

Star and Republican Banner.

D. A. BEHLER, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

"FEARLESS AND FREE."

GETTYSBURG, PA., FRIDAY EVENING, APRIL 17, 1846.

TERMS—TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

[WHOLE NO. 837.]

POETRY.

From the Botanical Medical Recorder—by request.
Reflections in a Meeting House on Tobacco.

The Israelish camps were clean,
Such was their institution;
And why should not a meeting house
Be guarded from pollution?

Religion is a cleanly thing,
And decency befits it;
Spitting the floor a nauseous thing,
And every one admits it.

Yet this vile practice here prevails,
It pains me to relate it;
And rational, reflecting men,
We hope will reprobate it.

The rules of moral decency
Our mothers inculcated,
Are here profaned and trampled on—
Too bad to be related.

We are the weaker sex—then, sure
You'll pardon our complaining,
While true affection urges us
To try for your reclaiming.

Pray lend a kind propitious ear,
And do not be offended,
When we propose a remedy
To have this evil mended.

Let those who will indulge at home—
There use it unthought,
If those around them can submit
To be so much infested.

But when they come to worship God,
Behave as is befitting,
Oh, then refrain for conscience sake—
This is no place for spitting.

But for inveterate cases, when
They cannot be obedient,
And for accommodation's sake,
We have a grand expedient:

Let each procure a calabash;
This from the neck suspended
Would answer well, and cleanliness
Would be thereby befriended!

MISCELLANY.

READING THE BIBLE.—Of the Hon. Jno. Cotton Smith, late Governor of Connecticut, it is stated that "during the last eight or ten years, he has read the bible through *annually*, and had well nigh committed the New Testament to memory at the time of his decease." At his funeral the Rev. Mr. Andrews of Kent said:—"One of the noblest of men of a former and better age has been taken from us. But our joy and boast this day, is not that he was a statesman of enlarged insight; not that he was a scholar of refined taste; not that he was a gentleman in whose deportment dignity and courtesy were so remarkably blended—the observed of all observers"—but that he was a meek and humble disciple of Christ, rejoicing in the consolations, reverencing the ordinances, and laboring for the advancement of the Christian faith."

A BEAUTIFUL THOUGHT, WITH A BEAUTIFUL RESPONSE.—A lady had written on a card, and placed it in her garden-house, on the top of an hour-glass, a beautiful simple stanza from one of the fugitive pieces of John Clare, the rural poet—it was at the season of the year when the flowers were in their highest beauty:

To think of summers yet to come,
That I am not to see,
To think a weed is yet to bloom,
From dust that I shall be!
The next morning she found pencilled on the back of the same card:
To think, when Heaven and earth are fled,
And times and seasons o'er,
When all that can die shall be dead,
That I must die no more!
Ah! where wilt thou my portion be?
How shall I spend Eternity?

THE MEAN MAN.—Scrimping wretch! see him at his gold! How much of it has been wrung from widow's hearts, none can tell. He would remain in a ditch all night to save a groat, and yet, he knows not how to dispose of his income.
"And when from earth he passes,
Satan to see his little soul
Would have to use his glasses."

BE KIND AND CONSIDERATE.—Children should never be unnecessarily thwarted when in pursuit of an object. A child, for example, before he can speak, is trotting after a ball, the nurse snatches him at the moment to be washed, and the poor child throws himself into a violent passion—whereas, had she kindly assisted him in gaining his object, and then taken him up, this trial would have been spared, and his temper never uninjured. Teasing and decision tend very much to embitter a good disposition, even in grown persons.

MORE TRUE THAN POETICAL.—The clergyman in a certain town, as the custom is, having published the bands of matrimony between two persons, was followed by the clerk's reading the hymn beginning with these words, "Mistaken souls, who dream of heaven!"

MILEAGE IN PROSPECT.—The sailing distance from New York to the mouth of the Columbia River, Oregon, is only fifteen thousand miles. The mileage of the "Oregon member" will be an item—about twelve thousand dollars, and the constructive pay for the Senators the same amount.

SINGULAR PHENOMENON.—The water in the Detroit river is now nearly as low as in 1822. In 1824 it began to rise, and continued to do so, down to 1838, when it was at its maximum. In 1839 it began to fall again, and has so continued to the present time.

MR. WEBSTER'S SPEECH, IN SENATE—April 6 & 7:

In reply to Charles J. Ingersoll and Senator Dickinson.

US.—The extreme length of Mr. Webster's great speech in defence of his course while acting as Secretary of State, precludes its entire publication in our columns. His remarks upon the first day, although important to a thorough understanding of the history of the North-eastern Boundary negotiations, were designed as a defence of the Treaty in which those negotiations terminated; and being necessarily attended with numerous citations from the documentary history of the period through which the negotiations extended, they would prove uninteresting to the general reader. We therefore give, to the exclusion of other matter, the concluding portion of his second day's speech, in which he directed his attention more particularly to Messrs. Ingersoll and Dickinson, as found in the Washington Union—preceded by a sketch of his opening remarks by "Oliver Old-school," the correspondent of the U. S. Gazette. The speech of Mr. Webster is admitted, upon all sides, to have been a most extraordinary effort.—The Editor of the "Union" (loco) says it is "severest, the bitterest, most scathing attack ever heard in the Senate." Oliver Oldschool commences his sketch as follows:

I have listened nearly three hours and a half to-day to one of the most extraordinary and powerful speeches, I will venture to say, that was ever heard in the Senate. I allude to Mr. Webster's in continuation of his speech yesterday, in vindication of the Washington treaty of 1842. Such fierce invective, such scathing irony, such stinging sarcasm, and such execrations, as he poured out upon the devoted heads of C. J. Ingersoll and Mr. Dickinson of the Senate, never before upon human being. It was not even in the flowing lava from the burning crater, which burst from the depths of Mr. Hannegan's oratory, but in his own words. He represented his treachery would bury him under a load of infamy. It scarcely seemed possible that the English language could be so combined as to express such withering scorn, such ineffable contempt, such a picture of worthlessness, mendacity, moral obtuseness, and mental deformity, as was this day exhibited to the audience—and I enter upon the attempt to give an outline of Mr. W.'s remarks with the same feeling of despair that one would feel in attempting to convey an idea of one of Haydn's or Mozart's Antheims or Oratorios, performed by themselves on one of the largest organs in the world. Words can be written down by those who write short hand; but the tone of voice, the look, the emphasis, the curl of the lip, the energy of action—these are portions of the scene and of the eloquence, which the pen cannot catch nor words describe.

Mr. Webster commenced his remarks by referring to the declaration made by Lord Palmerston in his despatch to Mr. Fox, mentioned yesterday, namely, that there could be no hope of bringing about an amicable settlement of the N. E. boundary question while Mr. Van Buren was in office. He referred to that at this time merely to prevent any inference being drawn that it was owing to any peculiar rigidity in maintaining our rights by Mr. Van Buren, and that the British Government expected to make better terms with the negotiating administration. It was because the negotiation had become so intricate and so involved, he said, that he proposed arbitration, England had acceded to the proposition, but during the whole of Mr. Van Buren's administration, the whole correspondence turned upon projects and counter projects, exceptions, and exceptions to exceptions in an almost endless number, until the negotiation became as perplexed and intricate as a travelled skein of yarn. He had referred to this merely to *bar an inference*.

He again spoke of the objections that had been made to this treaty—to the concessions which this government had made. When those who made these complaints felt a desire to have the mutual equivalents be taken into the account, and that what we had obtained should not be entirely overlooked. He again referred to Rouse's Point, and dwelt upon its value in a military point of view, and the estimation in which it was now held by our government, not inferior to the Narrows of New York Harbor. He put it to the people of this country, whether the complaints which had been made are being made of that treaty, do not arise from an apprehension that too much credit should be given to those who had a hand in forming it!

Mr. Webster now took up the subject of the Caroline, and the other exciting subject growing out of it, the M'Leod case. He gave a succinct history of the revolution, or attempted revolution in Canada, and the part taken by some of our citizens on the Canadian border. Certain persons had assembled on Navy Island, in the Niagara, who were making war upon Canada, and cannonading it from the Island. The steamboat was alleged to be in the service of these persons, and that account was taken and destroyed. Mr. Fox, when called upon by Mr. Forsyth, avowed the act to have been done under the authority of the British Colonial Government. A correspondence took place on the subject between Mr. Stevenson and Lord Palmerston, and there the matter slept until waked up by the arrest of M'Leod. On that occasion Mr. Fox demanded his release, again declaring that the act was done under the authority of the British Government which was responsible for it. M'Leod being a private soldier, and obeying officers by whom he was commanded. Mr. W. referred to the correspondence between Mr. Fox and Mr. Forsyth, and Mr. Stevenson and Lord Palmerston, on the subject. The latter wrote to Mr. Stevenson in August '41, that no explanation would be given in regard to that act and no reparation made. Now, he had to remark, that during all the time that intervened from the destruction of the Caroline, down to the close of Mr. Van Buren's administration, had any reparation been demanded of our territory, and would honor? Had any thing been done? Nothing. Even as a private outrage, no steps had been taken to procure redress.

Mr. W. went on to comment somewhat at length upon this case, the injury done us in that act by the violation of our territory, the arrest of M'Leod, &c. Such was the state of things when Gen. Harrison came into office; there was great excitement here and in England. How did Gen. Harrison act? As a high-minded man, at the head of the Government should act. He said that the destruction of the Caroline was an invasion of our territory, and an outrage of our soil. At the same time, the proceedings in the M'Leod case were all wrong. He said there was an apparent want of courtesy in Mr. Fox's letter demanding his release, but it is proper to consider Mr. Fox as asking nothing but that M'Leod should be released, discharged by the due course of law. Mr. Fox was informed that this case was in the U. S. Court, the President would order a *nolle prosequi* to be entered; but it being in the Court of the State of New York, the President had no power over it. He would ask the Senator from New York (Mr. Dickinson) as he had notified him he should, for his authority for saying that the Government of the U. S. States were guilty of a direct and palpable interference with the Courts of N. Y. They did no such thing. They thought it beneath the dignity of an act for which England declared herself responsible; but they were guilty of no interference with the Courts of N. Y. It was the more manifestly course to look to the Government of England, would you leave the lion and fall upon the lamb? For three years the Government of the U. S. had lain idle, but when an individual comes over the line, you go and seize him, and attempt to punish him for the act of the Government! Mr. Webster put it to the Senators and the people to say whether, if the case were our own, if one of our soldiers were seized for an act done by the authority of the Government with the American Eagle waving over his head, and attempted to be tried for his life, if they would not be indignant, if they would not declare war in six hours. Is there an American base enough and mean enough, Mr. W. exclaimed with great emphasis, not to feel an irrepressible indignation at such an act? Is there a man worthy the name of an American who would not call upon the Government to protect such a man, and not give it all his aid? Don't gentlemen remember that such was the excitement on the frontier, that Gen. Scott was sent there to preserve the peace of the country?

The offense which England had committed, or which had been committed under her authority, was the invasion of our territory. Had she destroyed the Caroline in Canada no one could have complained. The persons who had her were committing outrages against the laws of the country, and some suffered for it; he wished they had all suffered.

Mr. Allen here rose and asked Mr. Webster what evidence he had that these men had committed outrages against the laws?
Mr. W. replied abundantly: It was to be found every where. It was a matter perfectly notorious in Buffalo, and in that quarter, and the fact had been proved in the trial of Van Rensselaer and others; it was a part of the *res gesta*. The boat pretended to be running between Buffalo and Schlosser, but what occasion was there for a boat to be running between these places in the dead of winter, when the river was full of ice, and when there was a railroad between the two places? He would suggest that, to the chairman of the committee on foreign relations. [a laugh]

A man came to Washington to seek compensation for the loss of the Caroline, but was told that he had better shut his mouth, or he might get into difficulty, and he was prudent enough to forever after hold his peace.
Mr. W. then spoke of Gen. Harrison's Cabinet as being men of high character, and not likely to submit to wrong or do wrong. He did not of course name himself, but spoke of Mr. Ewing, Mr. Bell, Mr. Badger, Mr. Crittenden, and Mr. Granger—all men of ability and honor. He also spoke of and paid a passing tribute to Gen. Harrison.

He then referred to the decision of the Supreme Court in the M'Leod case, expressed his respect for that court generally, but declared upon his professional reputation that that opinion was not a respectable one, neither in the result to which it came or in the reasoning by which they arrived at the result. The judiciary of the general government, he said, must be co-extensive with the legislative and Executive power. What the laws made by Congress extend, to that extent must go the judicial power, so that questions arising out of them, and questions arising out of the Constitution, may be decided by the judiciary of the general government.

He then alluded to Mr. Allen's speech, said that being engaged in the Supreme Court at the time, he only heard parts of it, and had since been unable to find a report of it so as to ascertain what precisely he had said in regard to the treaty of Washington.

Mr. Allen rose and said that if the Senator desired it, he would state what he said.
Mr. Webster thought on the whole that he would wait till the Senator published the speech, so that he could see what he said and would then reply to it.

Mr. Webster here turned his attention to Mr. Ingersoll and Senator Dickinson. The annexed report is taken from the Washington Union.]
An honorable member from New York nearest the chair [Mr. Dickinson] made a speech on this subject. I propose to take some notice of that speech. But first I may remark that the honorable gentleman did not seem to be satisfied with his own light; he borrowed somewhat extensively. He borrowed and incorporated into his speech, by way of a note, what he entitled, "Extracts from the speech of Mr. C. J. Ingersoll, in the House of Representatives." Speaking of the M'Leod affair, Mr. Ingersoll said: "Well, then, my first business is, to examine a little this jewel which the honorable Senator chooses to work in to his own diadem; and I shall do it unmoved in temper, I hope, and at the same time, I do not mean to omit what I may consider a proper notice of the whole of it in all its parts. And here, sir, is that extraordinary ebullition called by the honorable senator 'the speech of Mr. C. J. Ingersoll in the House of Representatives.'" Mr. President, I almost wish I could find myself out of order in referring to it, as I imagine I should be if it had not been that the honorable Senator has made it his own and a part of his speech. I should be very glad to be compelled not to take any notice of it—to be told that I was not at liberty to know that such a speech was ever made, and, thank God, to know that such an ebullition had never been made out of a bar-room any where—and that's a theatre quite too high for it. Now, sir, a portion of this "speech" seems to be directed against the individual now addressing the Senate. I will read its parts and parcels, and take such notice of them as they deserve as I go along. Hear what the senator says: "Mr. Dickinson had understood there was a correspondence between the authorities at Washington and the Governor of New York to that effect; but he particularly alluded to a letter addressed by Mr. Webster, Secretary of State, to Mr. Crittenden, Attorney General, at that time, directing him to proceed to New York, and take charge of the trial of M'Leod. He had it not then before him, and did not recollect its precise language, but would endeavor to speak of the history of the past truly, and in perfect kindness, but he wished to show what he had gained by negotiations with Great Britain, and who had made the concessions."

Now, sir, either by giving interest to this narrative—or something else—the gentleman from New York makes this a little more distinct. He says not only that Mr. Webster wrote this letter to the Government of New York, with his own hand, but that he sent it by express. I believe the "express" matter was expressly by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Dickinson. Will you allow me?
Mr. Webster. Oh! yes, I will allow you.
Mr. Dickinson. The gentleman from New York is not at all responsible for the statement in the note. Nor does the gentleman from New York make the extracts from Mr. Ingersoll's speech any part of his; on the contrary, I stated expressly, at the time that I alluded to it as a very extraordinary statement. Having met with the emphatic contradiction of the honorable senator from Massachusetts or what implied contradiction, I proposed to read in justification the remarks of Mr. Ingersoll. The friends of the Senator in his immediate vicinity objected to have it read. I did not read the extract, nor was it in the report of my speech, which in the usual way, found its way to the newspapers. But as I had repeated calls for what I had alluded to as spoken by Mr. Ingersoll, I did append in the pamphlet edition of my speech those remarks. I gave them as they were found in the newspaper, and therefore the senator from New York neither added to, nor diminished, these remarks. I wish to set the senator right as to this single matter of fact.

Mr. Webster. I have only to state the fact, that the additional falsehood in the speech of Mr. Ingersoll, as published by the member from New York, is not to be found in the published report.

Mr. Dickinson. In what paper?
Mr. Webster. In the National Intelligencer, as corrected by Mr. Ingersoll himself; and so it would appear, that if not inserted by the member from New York, there is one falsehood in the case which the original author was not so graceless as to retain. But I go on with this speech:

"Out of this controversy arose the arrest of Alexander M'Leod. What he intended to state now, consisted of facts not generally known, but which would soon be made known, for they were in progress of publication, and he had received them in no confidence, from the best authority—When M'Leod was arrested, Gen. Harrison had just died, and Mr. Tyler was not yet at home as his successor. Mr. Webster—who was *de facto* the administration of New York, with his own hand, a letter, and sent it by express, marked 'private,' in which the governor was told, that he must release M'Leod, or see the magnificent commercial emporium laid in ashes. The brilliant description given by the gentleman from Virginia of the prospective destruction of that city, in the case of a war, was, in a measure, anticipated on this occasion. M'Leod must be released, said the Secretary of the State, or New York must be laid in ashes. The governor asked when this would be done? The reply was forthwith. Do you not see coming on the waves of the sea the Paixhan guns? and if M'Leod be not released, New York will be destroyed. But, said the governor, the power of pardon is invested in me, and even if he be convicted, he may be pardoned. Oh, no, said the Secretary, if you even try him, you will bring destruction on yourselves."

Well, now, I say that a series of more distinct, unalloyed falsehoods—absolute unqualified, entire—never appeared in any publication in Christendom. Every allegation here made—every one would entirely justify the use of that expressive monosyllable which some people are base enough, and low enough, to deserve to have thrown in their teeth, but which a gentleman does not often like to utter—Every one of them, from beginning to end, is false. There is not a particle of truth in them—there is not the slightest foundation for any one of these assertions. "Mr. Webster wrote a private letter, &c." False, sir—all false. I have never said or written such a thing in my life to the governor of the State of New York. "M'Leod must be released." It is false. I never said any such thing. "N. York must be laid in ashes." The governor asked when this was to be done? "What does this mean? Why it implies that the governor of New York wrote to me another letter in answer to mine, inquiring when New York was to be laid in ashes," and the reply was, "forthwith." And here we have this—Mr. Ingersoll himself preparing this speech for the press, italicizing the words forthwith, as if I had written another letter to the Governor of New York, "telling him" that New York was to be laid in ashes "forthwith." What follows? Steam force! I never mentioned steam force nor any other force. "But said the governor, the power of pardon is invested in me, and if he be convicted he may be pardoned." Here is another letter—a third letter from me! "Oh! no, said the

secretary"—why, here I am writing a fourth letter!—"if you even try him you will bring destruction upon yourselves."—This is stated by a man or a thing that has a seat in one of the houses of Congress.—I promised to keep my temper, and I will. The whole concern is infinitely contemptible, and cannot disturb the temper of a reasonable man. But I will expose it. Such, then, is the contents of the letters which this person describes as "facts not generally known, but which would soon be made known, for they were in progress of publication, and he had received them in confidence from the best authority." Well I do not know where he got his "authority," unless, as suggested by my friend near me, it was from some chapters of his own recent work! But let me state what did occur, and so prepare the minds of the Senate for some degree of astonishment, that any man in the world could tell such a story as that. When M'Leod was arrested, there was a good deal of conversation in Washington and elsewhere about what would happen. It was a subject of very considerable conversation, and certainly of embarrassment to the government. It was hoped and expected by me, and I believe by other gentlemen, that the Governor of New York would see that it was a case in which, if he were invested with authority, by the constitution and the authority of the State, he would recommend the entering of a *nolle prosequi* by the prosecuting officer of the State of New York.—It was expected, that he would do that, and Gen. Harrison one day said to me, that he had received a letter from a friend, in which he was informed that the governor of New York had made up his mind to take that course, and that he was very glad of it, as it relieved the government.—It was about the time that the Attorney General was to proceed to New York to see how the matter was, because the information was not authentic, and the case was to be tried immediately within ten days at Lockport, in the western part of the State of New York. Having heard this, however, General Harrison directed me to write a note of thanks to the Governor of New York, stating that he had done exactly what was proper, and by so doing had relieved the government from some embarrassment, and the country from some danger of collision with a foreign power. And that is every thing said in that letter, or any other letter written by me to the governor of the State of New York. The letter is here if any body wishes to see it.

Mr. Crittenden here suggested that the letter should be read.
Mr. Webster here read the letter. It is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 11, 1841.
MY DEAR SIR: The President has learned, not directly, but by means of a letter from a friend, that you had expressed a disposition to direct a *nolle prosequi* in the case of the indictment against M'Leod, on being informed by this government that the British government has officially avowed the attack on the Caroline, as an act done by its own authority. The President directs me to express his thanks for the promptitude with which you appear disposed to perform an act, which he supposes proper for the occasion, and which is calculated to relieve this government from embarrassments, and from some danger of collision with a foreign power.

You will have seen Mr. Crittenden, whom I take this occasion to commend to your kindest regard.
I have the honor to be, yours truly,
DANIEL WEBSTER.
His Excellency WM. H. SEWARD,
Governor of New York.
Mr. MANGUM. Was that the only letter?
Mr. WEBSTER. Yes, the only letter. Now, how am I to treat such allegations? It is the falsehood, "with circumstance." A general statement might pass unregarded; but here he quotes what he calls the highest authority. He states particulars. He gives all possible plausible marks of credit to the falsehood, in all its parts, from beginning to end. Now, I do not wish to use epithets, nor to call names. But I hold up this picture, which I have painted faintly but truly—I hold it up to every man in the Senate and in the country, and I ask him to look at it, and then write at the bottom of it any thing which he thinks it most resembles. The speech proceeds: "The next step taken by the administration was to appoint a district attorney, who was to be charged with the defence of Alexander M'Leod—the gentleman who was lately removed from office—and a fee of five thousand dollars was put into his hands for this purpose." False, sir—false every way. The government of the United States had no more to do with the employment of Mr. Spencer for the defence of M'Leod than had the government of France. Here—[taking up the corrected report of Mr. Ingersoll in the Intelligencer]—here he says that, "enlightened by the gentleman from New York, he found he was mistaken on this point." "Mistaken!" No more mistaken or false, than he was in any of his other allegations. "Mistaken!" No man who makes such statements is entitled to shelter himself under any notion of this kind. His declaration in this particular is no more false than is the declaration that the government of the United States appointed an attorney, or charged their attorney with the defence of M'Leod. They never interfered in the slightest degree. It is true, they furnished to Mr. Spencer, as

counsel, the official correspondence, to prove that the government of Great Britain avowed the act of the destruction of the Caroline as their own. "Application was afterwards made to the Chief Justice of the State of N. Y., for the release of M'Leod. The judge did not think proper to grant the application. The marshal was about to let him go, when he was told that he must do it at his peril; and that if M'Leod went out of prison, he should go in." I do not know what the marshal had to do with the case. M'Leod was in prison under the authority of the State of New York. I do not know how it was possible that the marshal—an officer of the United States—could interfere. But there are some other matters in the speech to which I must refer. "He would call on the honorable member from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) to sustain him." I do not find that the honorable member from Massachusetts has yet sustained him in these statements, and I rather think he never will. He asserts that I wrote to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House on the subject. It is a falsehood; I never did. "These are facts," he says, "which no one will dispute." I dispute them. I say I have no recollection of them at all. I do not believe Mr. Adams has any recollection of any such note being written by me. If I had written such a note I think I should have remembered it. Well, now, this person next proceeds to a topic now connected with what he had been discussing. [Here Mr. W. read an extract from the speech of Mr. Ingersoll, charging him (Mr. W.) with offering to give Oregon for free-trade with England, in a speech made at a public dinner in Baltimore, May 1843.] Here by me, sits a Senator from Maryland, (Mr. Johnson,) who was present at that dinner, and heard that speech, and if I wanted a witness beyond my own statement and printed speech, I could readily call upon him. In that speech, I did not mention Oregon or allude to Oregon in the slightest degree. It is an utter falsehood. There can be no mistake about it. The author of this speech (Mr. Ingersoll) was not there. If he knew any thing about it, he must have affected to acquire it from the printed speech; but in that there was not the slightest reference to Oregon—there is another statement just as false. Why, sir, hydrostatic pressure has no means of condensing falsehood—any thing into such a narrow compass as the author of this speech condenses falsehood. What does he say here? Why, that my speech at Baltimore contained a strong recommendation of a commercial treaty with England. Why, a commercial treaty with England to regulate the subjects upon which I was talking at Baltimore—the duties between the two countries—was just the thing that I did not recommend, and which I there declared the treaty-making power had no right to make—no authority to make. He would represent me as holding out the idea that the power of laying duties for revenue was a power that could be freely exercised by the President and the Senate as the treaty making power! Why, I hope that I know more of the Constitution than that. The ground I took was just the reverse of that—exactly the reverse. Sir, my correspondence, public & private, with England, then led me to anticipate before long, some change in the policy of England with respect to certain articles, the produce of this country—some change with respect to the policy of the corn laws. And I suggested in that speech how very important it would be, if things would so turn out as that that product of ours—the Indian corn—of which we raised five times as much as of wheat—especially of the State of Tennessee, which raised annually I did not know how many millions—I suggested, I say, the great good fortune that would happen, if an arrangement could be made by which that great article of human food could be freely imported into England. And I said, that in the spirit that prevailed, and which I knew prevailed—I knew that the topic had been discussed in the board of trade in England—if an arrangement could be made in some proper manner to produce such a result, it would be a piece of great good fortune. But, then, did I not immediately proceed to say that that could not be done by treaty? I used the word "arrangement"—studiously used it—to avoid the conclusion that it could be done by treaty. I will read what I had said:

"But with regard to the direct intercourse between us and England, great interest is excited, many wishes expressed, and strong opinions entertained in favor of an attempt to settle duties on certain articles by treaty or arrangement. I say, gentlemen, by 'arrangement,' and I use that term by design. The constitution of the United States leaves with Congress the great business of laying duties to support the Government. It has made it the duty of the house of Representatives, the popular branch of the government, to take the lead on such subjects. There have been some few cases in which treaties have been entered into, having the effect to limit the duties; but it is not necessary—and that is an important part of the whole subject—it is not necessary to go on the idea, that if we come to an arrangement with foreign governments, that we should only by means of a treaty, that the President and I, through the Senate, as coming to the form of the Constitution, they would have furnished to any other