

THE BRADFORD REPORTER.

VOLUME VIII.

"BOARDSHIP OF DENUNCIATION FROM ANY QUARTER."

NUMBER 68

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY, AT TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., BY E. O'MEARA GOODRICH.

TOWANDA:

Wednesday Morning, March 1, 1848.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

SPEECH OF HON. D. WILMOT, OF PENNSYLVANIA,

In the House of Rep's, Feb. 7, 1848,

In Reply to some strictures upon his course, published in the "Union" Newspaper, of the 2d inst.

Mr. WILMOT rose and asked leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER said it would be in order only by the general consent of the House.

No objection being made—

Mr. WILMOT was proceeding with his remarks, when

Mr. ROOT rose and objected.

The SPEAKER (continuing), said, he trusted that gentlemen would find he was not disposed to trespass far upon the indulgence which had been extended to him.

It was the first time, since he had been a member of this House, that he had made an appeal to its courtesy; and he should not now, but for the very extraordinary character of an article which appeared in the "Union" of the 2d instant, under its editorial head. As this is the second attack that has been made upon me within the last few days, in the editorial columns of that paper, the "venerable" editor who presides over it, might think I was wanting in personal respect, unless I notice them. It is not, sir, I assure you, because I feel the slightest degree of inconvenience or pain under the lash which he chooses to apply to me. I feel entirely confident that any efforts which that gentleman may make to injure me before my constituents, will be idle and abortive—

My principles were known to them before I left my home; they were always freely promulgated; and when I choose to avow them on this floor, I claim the right to do so, and I am entirely indifferent what course the editor of the "Union" may see fit to take with reference to it. I will read the article to which I refer—

"Mr. D. Wilmot, of Pennsylvania, is not content with the notoriety he has gained by his 'Proviso'—

We must have the *Wilmot Proviso*, No. 2. He has proposed a scheme of direct taxation—the 'second proviso'—No. 2—another firebrand. I suppose, through the columns of the 'Union,' we have heard, through the columns of the 'Union,' of the last year—may, more, ever since the introduction of that measure—that the 'proviso' was a 'firebrand' thrown into the ranks of the Democratic party, and which was calculated to divide, if not to defeat it. This has been the constant clamor of the 'Union.' Now, sir, we have firebrand No. 2 in the shape of a proposition to levy a direct tax upon the capital and wealth of the country. As a representative of the people, standing upon my rights as a member of this House, under my responsibilities to my constituents and to God, in the oath I have taken, I propose a measure for the consideration of this body and of the country, the object and purpose of which is, to draw from the coffers of the capitalists and the wealthy classes, some fair share of the expenses and burdens of Government. When, lo! I am assailed, and the proposition denounced as a firebrand by a paper professing to speak for the Administration—professing, I say, to be the guardian and defender of the Constitution, and being responsible for its course. I do not believe the article, upon which I am commenting, can receive the approbation of the President or any prominent member of his Cabinet.

This is a 'mischievous' proposition which I introduced—a second, 'proviso'—a firebrand—an attempt to invade the principles of the Republican party—a second effort to disturb that 'peculiar institution,' of which this 'venerable' editor seems the peculiar guardian, and to have ever in view, and at which he fancies some blow is struck, in almost every movement that may be made here. Why, sir, if an empire of free and fertile soil is to be acquired, Mr. Ritchie sees nothing in it above and beyond the extension of slavery. If a proposition is introduced here for the purpose of raising money for the support of this Government in time of war, and for the payment of its debt, Mr. Ritchie sees nothing in that, but an effort to impose a tax upon slave property. His vision is altogether unable to extend any further; and he seems to think that gentlemen are actuated by no other motives, in whatever movement they may make here. I had no particular allusion to this species of property. If there had been no such property I should have made the same proposition; I did not propose to exempt it; I do not know why a few thousand slaves of the South, who hold a certain species of property, should be exempt from taxation; but my object was to call upon the capital generally in all sections of the country—North and South, East and West—wherever found, to bear its just proportion of the burdens of Government. This was my object; to this my amendment was directed, and this only. And this is a 'heresy' in the Republican mind. A new doctrine in the Democratic party, as it

Mr. Ritchie declares it to be a "heresy" one that must be kicked out of doors; and "fortunately," he tells us, it was so treated, "several" of the Whigs voting against it. Mr. Ritchie, then, was fortunate in having some Whig allies—here and there a scattering one, who came to his aid, and voted down this most "mischievous" proposition—the proviso No. 2. Why, sir, this barefaced attempt at misrepresentation! It is, however, in character with all that the "Union" is pleased to say of me—calculated and intended to deceive, and to place me in a false position before my constituents and the country; to represent me as acting with the great body of the Whig party, while here and there a Whig voted with the Democrats, and thus, fortunately, defeated my "scheme of mischief!" Sir, there were seventy-two Whigs voting against my amendment, and only twenty-four for it. This Mr. Ritchie knew when he said it was defeated—"several" Whigs voting against it." I should think that seventy-two out of ninety-six would indeed make "several."

It is not long since Mr. Ritchie himself was as earnest and apparently sincere advocate of free-trade. I find the following words in the "Union," and only regret that he does not still adhere to them:—"The argument in favor of free trade is too plain for argument or for details."—"The United States have heretofore been the great pioneer in propagating free principles, and in promoting free and liberal intercourse among nations. Let us, then, pursue this good work, which, under the influence of our glorious career and bright example, has been so successfully commenced. It is demanded of us by the genius of our Government, by the spirit of the age, and by every consideration that can address itself to our patriotism."

"Pay as you go" is a cardinal Democratic doctrine; and the Democracy that conflicts with it comes in questionable shape."—"The sound sentiments I respond a cheerful and hearty amen. Some of these were uttered within a few months by this same man, who now assails me. Truly, Mr. Ritchie has acquired great facility in jumping from one "platform" to another. Doubtless, the habit of turning political somersets has grown upon him, until he is scarcely conscious of the antics he plays.

To-day I am denounced for my strict adherence to the doctrines of the free-trade party. A few days ago, a most grave and imposing charge was preferred against me by the "Union," of having deserted and abandoned them. I never abandoned them; I have held them from my youth; I adhere to them still. I was charged in the "Union," of the 25th of December last, and in the "Pennsylvania" of the same date, with having deserted the tariff of 1846, and with laboring to defeat it in the last stages of its passage. This is not true; and I will bring Father Ritchie himself upon the stand to prove it false. I never gave a vote, the intention or the effect of which was to defeat the bill. My votes will be found consistent with each other, and with the sentiments declared in my speech on that subject.

Does Mr. Ritchie understand this language?—Does he not know, that in resisting direct taxation, he is aiding the Whigs, and helping to re-establish the high protective policy? The gentleman from Ohio is correct in his statement, that there are in existence two opposing parties, on the subject of taxation and trade—the free-trade party, and the protection party. I do not, however, admit, that the doctrines of the free-trade party, as at present understood, necessarily end in direct taxation. There is already a powerful party, both in number and talents, who advocate full and perfect freedom of trade, and assessments directly made on property, to meet all Government expenses. In my judgment, this party will increase rather than diminish; and some years hence, may find the Democracy, upon this question, occupying other and higher ground than at present. By free trade, Democrats of the present day, generally understand, a system of duties on imports, adjusted upon the revenue, instead of the protective principles, and brought down to the lowest point consistent with the wants of the treasury in time of peace, under an economical administration of public affairs. Under this definition of free-trade, all unusual and extraordinary demands should be provided for by direct taxation; nay, must be, or the free-trade principle is overthrown. Protectionists insist upon increasing the duties from this "lowest point," up to the maximum duty that the articles will bear; and if this fails to supply the extraordinary drain on the treasury, then that resort should be had to loans. They are, in short, as the gentleman from Ohio has said, opposed to direct taxation, so long as an increase of duties will increase the revenue, or money can be procured on loans. They favor a national debt, because it creates a necessity for a high tariff, and furnishes a most plausible excuse for the creation of a national bank. The free-trade party, on the other hand, advocates a national debt, national bank, and a high protective tariff; and looks to direct-taxation, as the only sure means of safety, in time of war, or other great public emergency. Any other policy, at a time like the present, when heavy expenditures are required in the prosecution of a foreign war, and a large public debt is rapidly accumulating, must inevitably throw us into the hands of the protectionists. This is exactly what the Whig party desires; and hence they oppose my proposition; and Mr. Ritchie stands by to encourage them, and denounce me. They seek to force us back again upon the ground of the protectionists. Mr. Ritchie ought to know this, and does know it; and I charge him with cooperating with the high-tariff party—with an abandonment of the doctrines of free-trade. He is willing that a debt of one or two hundred millions should accumulate, without providing for its early payment, by a direct assessment upon capital; thus forcing us, of necessity, to an increase of duties, and in the end, back into the protective policy. There is no escape from this. If your tariff is reduced to the lowest point demanded by an economical administration in time of peace, (and this I hold to be the Democratic policy,) how are you to meet extraordinary expenditures—how pay a debt necessarily incurred in the prosecution of a war, unless you resort to what I propose—direct

titation? The only alternative is, an increase of duties. This done, and the Democratic policy is destroyed—the labor and the efforts of years of severe party conflict are lost—Whig policy is successful—Whig principles triumphant. I desire to save the great measure of reform, that the Democratic party have just succeeded in establishing. I desired to save the tariff and the independent treasury. They must both fail, and will fall, under the weight of a heavy and permanent national debt. This, the Whig party know, and shape their course accordingly. Well might the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Vinton) say, that "they (the Whigs) were willing to hide their time." It will soon come, if the present state of things continues, and statesmen still stand trembling, afraid to meet the crisis. There is but one mode of escape—only one ground of safety—not Mr. Ritchie's "platform," but the platform on which I stand—direct taxation.

"But we have a few more words to say of Mr. Wilmot's political course. It is time that the public should be enlightened on this subject. We have heretofore refrained from exposing it; but he was now thrust himself before the public, and longer silence on our part would be impolitic. We object in his protest, to the Toga Eagle receiving the post-office advertisement because it had been opposed to the tariff of 1846. Mr. Wilmot, it is true, did speak and vote in favor of this tariff when it passed the House of Representatives. We have always given him credit for this without animating upon his opposition to the measure after it returned from the Senate. That he had adopted one and another amendment to the bill, his friends strained every nerve to have this amendment concurred in by the House. We will recollect, that at that time the fate of the bill was believed to depend upon this occurrence. His pamphlets believed that if it could again be sent back to the Senate, there was sufficient strength to pass it there. At this trying crisis, where was Mr. Wilmot? We say, emphatically with the *crisis of the measure*. This we heard at the time; but we choose to speak from record. Without commenting upon his previous vote, in this final struggle on the last great question, 'Will the House agree to the amendment of the Senate?' we state the fact that Mr. Wilmot's vote is recorded in the negative, along with the names of all the members of the House of July 29, 1846, page 1176. At this critical moment, he abandoned the measure which he had at the first supported."

It is not time that Mr. Ritchie returned to Virginia! It is an editor who will thus falsify and stuff himself to be the mouthpiece of the Republican party! Here, with all the facts before him, I am landed and condemned for the same conduct and the same acts—held up as an example for others to follow, and as a traitor, unworthy of confidence; as having "falsely" acted my part in the councils of the nation, in support of this important measure, and with having "abandoned" it at the critical moment, and in the issue of its fate.

I had earnestly advocated that certain amendments should be ingrafted on the new tariff bill, as well in my speech as in private conversation with several of its most active friends. I had uniformly voted at all times to amend the bill; and any and every proposition which left it open to the possibility of amendments I voted for, and against every motion the effect of which, if successful, was its defeat. The vote of non-concurrence was in strict accordance with these principles, which all knew governed my action. Had the House refused to concur, the bill would have gone to a committee of conference, who could have reported it back with amendments. Twice within the same hour did I vote against laying the bill on the table—a motion, in which its fate was truly involved, and which, had it prevailed, would have been its utter defeat. Mr. Ritchie knew and understood the true character of that vote when it was given; nor did he ever dream of constraining it into a desire to defeat the bill, until it suited his purpose to assail and misrepresent me. I will leave Mr. Ritchie to settle this matter with himself. If his testimony is worth any thing, I believe it is quite as strong in my favor as against me.

Again, sir, Mr. Ritchie advises me "to consult wiser councillors." If by this he means to imply that in moving in this measure, I have consulted with the opponents of this Administration, I pronounce the insinuation false. I consulted with no man; I took counsel of my own judgment, and acted as I thought duty to my constituents required. If, on the other hand, I am to understand it as an invitation to take counsel of him, I respectfully decline. I would regard it as unwise. I think he has served at that period of life, when his judgment, if he had any, is unbalanced and unguided. He has reached that period of old age, known as around childhood, more feeble and more helpless than the first. I trust I will be able to show before I sit down; that his deviations from party principle and policy, have been so wanton and so flagrant, that it would be unsafe for any Democrat to rely upon his counsels or follow his advice.

But the most extraordinary and significant part of the article is that which informs me that the "platform is laid down" on which I am to stand! Now, I appeal to every gentleman, can language more grossly insolent be employed towards a member of this House? It is substantially this: The platform is laid down; if you choose to stand upon it, well; but if you dare depart from it, I hold in my hand a lash with which to pursue you. I am commanded to walk between two parallel lines, and if I perchance I step over, the anathemas of this man are flung upon my head—this man who professes to be the organ of the great Republican party of the Union; still who has done more to weaken and divide that party, by his narrow and sectional

views, and by his denunciations of sound and unwavering Democrats, than any one hundred of its bitterest enemies. If its banner trails in the dust, Mr. Ritchie will not for the first time, be responsible for its overthrow, by the assaults and denunciations of men who have stood with fidelity and entire consistency on the platform of the Republican faith. Without arrogating to myself any particular merit, I claim to have stood there, and I defy him and those who use him, to point out any act or vote of mine, as a Representative upon this floor, that conflicts in the least degree with the principles of the party to which I belong. Even if he chooses to penetrate my district and inquire into my political conduct and history, I defy him to bring against me the first act of party unfaithfulness.

This is a most novel, a most extraordinary charge preferred against me. I venture to say that you may search the records of the public prints of every party organ, that has existed since the establishment of the Government, without finding its parallel. The principle here laid down is that the Representative has no right to think or act for himself; that he has no right to consult the feelings or wishes of the constituency he represents; but that his highest duties are discharged, when he follows blindly the path marked out for him by others—when he stands like a block upon the "platform" laid down for him. I have always understood that by the Constitution all revenue measures must originate in this House. Mr. Ritchie, it seems, interprets the Constitution differently. "The platform is laid down;" "the measures finances are marked out;" and it is our duty to pursue them under the pains and penalties of excommunication. Who authorized "Father Ritchie" to send in here his measures of finance? or who gave him the right to demand of us implicit obedience to the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. Ritchie, then, has already stated, that its design was to reach the capital and wealth of the country. I am one of those who believe that a great public debt is a great calamity, one of the most paralyzing and unmitigated curses that can be inflicted upon labor, one of the most effectual means of binding down and keeping down the honest laborers of the land. Such have been its consequences in every government, and, if the same policy be pursued by us, such will be its results here. So believing, I am anxious to provide for the extinguishment of the debt at an early day; and this, too, from the pockets of those who are best able to bear it. We are in the midst of a war—a war that must be prosecuted. In its prosecution a large debt has already been incurred, and, if continued, it must be greatly increased. I hold that it is our duty at this time to provide means for its early extinguishment. We have no right to inflict upon posterity, those burdens which properly belong to ourselves, and which we are abundantly able to bear. What right have we to cast upon our children the curse of an onerous public debt? I hold that provision should be made for its early payment, at least within the lifetime of the generation that creates it. This is my doctrine; and it is for entertaining such principles that I am denounced.

The able gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means of the last Congress, (Mr. McKAY,) when my proposition was introduced, made a speech in favor of resorting to direct taxation if the present war was not speedily brought to a close. He, of course, comes in for a share of the denunciations of the "Union." I differ from that gentleman in this: he would resort to this mode of raising revenue only in the event of a prolonged continuance of the war; I would advocate its adoption, if the war were to cease to-day. I look as well to the payment of the public debt, as to the raising of money to supply the immediate wants of the treasury. If, after the extinguishment of the public debt, there should be a surplus of revenue, beyond the ordinary wants of the Government, I would diminish the duties, and thus relieve the people from a portion of the burdens of taxation. Such I undertake to say, are the doctrines of the free-trade party; and to such results my proposition was directed. Every man knows that the great burdens of government rest upon the laboring, toiling masses; and because they bear the load in silence, because they have no pensioned presses to utter their grievances or to assail their rulers, therefore they would load them down until their very backs were broken. My proposition was to reach the capital of the country—to tax stocks, money at interest, and personal property. I could not go into details as to the particular kinds of personal property on which I would have this tax imposed. This was the appropriate duty of the committee. Could I have gone into details, I should have designated, as some of the objects of taxation, gold and silver plate, pleasure carriages, watches and jewelry of all kinds, and household furniture exceeding in value a given amount.

These, sir, were some of the luxuries and extravagances of the rich, that I particularly had in view. I have already said that I did not intend to exempt the capital of the South; and therefore the peculiar property in which the money of the planter is principally invested would have been embraced. I desired to exempt the humble laborer of the country, from any portion of this tax. I believe that if the whole five millions proposed to be raised by my amendment, was drawn from the large capitalists and moneyed wealthy classes, still the largest proportion of the burdens of government would fall upon the laboring classes.

I have said, I regard Mr. Ritchie as an unsafe counselor; I would not dare to follow his advice even if I were disposed to seek it. In order to show how unsafe and how dangerous it would be to be guided by his counsels, I will read some of his violent attacks upon General Jackson, and also give the opinion which General Jackson entertained of him. I read extracts taken from the Richmond Enquirer, at the time when General Jackson's name was before the country as a candidate of the Republican party:

"We cannot consent to lend a hand to the election of such a man as Andrew Jackson."
"We would deprecate his election as a curse upon our country."
"One who, in any great crisis, would convert the whole country into one great camp, and would reduce all everything under martial law."
"Compare him with Adams and Crawford, and how inferior must he be."
"We can commend General Jackson's modesty in retiring from the Senate, and the bench, where he discovered the superior qualifications of other people. Can we say as much for his modesty when he is now aspiring to the highest office in this nation?"
"He is too full of a statesman, too rash, too violent in his temper, his measures too much inclined to arbitrary government, to obtain the humble support of the editor of this paper."
"What kind of a President, would this great villain make? A gentleman who cannot interpret the plain expression of one law; and yet would be called upon to administer all the laws of the land! Whose ideas are so purely military, that he would transmute a traitor into a spy, or would punish treason, not by the civil courts, but by a court martial?"

These were the opinions entertained by Mr. Ritchie of General Jackson. Do you think, sir, that he would be a safe adviser for a Democrat who has drawn largely from the teachings of that great man in the formation of his political creed—who looks upon his vile messages as a text-book to guide the republican in the path of safety? I shall not call upon him for his advice, but most respectfully decline to follow any he may offer.

But General Jackson placed on record his estimate of Mr. Ritchie's character. I read from the letters of Judge Breckenridge:

"I have often heard him (Jackson) use these emphatic words: 'Ritchie is the greatest scoundrel in America.' And in one of these letters, he uses the following language, which deserves to be engraved in letters of brass:—
"I see that I am attacked in Congress by Coxe, Whitman, and Williams, aided by that infamous press, the Richmond Enquirer. If such a corrupt press as the Richmond Enquirer were to appropriate my conduct, I should think that in some unguarded moment I had committed some great moral impropriety."

We all know with what apprehension, nay, with what fear, General Jackson, in his last moments, contemplated the displacement of his old friends Blair and Rives, and the removal of Thomas Ritchie to the seat of government, as the editor of the organ of the Republican party. He predicted that division in the party and disaster would follow. He remonstrated, he did all that a dying patriot could do, to save us from such a calamity, to preserve the integrity and harmony of the Republican ranks. But the faithful and tried servants of the party, Blair and Rives, who had stood by us in our hour of peril, who had safely carried us through the most trying and eventful struggle in the annals of party warfare, were thrust aside. What were the reasons assigned for this? Did any one ever question their integrity as partisans or as men? Their ability and energy were never doubted; but it was said that they had assailed so roughly, many Democrats, as to make them obnoxious to a considerable portion of the party. True, they did assail with vigor, and justly, too, many professed and pretended Democrats. It was at a time when treason was rife in our ranks, when the Bank of the United States had openly entered the palatial arena, and was buying up, like cattle in the market, the press, and the people's Representatives. And yet Blair and Rives, during the whole twelve years of Jackson's and Van Buren's administrations, never denounced half as many members of the party, as has this querulous and waspish old man. They denounced for good cause; he without reason or just foundation. Take the members of the last Congress; and of the one hundred and forty Democrats of whom it was composed, there cannot be found twenty whose skirts are free from the direct or indirect censures of this old man. Those who sustained appropriations for internal improvements, embracing a large share of the Democratic representation in Congress, have been daily read out of the party, unchurched from its communion, and set over to the Whigs. In the "Union" of December 16, 1847, all such were censured as cooperating with the Whigs to oppose the war, to compel the Administration to withdraw the army, to embarrass the Republican party, and elevate the Whig candidate to the Presidency."

Next came those who in late Congress opposed a tax upon tea and coffee. All will remember the severity with which the stathemars of the "Union" were poured out upon the heads of this class of sinners. At one time, there was no redemption or salvation for those who opposed the principles of free trade; and at last, but in due season, are heard the thunders of this organ against those who support this policy, and honestly seek to carry it out by a resort to direct taxation, to meet the heavy expenditures of a foreign war.

But the editor of the "Union" has other and deeper sins to answer for, than any I yet have charged upon him. He labored to destroy the administration of Mr. Van Buren, in the crisis of its fate. He opposed that greatest and most wholesome of all measures that has engaged the attention and enlisted the support of the Republican party of modern times, the independent treasury; recommended by Mr. Van Buren, whose administration reflects the highest honor on the Democratic party, and will constitute a bright page in the history of the Republic. I read again from the Richmond Enquirer:

"This scheme [the independent treasury] is wicked, because it can only be said to be a waste and expedient to discredit the present State banks, and would essentially and Mr. Ritchie's and his bank in breaking them down."
"Let it once get foothold, and all the restraints of the Constitution will be broken down, with the liberties of the people."
"The institution and establishment of sub-treasuries at all the secondary and commercial points in the United States, would cost the Government several millions of dollars. Strong banks, with vaults, chests, bars, bolts, and locks, would be necessary, with a regular course of watchmen, and an additional set of officers. To blind the public, the scheme might be commended with a very few new officers, but they would soon be increased to any number as they were necessary."

I have said, I regard Mr. Ritchie as an unsafe counselor; I would not dare to follow his advice even if I were disposed to seek it. In order to show how unsafe and how dangerous it would be to be guided by his counsels, I will read some of his violent attacks upon General Jackson, and also give the opinion which General Jackson entertained of him. I read extracts taken from the Richmond Enquirer, at the time when General Jackson's name was before the country as a candidate of the Republican party:

"We cannot consent to lend a hand to the election of such a man as Andrew Jackson."
"We would deprecate his election as a curse upon our country."
"One who, in any great crisis, would convert the whole country into one great camp, and would reduce all everything under martial law."
"Compare him with Adams and Crawford, and how inferior must he be."
"We can commend General Jackson's modesty in retiring from the Senate, and the bench, where he discovered the superior qualifications of other people. Can we say as much for his modesty when he is now aspiring to the highest office in this nation?"
"He is too full of a statesman, too rash, too violent in his temper, his measures too much inclined to arbitrary government, to obtain the humble support of the editor of this paper."
"What kind of a President, would this great villain make? A gentleman who cannot interpret the plain expression of one law; and yet would be called upon to administer all the laws of the land! Whose ideas are so purely military, that he would transmute a traitor into a spy, or would punish treason, not by the civil courts, but by a court martial?"

These were the opinions entertained by Mr. Ritchie of General Jackson. Do you think, sir, that he would be a safe adviser for a Democrat who has drawn largely from the teachings of that great man in the formation of his political creed—

who looks upon his vile messages as a text-book to guide the republican in the path of safety? I shall not call upon him for his advice, but most respectfully decline to follow any he may offer.

But General Jackson placed on record his estimate of Mr. Ritchie's character. I read from the letters of Judge Breckenridge:

"I have often heard him (Jackson) use these emphatic words: 'Ritchie is the greatest scoundrel in America.' And in one of these letters, he uses the following language, which deserves to be engraved in letters of brass:—
"I see that I am attacked in Congress by Coxe, Whitman, and Williams, aided by that infamous press, the Richmond Enquirer. If such a corrupt press as the Richmond Enquirer were to appropriate my conduct, I should think that in some unguarded moment I had committed some great moral impropriety."

We all know with what apprehension, nay, with what fear, General Jackson, in his last moments, contemplated the displacement of his old friends Blair and Rives, and the removal of Thomas Ritchie to the seat of government, as the editor of the organ of the Republican party. He predicted that division in the party and disaster would follow. He remonstrated, he did all that a dying patriot could do, to save us from such a calamity, to preserve the integrity and harmony of the Republican ranks. But the faithful and tried servants of the party, Blair and Rives, who had stood by us in our hour of peril, who had safely carried us through the most trying and eventful struggle in the annals of party warfare, were thrust aside. What were the reasons assigned for this? Did any one ever question their integrity as partisans or as men? Their ability and energy were never doubted; but it was said that they had assailed so roughly, many Democrats, as to make them obnoxious to a considerable portion of the party. True, they did assail with vigor, and justly, too, many professed and pretended Democrats. It was at a time when treason was rife in our ranks, when the Bank of the United States had openly entered the palatial arena, and was buying up, like cattle in the market, the press, and the people's Representatives. And yet Blair and Rives, during the whole twelve years of Jackson's and Van Buren's administrations, never denounced half as many members of the party, as has this querulous and waspish old man. They denounced for good cause; he without reason or just foundation. Take the members of the last Congress; and of the one hundred and forty Democrats of whom it was composed, there cannot be found twenty whose skirts are free from the direct or indirect censures of this old man. Those who sustained appropriations for internal improvements, embracing a large share of the Democratic representation in Congress, have been daily read out of the party, unchurched from its communion, and set over to the Whigs. In the "Union" of December 16, 1847, all such were censured as cooperating with the Whigs to oppose the war, to compel the Administration to withdraw the army, to embarrass the Republican party, and elevate the Whig candidate to the Presidency."

Next came those who in late Congress opposed a tax upon tea and coffee. All will remember the severity with which the stathemars of the "Union" were poured out upon the heads of this class of sinners. At one time, there was no redemption or salvation for those who opposed the principles of free trade; and at last, but in due season, are heard the thunders of this organ against those who support this policy, and honestly seek to carry it out by a resort to direct taxation, to meet the heavy expenditures of a foreign war.

But the editor of the "Union" has other and deeper sins to answer for, than any I yet have charged upon him. He labored to destroy the administration of Mr. Van Buren, in the crisis of its fate. He opposed that greatest and most wholesome of all measures that has engaged the attention and enlisted the support of the Republican party of modern times, the independent treasury; recommended by Mr. Van Buren, whose administration reflects the highest honor on the Democratic party, and will constitute a bright page in the history of the Republic. I read again from the Richmond Enquirer:

"This scheme [the independent treasury] is wicked, because it can only be said to be a waste and expedient to discredit the present State banks, and would essentially and Mr. Ritchie's and his bank in breaking them down."
"Let it once get foothold, and all the restraints of the Constitution will be broken down, with the liberties of the people."
"The institution and establishment of sub-treasuries at all the secondary and commercial points in the United States, would cost the Government several millions of dollars. Strong banks, with vaults, chests, bars, bolts, and locks, would be necessary, with a regular course of watchmen, and an additional set of officers. To blind the public, the scheme might be commended with a very few new officers, but they would soon be increased to any number as they were necessary."

I have said, I regard Mr. Ritchie as an unsafe counselor; I would not dare to follow his advice even if I were disposed to seek it. In order to show how unsafe and how dangerous it would be to be guided by his counsels, I will read some of his violent attacks upon General Jackson, and also give the opinion which General Jackson entertained of him. I read extracts taken from the Richmond Enquirer, at the time when General Jackson's name was before the country as a candidate of the Republican party:

"We cannot consent to lend a hand to the election of such a man as Andrew Jackson."
"We would deprecate his election as a curse upon our country."
"One who, in any great crisis, would convert the whole country into one great camp, and would reduce all everything under martial law."
"Compare him with Adams and Crawford, and how inferior must he be."
"We can commend General Jackson's modesty in retiring from the Senate, and the bench, where he discovered the superior qualifications of other people. Can we say as much for his modesty when he is now aspiring to the highest office in this nation?"
"He is too full of a statesman, too rash, too violent in his temper, his measures too much inclined to arbitrary government, to obtain the humble support of the editor of this paper."
"What kind of a President, would this great villain make? A gentleman who cannot interpret the plain expression of one law; and yet would be called upon to administer all the laws of the land! Whose ideas are so purely military, that he would transmute a traitor into a spy, or would punish treason, not by the civil courts, but by a court martial?"

These were the opinions entertained by Mr. Ritchie of General Jackson. Do you think, sir, that he would be a safe adviser for a Democrat who has drawn largely from the teachings of that great man in the formation of his political creed—

(Continued on Fourth Page.)