give at least some expression to their will; and those whom they should send here, are responsible to the People.

who have now an opportunity of bringing with them some expression of the public sentiment on the measure. So much for this objection, which, to a merely casual observer, might appear to have more in it than it really contains.

I come now to what the Secretary gives as his prominent reason for the measure he adopted, viz: the probable expiration of the Bank Charter about two years hence. It was no part of the Government's contract with the Bank that the Government should be bound to prolong the whole period of its existence; on the contrary, it was expressly stipulated that they might be withdrawn by the Secretary at will. Nor was any reason stated as the ground of removal. It was not necessary, to render the removal of the Bank, at the expiration of its term, in the hands of the Bank; other reasons might operate to produce the Secretary's determination. This was conceded in the argument of the gentleman from South Carolina—he granted that there might be other sufficient reasons for such a removal. The Government was not bound to prolong the expiration of the Charter in 1836, and the necessity in anticipation of the state of things which must necessarily take place at that time, of providing a currency for the public use, and a place of safe keeping for the public mo-

The gentleman spoke of the embarrassment of the country, the consideration of things in 1817 and 18, and the necessity to go to the Congress if there were no Bank of the United States. The gentleman is making a different assumption—he goes on the principle that the Bank is not to be re-chartered. He considers himself bound to go as far as they are; in addition to which, he has the further ground of public opinion. I think he has pretty good extent. On that point, I may boldly appeal to gentlemen here. Sir, how many of these Representa-

will be for the people. I will not believe that the Bank will be re-chartered. However, Sir, the knowledge that the Bank is in the hands of the people, and that they possess of the public opinion, will expel such a belief? I guess you will find but few gentlemen on the floor willing to stake their reputation on such an opinion. The difference between the Secretary and the gentleman from South Carolina lies in this: that the one assumes that the Bank is to be re-chartered, and the other assumes the contrary—which has the right of the question? Time will tell. I am not a public opinion man, nor we all know, Sir, that the public opinion is not infallible. It is not the inference of the gentleman from South Carolina, I ask when then could the deposits have been removed at a better time than now? Sir, the argument of the gentleman amounts to an assumption that the Bank

But, it is said that the removal of the deposits has been productive of great distress, and an unusual pecuniary pressure. I shall controvert that position; but, admitting it for argument's sake, I ask, at what time would their removal have been productive of *such* distress? It is to expire, if it is not to be re-chartered, and if the deposits must have been withdrawn at some time, I beg gentlemen to point their finger to the time when the pressure (which they assume to be the effect of the withdrawal alone) would have been any less than it is now? Nay, sir, when would it not have been *greater* than it is? Will gentlemen answer, at the moment when the Bank char-

been millions of its circulation shall be returned to the Bank, and the institution shall be in the act of winding up its affairs. Would less pressure be caused than?

His lordship said, "The pecuniary pressure, I call the attention of the House to, is a very real fact. It appears from the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, and his statement is verified by the Bank returns themselves, that although the charter of the Bank was extended to the 1st of August last, the Government continued to extend its discounts, until, for reasons best known to the Bank, about the 1st of August last, the policy of the institution was totally changed, and a curtailment of its discounts was made, which, I think, more than had ever been known since it went first into operation, and a proportionate pressure was felt throughout

the country. But to be more accurate, and I feel this necessary, because the gentleman from South Carolina said, in no very measured terms, that the Secretary, in his capacity of Secretary of the House, has been guilty of a misrepresentation and of a gross attempt to impose upon Congress. Now, sir, I stand here before this House and this nation, pledged to prove to the satisfaction of every human being, that the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury is true to the letter.

The statement of the Secretary is, that the curtailments of the discounts of the Bank from August 1, to October 1, 1833, amounted to \$1,000,000. He has before me the statement of the returns of the Bank, and they show the statement to be accurate to a farthing, according to the Bank's own

statement. [Mr. P. made some other comparative statements, which the Reporter could not catch, concluding by saying that the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury were perfectly and literally accurate and true.] The Secretary attempts no misstatement. He expressly says, that the amount consisted of loans and domestic bills.— But the gentleman from New York states that the domestic bills are not to be considered as discounts, but as loans, and, indeed, and totally new, at least to me, strange as it may seem. I will not say that the gentleman shows, by the statement of the Bank itself, that the amount of domestic bills discounted in a single year was forty-eight millions of dollars; but the gentleman will have it that these are not discounts. Not discounts, sir?

that thought that the established rule was to set down all that goes out as debit, and all that comes in as credit. I present a note: the Bank discounts it; a merchant draws on Boston, payable at New York; but the Bank discounts it up, and the merchant gets the proceeds of the note discounted.—This doctrine as to these bills is so clear and settled, that I had not supposed it possible it could ever be doubted.

Mr. P. here went into a view of the operation of discounts of Domestic Bills of Exchange, &c. and consequent drafts and re-drafts, which made this sort of discounting the profitable and *avo*ite business of the Bank. Yet it is said that these Bills of Exchange, thus paying interest, and premium, are not discounted bills! The Secretary,