THE ERIE OBSERVER.

ONWARD.

VOLUME 19. SATURDAY MORNING, AUGUST 5, 1848. NUMBER 12.

THE WEEKLY OBSERVER.

ERIE PA:

SATURDAY MORNING, AUGUST 5, 1848.

THE VETO POWER.—No. 1.

The subject of the qualified negative upon the action of Congress, vested in the hands of the President by the wise framers of our Constitution, has become *suddenly* a question of vital importance to the people of the whole country, *inasmuch as this* one of the fundamental principles incorporated into the Constitution for the purpose of preventing the occurrence of certain evils, is in danger of being virtually annihilated by the blind fanaticism and political insanity of designing demagogues, who have apparently no reverence for that sacred instrument. They dare not openly avow their *opposition to the veto power* unqualifiedly, being aware of the odium which such an avowal would *inevitably* cast upon them, but under cover of *correcting its abuces—under the palpably insincere pretext* of bringing the administration of our government back to the primitive purity that characterized that of Washington, they are aiming a death blow at the Constitution, which, if successful, would be totally destructive of its whole framework. They are pursuing a course at war with every principle in that glorious instrument, the true and real tendency of which is to run counter to all its dictates—to paralyze and nullify its sacred injunctions. The Constitution directly prescribes a mode to be adopted for its amendment whenever, in the progress of events, deemed absolutely necessary; yet these *men, so* suddenly transformed into the advocates for a more liberal policy, the very antipodes of all that they ever have been, appear unwilling to await the ordinary progress of law, but are rushing headlong into the gulf of constitutional nullification. If the attempts of this party were sincere, if their efforts were patriotic, there might be something like an approximation towards an apology for the undue precipitancy of their movements. But all their former conduct when once or twice in an age the sunshine of power shed its blessings upon them fully and amply attest the truth of the assertion that all their *holy horror* at the "one man power," as they erroneously term it, is not only affected, but a mere *subterfuge, a miserable catch phrase* to deceive the people and persuade them into the belief that they are in favor of a more liberal policy than the Democratic party—a paradox which they will find it utterly impossible to reconcile with their previous practices. It becomes the people in the present great crisis, in view of the experience of the past, to look with distrust upon all professions of this character, emanating as they do from a party which has always, when opportunity offered, disregarded the will of the people; and should, through the medium of the ballot-box, that great speaking trumpet of freemen, cast a withering, scorching rebuke upon all such attempts to strike at the foundation of the "great charter of our liberties." That instrument was the result of the deliberations of as wise and patriotic a body of men as ever assembled for any purpose, and the beautiful and proportionate symmetry of its complicated form, its wonderful adaptation to answer the ends of its creation which the experience of sixty years has fully demonstrated, attest the foresight, the political knowledge and sagacity of its framers. It is a solemn compact, based upon an honorable compromise of the interests, principles and prejudices of distinct and independent societies of freemen, and intended to secure and perpetuate our Union. Hence the necessity of preventing the introduction of any cause calculated even in the most remote degree to mar its harmony or destroy its equilibrium. It is composed by the union of a variety of elements—of counteracting and cooperating powers, all depending on the other in such a manner that to unsettle a part is to destroy the whole.—The veto power is one of these elements that enters into the formation of this glorious combination. It is a balance introduced to counteract and regulate opposite and conflicting interest, the prerogative of the executive and the power of the legislature. Destroy the legitimate effect of this regulating power, and the whole federative system is decomposed and dissolved, and the fair fabric levelled into ruins. The inevitable tendency of the reckless course of the whig party is to produce this so much-to-be-abhorred result, and hence the moral obligation imposed upon all real friends of our institutions to unite their efforts to prevent the occurrence of so lamentable a catastrophe. Let them beware of the "insiduous wiles" of these professed friends of the dear people, but in practice sycophantic worshippers at the shine of power. Let them beware of the *siren song* with which they are attempting to lull the people into a support of their intangible doctrines and their available candidate, and place a true estimate upon the real designs of this party which are deducible from their previous history. RATIO.

GENERAL CASS AT CLEVELAND.—The remarks of this gentleman at Cleveland have been most shamefully misrepresented by the whig press. The report which we subjoin from the Cleveland Plaindealer, is correctly stated as delivered.

In reply to a short address by the Hon. Reuben Wood, he responded substantially as follows:

SIR: The noise and confusion which prevades this vast assembly will, I apprehend, prevent me from being distinctly heard by all present. I can do but little more, sir, at this time, than return my thanks for the warm and flattering reception which the citizens of Cleveland have given me. I take this expression of their feelings not so much as a compliment to myself, individually, as an expression of their attachment to the great principles of the party, whose standard-bearer unworthy I am. I have been selected as the candidate of the great democratic party for the highest office in the gift of the people—the highest office I may say in the world. Should I be elected to this high and important station, I shall endeavor to administer the affairs of the government in the true spirit of her glorious institutions.

You have made some allusion, sir, to principles and measures which agitate the public mind. I can but refer you to my votes as recorded, and sentiments as heretofore expressed, upon these questions. My acts for the last forty years are before the people, and if these are not sufficient to satisfy the public, all that I can now advance will be mere delusion.

☞ Gov. Morehead's missing letter to Gen. Taylor, informing him of his whig nomination, has at last made its appearance in the dead letter office at Washington!—So, the conjecture of the Baton Rouge correspondent of the Picayune, is correct. The General refused the letter because he did not recognize the handwriting of the superscription, or because the postage was not paid! This certainly is a cavalier mode of treating the great whig "slaughter house" and their nomination! But what becomes of all the whig charges of corruption against the P. O. Department? Will these partizans withdraw them? We shall see.

☞ In 1844, when Clay carried Ohio by 5,940 majority, the district represented by Giddings gave him 5,293 majority, and the other counties of the Reserve some three thousand more. *Now as no man in his senses expects* a majority of one vote on the Reserve for Taylor, our whig readers will see the utter folly of expecting to carry Ohio for the commander of the Army of Occupation.

☞ The Hon. D. King, of Mass., has written a pro Taylor letter to his constituents, in which he tells a "whopper," purporting to have been a private conversation between John Quincy Adams and himself. He says the latter leaned to Taylor! The public have only the word of King for this self-stultification on the part of Adams. Who believes him?

☞ Mr. Covey Cahell, having drank there glasses of cold water, was found dead at Bridgetown, Md., half an hour after retiring to bed.

Speech of Hon. Jas. Thompson,

OF PENNSYLVANIA.

In the House of Representatives, Tuesday June 27, 1848, the House being in Committee of the Whole, and having under consideration the Civil and Diplomatic Appropriation Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should have preferred addressing the committee to-morrow had it been agreeable, but am very indifferent on the subject; and as my friends on the other side desire the debate to proceed at this late hour of the day, I am content; but as I may feel but little obliged by their determination, I shall, perhaps, on this account, feel none the less at liberty to speak, what I may have to say, with freedom. They have opened the ball—this political ball—and must bear the consequences and responsibility of converting the debate into one on party politics. The attack has been made (to vary the figure) under the lead of a distinguished captain, my colleague, [Mr. Stewart,] and his advancing war-whoop has sounded loud and threatening; *but it has not frightened or disturbed any one* that I have heard of—there are none slain nor missing yet, I believe. How that voice will sound on the retreat, I am not prepared to say; but I can imagine, that when the time comes, as it will, its smooth tones will be changed; its harmony will be gone, and it will terminate in one long, agonizing bowl.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, time spent in investigating the *principles*, qualifications, and claims of the candidates for the office of the Chief Magistrate of this Union may not be considered as misspent. It may be the most important thing we can do; certain it is, that if begun on the one side, the other may be allowed the same privilege. I shall, therefore, devote the brief period of time allotted me to this subject. Before saying anything of the candidates for the Presidency, I shall briefly *speak* of what I conceive to be the principles and practices of the two great parties that have placed them before the people. And here, sir, I will *remark*, that the existence of party in a free Government, where popular will is the source of power, is not a thing to be *regretted, or which I should ever desire* to see destroyed; it has a salutary effect; it *superinduces* watchfulness and fidelity in those who administer the Government, and scrutiny in those who desire to overthrow the powers that be. The existence, therefore, of party is perhaps, not an evil. The ascendancy of a party is quite another affair.

Never have parties existed in this country that have differed more vitally in principle than do the Democratic and Whig parties of the present time. This difference exists mainly from the construction given to particular parts of the Constitution of the Union—the former claiming for that instrument a strict construction, and the latter insisting and acting upon what they call a conservative or liberal, but which is in fact, a latitudinous construction of it. *Here, sir,* is a wide difference—wide enough to lead to the most opposite results in practice. The object of a constitution is limitation—the limitation of power within certain defined boundaries: so that *on the one hand the people may be protected, and on* the other the government also, within the just exercise of its powers. A strict construction of the Constitution is therefore obviously necessary to preserve the Constitution itself as a *means of limitation*. Why, sir, if you depart from the letter of the Constitution and the necessary incidents, limitation will depend *upon those who construe it*, not upon the instrument itself; and what might be its boundaries to-day, may be passed without hesitancy to-morrow, and still be claimed to be within its restrictions. It would thus expand or contract according to the will and views of those who, *for the* time being, might be called on to construe it—and be thus, in fact, no limitation whatever—defeating the end, the object, and intent of a constitution altogether. On the part of the Whigs, it has been contended that the Constitution authorizes the establishment of a bank of the United States—a distribution of the proceeds of the public lands amongst the States—assumption of State debts by the National Government—"protection for protection," without regard to revenue—and even the construction *of roads and canals* between points within States alone under the jurisdiction of State Governments. Now, sir, all these things are strangers to the Constitution—not to be found within that instrument—not within its just construction; *nothing*, by any just system of interpretation or implication, can be construed to favor it. All this has been contended for, and has been the sentiment, at times, of the party opposed to us, if not at all times. Indeed, sir, I have sometimes thought that their governing principle, on this subject, consisted in the will alone of Congress, as the only limitation under the Constitution. We have heard it said, of late days, that a bank of the United States was an "obsolete idea." Should the Whigs succeed in electing a President, would it be so? This was said before the elections in 1840: it proved then to be profession, not practice, as the history of the creation of a fifty-million bank most clearly proved. But, sir, my colleague, in spite of himself, has exhibited a slight glimpse of the cloven foot, even now. He told us yesterday that he thought that State banks were entirely unconstitutional—that the power to create them belonged exclusively, to the National Legislature. Here it is avowed. Would a party composed of such politicians and statesmen in power hesitate long to create a bank of the United States? Would General Taylor veto such a bank, when his friends—original friends, such as my colleague undoubtedly is—believed it to be within the power of Congress to create it—and believed, too, that the power exists nowhere else to make banks?

Mr. STEWART. Will the gentleman allow me to explain? I have always opposed the bank, and never voted for one in my life. Whigs and Democrats had both voted for them.

Mr. THOMPSON. This may be so, but did not my colleague support those who favored a national bank? Did he not give a *most hearty and earnest* support to Mr. Clay? to General Harrison? Was he *not always a supporter of Whig men and Whig principles? And were they not until lately, if not still, supporters of the measure? It is but recently* that the announcement that a bank was an "obsolete idea" began to be made; and I much doubt its continued prevalence if that party should acquire the power to create one. They are opposed to the subtreasury, the only medium under the Constitution of establishing a constitutional currency. Opposition to this measure, sir, in my judgement, is support of what they say is the exploded and "obsolete idea" of a bank. The Whigs have also been in favor of the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands to *the States. I should* not be surprised if this would soon be found among the 'obsolete," as also that other scheme of assuming the state debts; and, like the bank question, obsolete until opportunity shall exist to establish them by legislation. All these things they have claimed to find sanctions for in the Constitution. Not, sir, because the power is found within this instrument, but because it may suit their judgement of what public policy might dictate. *Over* and above all this, they oppose the exercise of the veto power.

The Democratic party insist on a strict construction of the Constitution; this they conceive to be the great safeguard of that instrument and its limitations. And in addition thereto, they approve of and sustain the *exercise of* the veto, power. While, sir, it may be, and frequently is, exercised contrary to the individual judgement and wishes of *members of* the party, yet they sustain it, they support its exercise as an additional protection to the Constitution, securing it from infraction either as the result of hasty, or mistaken legislation. The Whig doctrine, in short, is—liberal construction and no veto; the Democratic doctrine, strict construction and the exercise of the veto power. Can any one doubt which party, therefore, is most likely to preserve, free from encroachment, the great charter of our liberties, and national prosperity? If both these safeguards were withdrawn, let me ask, what is there left to protect against baleful influences during high party excitement or the intrigues of designing men? *And if* either be taken away, by so much, then, is the safety of the instrument endangered. How much, therefore, will not the danger be increased by the abolition of both? Sir, the great, and I might say, the only difference between free and despotic governments, consists in the existence of limitations, thro' the means of constitutions; and whatever destroys these limitations not only undermines constitutional restrictions, but advances towards the destruction of liberty itself.

Not more diverse has been the policy of the antagonist of Democratic principles in their practices on questions of great national interest. Time will not allow me to do more than to mention what history most clearly authenticate. The Federal party, in 1812, in Congress, (principally from a portion of the New England States, now Whig,) opposed, in the most active and virulent manner, the war with Great Britain; denounced it as unjust and unrighteous, and unbecoming a Christain people to rejoice at the success of the American arms in such a conflict; called it "Madison's war;" and finally held a convention at Hartford, to give form and method to their opposition, notwithstanding the war terminated gloriously for American honor.*

When President Jackson firmly and earnestly *demanded* that France should no longer be permitted to *temporize* and withhold payments of the indemnities due our citizens, the Whig press almost unanimously took ground against him; and Whig orators declaimed every where against him and his policy. Again the result was fortunate and honorable to the country, in the success of his measures, and the *indemnities* were paid. The Maine or Northeastern boundary, had been a subject of controversy between Great Britain and the United States for many years. A Whig administration and Whig negotiators settled the contest by yielding a large portion of what the Democratic administration had refused to concede, by adhering to what geography and history indicated to be the true boundary, and yielded up some eight hundred thousand acres of territory that had been claimed by the United States for half a century; and this treaty was confirmed by Whig votes in the Senate a very few Democratic Senators voting for it.—After this concession, came the Oregon contest.—Sir, this unsettled and long-agitated question came up shortly after the commencement of the twenty-ninth Congress. I, for the first time, had taken a seat in this Hall; I had anticipated, that on this national question, all would have embraced the *American side of it. For five or six months it was* discussed. The Democratic portion of the House maintained, with but few exceptions, our title to the whole of Oregon. The Whigs, with the same unanimity, denied this title. In all that long and earnest debate, I recollect but one voice on the other side of the House raised against the claim of Great Britain to any part of that territory. *Experience and learning* gave to the eloquence and energy of that great man *irresistible power: he* labored earnestly and enthusiastically for the right. That voice is silent now; and its possessor (John Quincy Adams) reposes in peace, leaving a name glorious for great services, purity of purpose, and patriotic devotion. That contest, ended on account of a preexpression of the Senate, which rendered it necessary for the President to submit the question of *treating for the 49th parallel* of latitude to the Senate, as the boundary, although against his own sense of its justice. Nearly the whole Whig party voted to yield our claim beyond this point. It was so settled, and another concession was thus obtained by Great Britain.

[Mr. THOMPSON afterwards corrected himself by remarking, that his colleague (Mr. POLLOCK) had spoken in support of our claim to 54dg 40min.; so also had Mr. DARRAGH.]

Next came the Mexican war. The Whigs, it will not be denied here, or anywhere, have in this House, and in the Senate, and almost universally in the country, opposed this war; denounced it by *every term and epithet that could express opposition* to it, and the Administration and party that has supported and conducted it. They have called it "the President's war"—characterized it as "unholy," "unjust," and "hellish." And this House finally, and during its *continuance*, voted that it was "*unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President.*" When this vote was given in January last, the prospect of peace *seemed* as distant as it had been a year before; yet this vote was given, and the Journals containing it (and what I think a most *unfounded libel on our country*) attest the fact, and will continue to do so, until the end of time, *unless* corrected by the expunging process, which I hope to see consummated, as well for our national honor as that the truth of history may be vindicated. Did this war begin by the act of the President? Sir, I think no mind, partial or impartial, after having examined the subject, can come to such a conclusion. What were the facts? Annexation had been determined upon, and resolutions to that effect (drawn by a Whig) passed on the 1st day of March, 1845, and an agent despatched to Texas with them on the 3d of that month. Mr. Polk was inaugurated on the 4th; on the 6th, two days thereafter, the Mexican minister, Almonte, notified the new Administration that he looked *upon the passage of the resolutions* as equivalent *to a declaration of war* against Mexico, demanded his passports, and terminated his diplomatic relations at Washington. To this the President, through the Secretary of State, caused the assurance to be made that no unfriendly feeling existed on the part of the Government of the United States towards Mexico; that it was his most earnest desire to preserve peace between the two countries; that Texas had been independent for nine years—her independence acknowledged by the principal European Powers, as also by the United States; and that, under such circumstances, it was conceived that Texas had as fully the right to annex herself as to maintain her independence: that the most liberal spirit would be *exercised in regard to all* questions of boundary. But all this *was deemed* insufficient. Mr. Almonte procured his passports, and left the country. The American plenipotentiary at Mexico was *furnished with his passports*, and friendly relations were at once ended. Sir, the most marked desire was evinced by the President to preserve peace. After this termination of *friendly relations, Mexico began to* collect an army: the public press, the manifestoes of generals, and every act of the Mexican Government, indicated plainly the intention to invade Texas. Indeed, it was said by Paredes, I believe, that he would plant the Mexican standard on the Capitol at Washington. The pretext for all this was the act of annexation of Texas, and it had been virtually annexed on the 3d of March, 1845.

Thus you see that the act leading to the war—insisted on as cause of war, and which led to war—took place before Mr. Polk came into office, and of this he was informed two days after his inauguration. Well, sir, on the 4th of July, 1845, annexation was consummated by the act of Texas, and she, in fact, although not entirely in form, became one of the States of the Union. *Under the treatenings of* Mexico, and with the knowledge that a *great force* was assembling on the northern frontier of Mexico, *the authorities of Texas called on the President for* protection. The point had arrived at which he was bound to act—the invasion of a State. He did act. General Taylor was ordered to take position at Corpus Christi. This he did in August 1845, west of the Nuecis. To prevent the threatening conflict, the Administration made an effort to reconcile angry feelings by negotiation. An inquiry was made by direction of the President, through the American consul at Mexico, whether a minister to settle all difficulties would be received by that Government. After some delays, an affirmative answer was given. A condition was annexed, that the squadron at or near Vera Cruz should be withdrawn. It was done. A minister was sent under this promise to receive him. He arrived in November, and after considerable delay and a resort to many subterfuges, he was refused. The administration of Herrera was overthrown, because, as he has since declared under his own hand, he was favorable to negotiation with the United States; thus showing that war was intended by Mexico before any approach of our army to the Rio Grande. Paredes *succeeded* him. An application was made to the new administration by our minister to be recognized, but was again refused. When the news of his final refusal was received at Washinton, General Taylor was directed to take *position* on the Rio Grande. He had recommended this himself in October previous, as his despatch fully shows. He was strictly enjoined, in making this movement, to commit no act of violence on any Mexican he might meet, resident or otherwise. Whenever he met such, he declared the wishes of the country for peace; and when he arrived at the Rio Grande, he found it necessary to *fortify himself within reach of the city of Matamoros.* After arriving there, a parley took place, in which *the officer on the part of* the United States (General Worth) avowed again the desire for preserving peace and referring the causes of dispute to negotiation. This, too, was disregarded. On the 18th of April, General Paredes issued positive and direct orders to Arista to attack the Americans; and his despatch of the 23d of the same month expresses the hope that, before the receipt of it, hostilities had commenced—that his troops had been victorious, (both found among Arista's papers taken at Resaca de la Palma.) About this time Col. Cross was murdered by the Mexicans. On the 24th of the same month, Captain Thornton was attacked, and himself and about 60 soldiers captured or killed by Mexicans on the Texas side of the Rio Grande. Lieutenant Porter had also been killed a day or so before; and on the 7th of May, Captain Walker and a party of soldiers were attacked and six men killed, on the same side of the river. On the 8th of May, the enemy's forces having all crossed the Rio Grande into Texas, the battle of Palo Alto was fought; and on the 9th of May the *victory of Resaca* de la Palma was achieved; and those Mexicans who escaped from the conflict recrossed the Rio Grande and fled into the interior of Mexico. Thus had the Mexican troops crossed the Rio Grande, (the boundary fixed by Texas in her declaration of independence, in her national constitution, and in her State constitution,) and, before a blow was struck, commenced hostilities, by killing and capturing officers and men of our army.

The President had wisely prepared for this Mexican invasion; he anticipated it, and was ready for the emergency. Was this beginning a war "unconstitutionally by him," to defend a State against invasion? He did this, and did no more. He caused *the enemy* to be met and resisted the moment they set foot on the soil of the State. So far as he was to be *governed* on the subject of boundary, he could look to no other boundary than the Rio Grande—none other had ever been hinted at, much less insisted on. The Rio Grande had been named and known as the boundary for almost a half century by our Government, and it had been claimed and defended as such by Texas. If the President did not defend this boundary, where would have found one? The Nueces, a little river of not over 100 miles in length, was no boundary, and had never been described as such; but the Rio Grande had. He therefore defended it, as he was bound to do.

But two ways exist for determining controversies between nations by negotiation and by war. Now, sir, negotiation had utterly failed, after every effort for its aid had been invoked by our Government.—Had our minister been at liberty to offer the Nueces as the boundary of Texas, it would not have been received by Mexico. And why? Simply because she would not hear any proposition whatever from him. War was therefore the only remaining alternative *to settle existing difficulties.* Mexico refused to treat, sent forward her army, and ours on the spot received and overthrew it. Sir, no national mind that will examine the matter fairly, can come to any conclusion, in my opinion, other than that the President did his duty, faithfully and truly, and deserves, as he will receive, the gratitude of the country for all his acts in regard to this trying crisis. But, sir, on the 13th of May, Congress passed a formal declaration of war, and declared that the "*war existed by the acts of the Republic of Mexico;*" the members of the House present, all but 14, voting for it, and all the Senators present but two. Notwithstanding this, sir, we have heard nothing but denunciation against the President by the entire Whig *party—I mean the politicians*; and finally, as a crowning act of opposition, a vote of this House on the 3d of January last was given, that the war was "*unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President.*" This was carried by a strict party vote—83 Whigs for it, and 82 Democrats against it. Sir, this vote is of serious consequence to the country; it casts upon it the imputation of aggression, inexcusable aggression, upon the rights of a sister Republic, by and through a violation of the Constitution, upon which we all should look with sacred reverence. Never was there a more serious *charge; never a charge so groundless, nay,* so thoroughly disproved by every act in the history of the war. And, *sir*, I shall re-offer, while I remain a member of this House, whenever I can under its *rules*, resolutions to expunge the unjust sentence, until it shall be obliterated or surrounded by dark and *ominous lines, warning the reader that within* their circumference is contained an aspersion on the national honor and the fidelity of our national *Administration*, and to be ever heeded, marked, and known as such. But I have not time to pursue this war question. It was justly begun and has been gloriously terminated, adding unfading glory to our arms as well as commemorating our magnanimity and humanity in conducting it. My object was to show that the Whig party had opposed it and taken sides against the country on this as on the other great issues between our country and other Powers that I have briefly noticed. It is enough here to say, that far different have been the principles and practices of the Democratic party. On all these questions, varied as they have been, that party has followed no lead but that of the country—no star but her welfare.

Mr. Chairman, republican governments depend *upon public opinion: monarchies and despotisms* upon the will and *interests of the few*, and the arm of power. With us it is *public opinion that* gives vitality and force to our institutions, and energy to Government. Upon it alone can they exist. It is obvious, that if popular approval or disapproval have nothing to do with the principles or the measures of Government to adopt by those who are to administer them, all *will depend on the views* of those who govern, and being unknown, must be taken on trust by their supporters and followers. The difference between the Democratic and Whig parties is *very great* in this respect.—The former put forth their candidates, avow principles, and ask their assent to such principles; all can *know them; nothing is taken on trust.* The Whigs avow *no principles, erect no platforms.* They have nominated their candidate, and certainly they have taken him on trust. Gen. Taylor has never embraced any political principles, if we believe his own admission. He has never voted, although eligible for thirty or forty years, and avows no principles now. *Let me ask, for what has he been selected? Certainly for no distinction gained as a statesman; for no political sagacity—because he confesses* himself unacquainted with political questions.—What, then, commended him to the choice of the Whigs? Simply and alone his military success in Mexico. But, sir, I would like to know why, if this was the only object of the Whigs, they did not nominate General Scott? Why was he overlooked?—The General, that *the party have been in the habit* of denominating the hero of Chippewa, Lundy's Lane, *Vera Cruz, Cerro Gordo, and the the battle-fields* near Mexico; why is he dropped or overlooked? His millitary successes are *rather more numerous* than that of General Taylor; besides, he had voted—had some political principles. Will the *friends of Gen. Scott feel much flattered by the neglect? If military glory* was the great desideratum, I cannot conceive the justice in passing by General Scott. If not so, and principles had anything to do with the selection, let me ask why the party have in his latter days abandoned their "Harry of the West!" For years, sir, they have loved to denominate him the "embodiment" of Whig principles. Have they, abandoned their principles? They used to speak of the *principles of the great Whig party*, as eternal and vital. *Where are they now?* When Mr. Clay was the candidate, their principles were not concealed—were open and declared; and although they were condemned by a majority of the people, there was something *to respect in an open contest* for principles, although *erroneous* as I think they were—when compared with that stealthy, snake-like policy that *makes no marks, leaves no tracks*, and is to be taken entirely on trust without any evidence of what it is, or is to be. The Whig party are again about to resort *to the plan of the campaign of* 1840. Previous to they election, that had announced some principles, some policy, but had been defeated. In that memorable campaign, they made no avowals *for the public eye; and they elected Gen.* Harrison. In 1844 they made Mr. Clay and his principles their creed and standard-bearer: they failed. In 1848 they resort to the plan of 1840, *and* take a candidate who avows no principles, and they avow none, in the hope that, unsuccessful with an avowal of principles, as they have ever been, their only prospect consists in success without any. Will the plan succeed? Sir, I do not believe it will.

My colleague [Mr. Stewart] says the Allison letter of Gen. Taylor exhibits his principles. Well, sir, we shall see. For non-committialism, that letter out-Herods Herod, in my judgement. *It is the* twenty-second or twenty-third of the series that General Taylor has given us. Let us see.

The first paragraph is as follows.

"I confess, whilst I have great cardinal principles which will regulate my political life, I am not sufficiently familiar with all the minute details of political legislation to give solemn pledges to exert my influence, if I were President, to carry out this or defeat that measure. I have no concealment. I hold no opinion which I would not readily proclaim to my assembled countrymen: but crude impressions upon matters of policy, which may be right to-day and wrong to-morrow, are, perhaps, not the best test of fitness for office. One who cannot be trusted without pledges, cannot be confided in merely on account of them."

In this he says he has great cardinal principles, but not sufficiently acquainted with legislation to give pledges to carry them out. What are these principles that cannot be described? At best he admits them to be "crude impressions upon matters of policy, which may be right to-day and wrong to-morrow." Now, Sir, these great "cardinal principles" that he possesses, are they subject to this contingency of "being right to-day and wrong to-morrow?" If so, they are only to be right one day and wrong the next, as circumstances may indicate.

But further of the letter.

"I will proceed however to respond to your inquiries.

"*First.* I reiterate what I have often said. I am a Whig, but not an ultra whig. If elected, I would not be the mere president of a party. I would endeavor to act independent of party domination. I should feel bound to administer the Government untrameled by party schemes."

"A Whig, but not an ultra Whig." This the General is sure is "right to-day," but it may be "wrong to-morrow." The same remark is true exactly of the manner he would administer the Government. He would administer it according to this plan and upon this principle, if he should not conceive it wrong to-morrow.

"*Second.* The veto power. The power given by the Constitution to the Executive to interpose his veto is a high conservative power; but in my opinion, should never be exercised except in cases of clear violation of the Constitution, or manifest haste and want of consideration by Congress. Indeed, I have thought, that for many years past, the known opinions and wishes of the Executive have exercised undue and injurious influence upon the legislative department of the Government; *and for this cause I* have thought our system was in danger of undergoing a great change from its true theory.—The personal opinions of the individual who may happen to occupy the Executive chair ought not to control the action of Congress upon questions of domestic policy; nor ought his objections to be interposed where questions of constitutional power have been settled by the various departments of Government, and acquiesced in by the people."

I have, Mr. Chairman, said something already in regard to the veto power as viewed by our opponents. But, sir, here is General Taylor's view of it; and never was there a greater error made in regard to its exercise. I protest against such a principle as is here avowed. The power, he says, "*ought never to be exercised except in cases of clear violation* of the Constitution," &c. Sir, what is this doctrine? Simply this: it must clearly appear that the legislation is unconstitutional before the veto power is exercised. The very reverse is the true doctrine. Legislation ought to be clearly constitutional, or it ought not to exist. According to this doctrine, a thing might be a little unconstitutional, but not being clearly so, doubts being cast upon the fact whether it is so or not, therefore the veto power ought not to be exercised. This is an inversion, I conceive, of the true doctrine. Legislation is to be limited by the Constitution, and what is not clearly within its limits as principle and necessary incident, ought not to be sanctioned. General Taylor says, what is not clearly—that is, notoriously—beyond its limits ought to be sanctioned and to be considered within it. This avowal, at best, is clear of his salvo. It is wrong to-day, and will be so forever. It seems to me a *great error.*

"*Third.* Upon the subject of the tariff, the currency, the improvement of our great highways, rivers, lakes, and harbors, the will of the people, as expressed through their representatives in Congress, ought to be respected and carried out by the Executive."

Sir it, would seem that Gen. Taylor has no views whatever on the subjects just enumerated. He refers it all to Congress. If they are favorable to a tariff, so is he; if favorable to harbors and rivers, so *is he; if against both,* so is he. He has no principles *in regard to these subjects.* Whatever Congress *may say, he is for that. When favorable to* these measures, he is favorable; *when against them*, he is against them. Now, sir, this is what my colleague calls General Taylor's platform. Nothing is said in this platform about a bank, *about the sub-*treasury, about distribution of the proceeds of the public lands. If this is the platform of the Whigs now, what has become of that one of 1844? If they were right then, why not insist upon it now? But, sir, the selection of their candidate was made with a view to availity. They make no platforms, and they have kicked from under them that one of 1844, and are now in the condition of certain great culprits who are sometimes obliged to dance upon nothing, as a penalty for their offences.

In all the letters of General Taylor, and in the Convention that nominated him, I had been unable *to ascertain what were his or their principles.* To learn, if possible, what they were, I attended a ratification meeting. I heard several speeches. I remember a distinguished gentleman of Congress who spoke eloquently, and, as the newspapers say, "at great length." In speaking of the General he *observed that it had been said that he had never voted*: "Well, for his part, he thought this was no objection: it was in his favor. He was a good Whig, and that was what he wanted. He did not want a man who had voted. If he had never voted, he had done some fighting. Others objected that he could not give any opinion in regard to certain great questions. Well, he couldn't—he couldn't because he didn't know what had been done since he left the United States. He didn't know what had been done and he hadn't time to lean it. He was the very man for the people. But it was said he was illiterate and couldn't writ. He didn't care if he couldn't write his name; he was honest; he was *the man of the* people. What do you think, fellow-citizens, makes him so popular? I'll tell you: it is his principles—yes, fellow-citizens, his principles!" As to what were his principles, the people were as much in the dark as ever. It was about as definite in regard to his principles, and as satisfactory as the story which I heard of a countryman, who, coming into an apothecary's shop, inquired, "Do you keep drugs and medicines here?" Apothecary; "Yes." "How much are they?" Apothecary; "They are considerable I reckon." "Very well, I will take one of each."

There was a time, sir, in the history of the world *when people were not allowed to be curious about* the opinions of rulers; they were not thought entitled to know. But it is too late in the day now.—Men, under the impulse of freedom, are rising up *every where and demanding to know the views and de*signs of those who are ruling them as to the future. A party here seems to be the only exception to this almost universal feeling. What a contrast to this feature might I not draw from the history of our own country! This Republic, new and glorious, the wonder of the world, started boldly forth, amidst the universal gloom, with a declaration dedicated to mankind of the principles to be contended for; the great platform was erected: it raised up friends and confounded foes; and these principles, the title-page of our national existence containing them, will remain, to be admired and venerated while the Republic itself exists. Sir, will the people, after a period of seventy-two years' national existence, abandon the early practice of open avowal, and devote themselves blindly to a man—a mere military chieftain—who avows no principles, and has not a particle of political experience? No, sir, they will not.

I remember a poetic fiction that furnishes a picture of disappointment incident to blind devotion.—The Veiled Prophet Khorassan induced his followers to believe that beneath the silver veil that ever hid his face, glowed a countenance radiant with beauty, and worthy to command all their homage.—Blindly he led them, relying upon faith, until it suited his purposes and wickedness to undeceive them.

At last, raising the veil, he exhibited deformity itself-deformed, exclaiming—

"There, ye *wise* saints, behold your light, your star;
Ye would be dupes and victims, and ye are."

Sir, this was fiction; but "truth is stranger than fiction," and blind faith in mortal man may be doomed to disappointments as great. Let me commend the picture to the confiding followers of General Taylor.

These are my views of the candidate of the Whig party. Sir, I would not pluck a laurel from his brow—deprive him of a single ray of glory that should justly surround him. He has been selected for his military achievements, as I have already said. How many, may not I ask, are there to whom much of the glory claimed for General Taylor, does not justly belong? Many a brave officer, now overlooked and forgotten by his admirers and supporters, performed services as faithfully, and as important to success, as did the general. *How many brave men* are there that made up the ranks of that glorious army, periled all for their country, fought and died for it, whose laurels are now bound around the brow of the commander? Is it just? Sir, the labors, perils, and courage of others are the materials that constitute the glory of a mere chieftain; and never was it more truly so than in the instance of General Taylor. Now, does this, the only element of his popularity, qualify him for President of the U. States? Sir, no man can say it does, and where is any thing else to commend him—the least evidence of civil qualification in his whole life? It exists nowhere—is not to be found or pointed out.

I have made these remarks, sir, in no spirit of unkindness. To the Whigs "personally, I have no objection;" to them politically, I have no other feeling in the world but to see them defeated in this their second attempt to slide into power by an appeal in *favor of men not principles.* This cruising without flag, or banner, or papers, always will induce scrutiny—suspicion; and certainly it is no fault of those who suspect—who doubt the entire fairness of the "transaction." *It is the folly of those who give* grounds to suspect. Sir, I like to see the banner I am to follow—see its motto, beholds its starts, and feel that it is known and recognized by my fellowman. Such, happily, are the principles of the Democratic party, that it moves not without these emblems—the insigna that shall enable every beholder to distinguish its banner from all other banners; its principles are broadly spread out upon its ample folds. Be victory or defeat the fortune of the day, still the banner is ever the same; on it remains the same great truths. In the contest that is to come, sir, I have no fears. Our opponents are made up of discordant materials, having no sympathies in common, and no principles in common; they cannot, under such circumstances, hope to succeed. On

[CONCLUDED ON FOURTH PAGE.]

*The following are a few of the many expressions against the war of 1812 by the party *opposing it then:*

"At the door of James Madison and his accomplices lies the blood of our butchered countrymen."—*Salem Gazette, during the War.*

"The evils the Federalists have long predicted, are thickening upon us; and, in our affliction, let us always remember it is *James Madison and his party that have brought these calamities upon us.*"—*Worcester Spy*, 1814.

"Mr. Madison has declared war, let Mr. Madison carry it on."—*Rev. Mr. Gardner, of Boston*, (*Sermon.*)

"So unjust is this offensive war, into which our rulers have plunged us, in the sober consideration of millions, that they cannot conscientiously approach the God of Armies for his blessing upon it."—*Boston Sentinel, of* 1813.

"The war was founded in falsehood, declared without necessity, and its real object was *extent of territory* by unjust conquest, and to aid the late tyrant of Europe in his view of aggrandizement."—*Resolve of the Massachusetts Senate, during the war.*

The committee of the Legislature of Connecticut, who reported in favor of sending delegates to the Hartford Convention, declare, that it is "an odious and disastrous war," "waged for foreign conquest," "devoted to a fruitless invasion of the enemy's territory."

"The war is purely Democratic; it was undertaken for *democratic*, and not for national purposes. Let the democrats, therefore, terminate it in the best manner they can. WE HAVE NO PARTNERSHIP IN THE MATTER." * *

"The war has hitherto been the war of a party; let it so continue, and so be terminated! The disgrace will then continue to be the disgrace of the party, and not of the nation—a consummation devoutly to be wished."—*United States Gazette, Philadelphia, during the war.*

"If at the command of weak or wicked rulers, they undertake a wicked or unjust war, each man who volunteers his services in such a war, or loans his money for its support, or by his conversation, his writings, or by *any other mode of influence, encourages its prosecution*, that man is an accomplice in the wickednes, loads his conscience with the *blackest crimes, brings the guilt of blood upon his soul, and, in the sight of God and the law, is a murderer.*"—*Dr. Osgood's sermon, Medford, Mass.*, 1812.

"My plan is to withhold our money, and make a separate peace with England."—*Boston Advocate*, 1814.

"Will Federalists subscribe to the loan? Will they lend money to our national rulers? To what purposes have the Federalists exerted themselves to show the wickedness of the war, *to rouse public sentiment against it*, and show the authors of it not only to be unworthy of *public confidence*, but HIGHLY CRIMINAL, if they now contribute the sums without which *their* rulers must be *compelled to stop?*"—*Boston Gazette*, 1814.

"It is very grateful to find that the universal sentiment is, that any man who lends money to the Government at the present time will forfeit *all claim to common honesty, and common courtesy* among all true friends of the country. *God forbid that any Federalist* should ever hold up his *hand to pay Federalists for money lent to the present rulers*; and Federalists can judge whether Democrats will tax their constituents to pay interest to Federalists." —*Boston Gazette*, 1814.

"All the evils which afflict the country are imputed to the opposition. It is said to be owing to the opposition that the war has been prosecuted with no better success. This, sir, is no new strain." * * * "The opposition is constitutional and legal. It is also conscientious. It rests in settled and sober convictions that such policy (the war) is destructive to the interests of the people, and dangerous to the being of Government." * * * * "This is not the entertainment to which we were invited. We are told that these disappointments are owing to the opposition which the war encounters. This is no new strain. It is the constant tune of every weak or wicked Administration!"—*Speech of Mr. Webster, in 1814, on the subject of the disasters on the northern frontier.*

Sentiments like the above, without number might be added, showing where the Federalists of New England were in 1812, and showing a great similarity with the Whig sentiment about the Mexican war of 1846.