

REMARKS

OF

MESSRS. TALLMADGE, WRIGHT AND TAPPAN,

ON CERTAIN

RESOLUTIONS OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK,

ADVERSE TO THE

INDEPENDENT TREASURY BILL.

SENATE U. S. FEBRUARY 25, 1840

WASHINGTON:

PRINTED AT THE GLOBE OFFICE.

1840.

REMARKS.

IN SENATE,

TUESDAY, February 25, 1840.

Mr. TALLMADGE presented certain resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New York, adverse to the Independent Treasury bill, &c.

Mr. T. went at much length into an examination of the policy of the Administration, and the course of the Executive in relation to the Sub-Treasury bill. When it was first broached in the President's message, in 1837, it was the whole subject of the message, and in the success of this single measure was involved the success of all the measures of his Administration. He brought forward no other proposition, and it was soon made known that those who could not support this Sub-Treasury bill could not support his re-election. He (Mr. T.) was in a peculiar and trying situation. It was the first question of moment with which he had differed with the President and the supporters of his Administration. The issue was made, and the people of New York decided against the policy of the Administration. This was not deemed conclusive, and they had again, in 1838, and yet again, in 1839, pronounced their condemnation of it. They had thus passed three several times on the policy of the Executive, and, after all these decisions, his colleague, [Mr. WRIGHT,] who was the sole representative of that State on the floor of the Senate when the Independent Treasury bill was before them, had voted for its passage. Had he (Mr. T.) been similarly situated, he would have felt it his duty to have regarded the expressions of public sentiment, and have acted differently. That his colleague was the only representative of his State for so long a period, was not his (Mr. T.) fault. The political friends of his colleague had prevented an election at the last session of the Legislature. At the present it was known that a majority in both branches were opposed to the Sub-Treasury bill, and of course it was known that they would send a Senator here who would represent their sentiments and those of the people of State on this subject. He regretted that under these circumstances the bill should have been hurried through this body before the State of New York had an opportunity of being heard. He saw by the newspapers how it had been hurried through on the last evening, and when the Senator

from Maryland, at a late hour in the afternoon, requested the Senate to adjourn, the usual courtesy on such occasions was denied him. He thought that such a refusal, under such circumstances, was unprecedented, in the annals of the Senate.

Mr. BENTON said the Senator was mistaken; there had been similar refusals, and under much less excusable circumstances. During the Bank panic, when the Opposition had the majority in that chamber, they attempted to break him down by physical exhaustion; and to prevent it he was compelled to resort to the use of expedients, and this was done in a sultry day in June.

Mr. TALLMADGE. This occurred before his time, and was probably during the exciting debates on the removal of the deposits; but he repeated, that under the circumstances, he regretted that the bill was passed so precipitately. His colleague was chairman of the committee who had the bill in charge, and had he requested some delay on the bill, it would have been granted, and he would not have been thought chargeable with a seeming want of courtesy. His colleague was aware of his election, and should he not have waited for his arrival here, so that his Legislature and State should have had an opportunity of being heard on the bill? Though these resolutions might not have been passed at that period, it was perfectly well known they would pass, and this, it might have been expected, would have had some influence on his colleague's course, and if he had not waited for his (Mr. T.'s) arrival, he might at least have waited for the expression of the sentiment of the Legislature of his State, especially as his colleague professes to be of that school of politicians who recognise the right of instruction. These resolutions explain the objections to the Sub-Treasury: they oppose it because its effect will be to produce two currencies in the country—one appreciated, and the other depreciated. The better currency of gold and silver coin will be for the officers of the Government, and the baser, of depreciated bank paper, will be for the people. Add to this the doctrines recently put forth by those in the confidence of the Executive—that it is the policy of this Administration to bring down the wages of labor in this country to a level with that received by the paupers of Eu-

rope—and it will be seen there is just cause of alarm to the friends of our free institutions.

Mr. WRIGHT said he should not have felt called upon to participate in this debate at all, had not the remarks of his colleague, in relation to the passage of the Independent Treasury bill in this body, been made personal in their application to himself; but as they had been so made, it was necessary that he should make a more minute statement of the facts, and of his own course, in relation to the action of the Senate upon that measure, than he had done upon a former occasion, when called out from the same quarter.

Preliminarily, however, he was bound to confess, though he did not pretend to be very well schooled in questions of courtesy, it did appear to his mind as somewhat singular that he should be arraigned for want of courtesy as a Senator, by one who was not, at the time the transaction complained of occurred, either present, or a member of the body. The Senate, as then constituted, was the tribunal to which he was properly, as he was willingly, responsible for the propriety or impropriety of his conduct upon that and all other occasions, when he acted here. Those who were then Senators, and were present, saw and heard, and could judge. Upon their judgments he was willing to rest the matter. To them, and to them only, was he amenable for his course; and he would now tell his colleague, as he had told him upon a former occasion, that he would not discuss, on this floor, with him or any other man, the propriety of his acts within these walls, touching any matter transacted here when the complainant was not a member of the Senate. This, he hoped, would end this matter between him and his colleague here. If the gentleman chose to discuss this, or any other topic, touching his course and conduct, elsewhere, he was at liberty to do so. The choice of the time, place, and manner, were open to him. Elsewhere, he might have rights in the matter, and he presumed he would know how to exercise them wisely, but here, he could have none.

As, however, his course upon the occasions alluded to had been characterized as "precipitate and wanting in courtesy," it was due to himself, and to those who constituted the Senate at that time, that he should detail somewhat minutely the facts in relation to the action of the body upon the Independent Treasury bill, during the present session, that his constituents and the country might know with how much propriety this charge had been preferred. For this purpose he would ask the indulgence of the Senate for a few moments.

The Senate met and was organized on the 21 day of December last. Through the kindness of the honorable Senator who then occupied the President's chair, and the indulgence of the Senate, he had been honored with the same place upon the standing committees of the body which he had occupied for several previous sessions, bestowed upon him, as the then presiding officer could testify, without solicitation from himself. This necessarily placed before the committee of which he was a member the reference of that part of the annual message of the President which related to the finances of the country, and consequently which related to the Independent Treasury bill. Thus

situated, if it had been his object to escape the influence of the powerful talents of his colleague in opposition to the measure, the charge should have been that he was dilatory, and not "precipitate," for it was not until the 6th day of January, more than a month after the meeting of the Senate, that the bill was reported from the committee. On the following day, the 7th of January, the Legislature of his State was to assemble, and he could not fail to know that among their first acts would be the election of a Senator.

By the direction of the committee, it became his duty to report the bill; and by the same direction he gave notice that its consideration would be moved on that day week. The day arrived, the 13th of January, and passed, and on the 14th the bill was called up. Some discussion was had in reference to a postponement for two weeks to give time for absent Senators to arrive, and for vacancies to be filled, and reference was made to the vacancy existing from his own State. He informed the Senate that his action, thus far, had been under the order of the committee; that having discharged their order, he now cheerfully submitted the whole matter to the disposition of the Senate; that it would give him pleasure to have a colleague here before the bill should be finally acted upon, and that he should now be in the daily expectation of the news of an election and of the arrival of the person appointed to take his seat in the body; that he did not consider it proper for him to urge any course upon the Senate; nor should he, any farther than to give his individual vote upon the question of postponement. This course on his part called forth, at the time, expressions of approbation from a distinguished Senator of the Opposition, [Mr. CLAY of Kentucky,] not now in his seat. The bill was under the consideration of the Senate daily, from the 14th to the 17th of January, when the question upon its engrossment was taken. This was Friday of the week, and after the question was declared, he, in violation of the wishes and feelings of a large portion of his friends, moved that when the Senate adjourn, it adjourn to meet on Monday, instead of Saturday, thus deferring the question upon the final passage of the bill to the following week. The motion prevailed. He entertained not a single doubt then that he should have a colleague present by the Monday to which the Senate stood adjourned.

The Monday came, but not his colleague. The bill was again taken up, and the discussion upon its final passage was continued from day to day, until Thursday, the 23d of January, when the question was taken, and the bill passed. On that day an effort was made to adjourn the Senate to give further time for the Senator from Maryland [Mr. MARRICK] to discuss the bill; and when the question was taken upon the motion to adjourn, he purposely left his seat, and did not vote.

Now, as to his conduct towards his colleague, who had chosen to make himself the author of these charges of "precipitancy" and "want of courtesy." On the evening of Saturday, the 25th of January, two days after the bill in question had finally passed the Senate, the mail from the North brought him a letter, dated at the Astor House, in the city of New York, on the 23d, the day on which

The final question upon the bill was taken here, moved by his colleague, giving the information that he was detained in New York by ill health, that being the first information of that character which had reached Mr. W.) and requesting that the final question upon this bill might be postponed to await his arrival, which would be on the Monday after. But a few moments had elapsed, after the letter reached his hands, when he was informed that the same train of cars which brought the letter, brought also his colleague to the city.

Upon this state of facts, well known to the Senator by a former explanation here, he rises in his place and again makes the charge of "precipitancy and want of courtesy." To such a charge, under such circumstances, and coming from such a quarter, he had no reply to make.

His statement of facts had been made to justify himself to his constituents and the country; it had been made to those who were Senators when the transactions took place, and could judge of the accuracy of his account of the matter. To his colleague he owed neither explanation, nor reply, to this repetition of such a charge.

It would be seen that some time had been allowed, after the meeting of the New York Legislature, and before the final action of the Senate upon the bill in question, for the filling of that vacancy, and the arrival of the elected Senator to take his place in the body.

He would leave to his colleague the duty of informing the Senate and the country at what time his election had taken place; at what time the notice of the fact had reached him; what time was occupied by him in travelling from the place of his residence to the city of New York; what number of days ill health had confined him there; and all the other facts, which would account to their common constituents for his late arrival to take his seat in the Senate. He had not taken the pains to make inquiries into these facts, nor were they such as it became him to enlighten the Senate about. He did not doubt the ability of his colleague to give the information, which seemed to be called for before he should become an accuser of others; but it was at his option to give the information, or to withhold it. To him (Mr. W.) neither course had any importance, nor had he any desire upon the subject. The facts were within the reach of those to whom they owed a common responsibility; and they would make up no judgment upon either side, without giving them their true weight and consideration.

He had no disposition to follow his colleague into the discussion of the Independent Treasury bill upon this occasion. The subject was not new to either, and the views of both were fully known to their common constituents. He has further thought it proper to discuss again most of the subjects upon which we have differed since we became members together of this body. He (Mr. W.) would not follow him in this review. He had been, and continued to be, content with their first discussions, and would rest himself upon them.

His colleague has said, with some apparent feeling and triumph, that he, Mr. W. had, upon those occasions, proposed to refer their differences to their constituents, and not make them the subjects of debate and irritation here. He had done so; and he

certainly had not regretted the reference. It was one which his duty, not less than his feelings, prompted him to make, and it was made to those who would take cognizance of them without their consent.

The Senator said their constituents had decided, thrice decided. Be it so. He had not questioned the assertion, nor was he to do so upon this occasion. He had not claimed to stand with the majority in his State, nor had he manifested any disposition, nor did he entertain any wish, to dispute the standing of his colleague in that particular. He felt no ambition to change places, or positions. He said now, as he had said before, leave our public acts to the determination of those common constituents, and not undertake to settle them here.

His colleague seemed to manifest peculiar anxiety to learn whether he would obey instructions from the Legislature of the State; a doctrine, he said, which originated in the school to which he, Mr. W. belonged. He was free to avow the doctrine of instructions as belonging to his school, but the present remarks of his colleague were the first intimation he had received that he too did not belong to that same school, upon this point at least. He was sorry to be compelled to infer that here again a difference was to grow up between them, as it seemed to threaten an entire separation in principle as well as practice.

He was aware that this answer had not exactly reached the object of his colleague, and that he desired him to speak particularly of the resolutions of the Legislature now before the Senate. This it was not his purpose to do at present, and the only relief he could give him now, was to inform him that when legislative instructions should call for it, he should be ready to act promptly and decisively.

Mr. TAPPAN said that the Senate had been repeatedly charged with precipitancy and want of courtesy in relation to the passage of the Independent Treasury bill. He would not have thought these charges worthy of notice if they had only been made by those who were not members of this body when the bill passed; but as the same impression had been attempted to be made by others, he would briefly state the facts as they actually occurred. On the Thursday that the bill passed, after the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HENDERSON] had spoken in opposition to the bill, and delivered an elaborate argument in favor of a United States Bank, I observed, said Mr. T. "that the Senate seemed tired of the debate; that I had intended to speak on that subject, and had made some preparation for that purpose, but was not prepared then to address the Senate; and from the little attention paid to the labored argument of the Senator from Mississippi, I should conclude that the Senate did not desire to hear any more speaking, but would prefer to take the question that evening. I said that it was my own opinion that we had spent time enough on the bill, and that we ought then to proceed to a final vote upon it; but if the Senate thought otherwise, and the debate was to be continued, I would, on to-morrow, take occasion to submit my view; that at present I would give way to any gentleman who desired then to address the Senate." The Senator from Maryland then took the floor, and after making a few remarks,

moved an adjournment, which was not agreed to. He then proceeded to make a very strong speech against the bill, and when he had spoken long enough for a reasonable sized speech, he gave way, and the member from Indiana made a motion to adjourn. This was also negatived, and the Senator from Maryland then proceeded until he had finished his remarks. After him, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAVIS] addressed the Senate with much ingenuity in opposition to the bill, and when he had concluded, no other gentleman seeming desirous to speak on the subject, the bill was passed.

As to the remark of the Senator from Maryland, [Mr. MERRICK,] which was published several days since, and not disavowed by him, that he [Mr. T.] declined to address the Senate *at all* on the subject, he must say, without supposing it other than a mistake in the Senator, it was not true. He made no such declaration. But the Senator from New York seems to think that his State is the whole Union, and that the Senate should lay by, and not presume to transact any important business, until the State of New York was fully represented here. Now, he was as willing as any Senator to admit the claim of that great State to be treated with all proper respect. The Empire State is a great and populous one; but she is not the only State in the Union. There are other States besides New York. In the west you may also see great and populous States, nearly equal to her in population, and on this floor entitled to as much weight and consideration. If both the New York Senators were not here to participate in the transaction of the business of the nation with the Representatives of the 25 other independent States, it not the fault of this body, and he saw no reason why the business of this great Confederacy should be delayed on that account. But the Senator says "he has been in a peculiar and trying situation." Has he indeed been in a "peculiar and trying situation?" and, for that reason, could not get here sooner? What brought him into that situation? What was its peculiarity? What was its trying nature? He has not told us; on that we are left to conjecture. But the Senator's course has not been hidden from public view—it has been open to the world. Did the Senator suspect he could go through a complete transformation, and be insensible to the change? Why, sir, we are so constituted that we cannot choose but feel, and feel deeply, all great revolutions in our circumstances. If a man, with an apparent zeal and honesty, advocates any cause for a series of years, so as to make himself not only conspicuous among the advocates, of that cause, but one of the most honored, distinguished, and trusted of those advocates; if in this way he identifies himself with a great party, with the majority of his countrymen, and then, without any reason, or for reasons common sense scorns as frivolous and unmeaning, he abandons (I will not say his principles, for such men have no principles) his party connections, all those he had professed to love and honor, joins his and their former enemies, and is the loudest and most unprincipled calumniator of his former associates, do you think he can do all this, without feeling that he has placed himself "in a peculiar and trying situation?"

No, sir, no; human nature is much the same all; we are so constituted that we cannot decry from a life of honor and virtue to acts of turpitude and wickedness, without feeling ourselves in "a peculiar and trying situation." Do you think, sir, that Benedict Arnold did not find himself in "a peculiar and trying situation," when he resolved to betray his country, to abandon his high and honorable station, as the gallant soldier of liberty, and sink into utter infamy? Undoubtedly he did; and although he burned and plundered the villages and towns of his countrymen with savage ferocity, to ingratiate himself with his new friends, if you could have heard the voice of his conscience, he would have told you that he found himself in "a peculiar and trying situation."

When, sir, a public man steers his course by the polar star of principle, he may be misunderstood; he may be misrepresented; he may lose his popularity; but he does not lose his honor, his self-possession and dignity. If public favor is withdrawn from him, he retires to private life, and enjoys the calm and peace of a mind at ease, and conscious of rectitude; he is not reaching out his "itching palm," and whining about his "peculiar and trying situation."

And if, indeed, the Senator has chosen to place himself in so very peculiar and trying a situation, it gives him no authority to misrepresent the motives or actions of those with whom he had been associated, although it may entitle him to the pity of all men of honor and integrity.

Mr. MERRICK said that the Senator from Ohio, in the course of his remarks, had said that a particular statement in his (Mr. M's) published speech "was not true." He wished to inquire of the Senator whether, by this remark, he intended to charge him with an intention to misrepresent facts.

Mr. TAPPAN said that he was a plain spoken man, and would say, with Martin Luther, that "he generally called a spade a spade;" but he did not say, or suppose, that the Senator intentionally misrepresented the facts: he only spoke of them as they were.

Mr. MERRICK then gave a brief history of the events previous to the passage of the bill. Having stated that it was half after five o'clock when he moved the adjournment.

Mr. TAPPAN said the Senator was mistaken in the hour; it was about a quarter past three o'clock.

Several Senators said that was about the time. Mr. TALLMADGE appealed to the Senate whether he had not, in all his intercourse with members, treated them with the courtesy which gentlemen owed to each other, and to the station they occupied. He was not in the habit of using harsh words there or elsewhere. He had no complaint to make of his colleague on this score. He would say that, as far as parliamentary and individual courtesy were concerned, no man carried it further than his colleague. It was his uniform manner, and he cheerfully awarded this to him. But, said Mr. T. my colleague has misapprehended me if he understood me as saying that he belonged to a school which avowed the doctrine of instruction, while I belonged to a different school. I said

such thing. But when we see Senators, who are professedly great admirers of the right of intemperance, quibbling for want of a technical word, confidence in the doctrine was a good deal shaken. He did not say his colleague would do this, but there had been instances of it in the States. If I received instructions, I would at once carry out the wishes of my State, or give her an opportunity of filling my place with another who would represent her truly.

He was sorry that the Senator from Ohio had thought it his duty to intermeddle in this family affair; and he would leave it to the Senate whether it was done with parliamentary or individual courtesy. The term traitor had been applied to him by political slang-whangers, but he did not expect to hear it from one who had sufficient respectability of character to obtain a seat on this floor. Traitor to what? To principle? Not a traitor to party. And for a difference in political sentiment, am I to be branded as a traitor? to be compared to Arnold? The Senator talks of what he knows nothing about, and reminds me of a certain British lord's puppy, who did not get his eyes open until he was about to be drowned. But the Senator is the very personification of Loco Focoism. He professes to be one of the Simon Pures of that school. He also professes another principle, which is a very natural one for a Loco Foco. I have seen it stated in the newspapers, that when the news of the Southampton insurrection reached Ohio, the Senator expressed his willingness to furnish powder and ball to the negroes. This feeling was only carrying out the destructive doctrines of Loco Focoism. He represents me as saying that New York is the whole Union, and that all legislation must stop until she is fully represented. I said no such thing, and pronounce it a misrepresentation—unintentional no doubt. It is likely if that Senator had his way, one Senator would be thought sufficient for New York, provided he be always right. He would not follow the example of the Senator from Ohio, and invade her territory: there is one there already who is used to repel invaders, and he will take care of the gentleman. He calls me a traitor. If I am a traitor, then are the people of New York, whose representative I am, a traitor. Let him come within her borders and say this to her sons, and they will treat him with the scorn and contempt he deserves.

Mr. HENDERSON rose to a point of order. He would inquire of the CHAIR whether he considered the course of remarks now indulged in as being within the rules of order.

The CHAIR stated that he had avoided any interference, because he trusted to the Senate to preserve its own dignity and the order of the body. He relied on the sense of honor and decorum of the Senators to treat each other with that respect and courtesy which is alike due to each other as gentlemen and the station they occupied. Since the Senator from Mississippi, however, had raised the point of order, he would say that he considered the remarks of the Senator from New York as transcending the limits of parliamentary courtesy. He regretted to be compelled to say this, but it was a duty imposed upon him by the position he held as

the presiding officer of the body, and when he knew his duty he could discharge it.

Mr. TALLMADGE approved of the sentiments of the Chair, and would endeavor to observe his injunctions. All he had said was to repel the rude attack of the Senator from Ohio. Mr. T. then went into a history of his difference with the President on the Sub-Treasury bill. He said his course in relation to that bill was taken by the advice and sanction of the highest political authority in his State; but since that time, these very men who urged him to the course, had denounced him as a deserter.

Mr. TAPPAN. The Senator from New York charges me with "interfering between him and his colleague;" with "invading his State," with meddling with New York politics. The Senator rose in his place and uttered a long and rambling speech, in which he censured his colleague, and in no very moderate terms charged the majority of this Senate with having passed the Independent Treasury Bill precipitately, and with the dishonest purpose of preventing him from recording his vote against it. Was I to sit here, sir, a silent listener to his foul slanders of the majority of this body, with which I had acted? Are we bound to submit to a manner of contumely and reproach? No, sir, no; the Senator shall exercise no such privilege here without the rebuke he merits. I interfered not between him and his colleague; I invaded not his State; I meddled not with New York politics; but I informed the Senator that there were other States in this Union than New York, and other Senators here whose rights were to be regarded, besides him whom his file leader pronounced fresh from the people.

But the Senator complains that I apply "odious epithets to him." I have applied no epithets: I have supposed what might have been the cause of his finding himself in so "very peculiar and trying a situation" as he confessed he had been in for some time past. I did not say that his conduct and character were paralleled by the conduct and character of Benedict Arnold. It is the Senator's own conscience which adopts this parallel: it is he that makes the hypothetical case his own. The Senator says he is always courteous in debate. What are his ideas of courtesy? He has made several speeches here since he took his seat; and what were they? The most low and vulgar abuse of all his old friends and associates, a tirade of newspaper slang and pot-house vituperation, with frequent and most complacent reference to "his speech"—a speech, when and where delivered, I neither know nor wish to know; but I can tell the Senator this: I never heard of "his speech" before, and, if it is as vulgar and abusive as the speeches he delivers here, he would do well to let it pass into oblivion without awakening a recollection of it, which can do him no honor. "Courteous in debate!" I submit to no such courtesy. In my life, sir, I have never heard any man speak in public who was more abusive, more calumnious, more careless, in his assertions; he must become courteous himself before he claims to be treated with courtesy by others. The Senator calls himself a Democratic Whig, and says I am a Loco Foco. I am indifferent what he calls

me; my enemies cannot change my name; near fifty years I have belonged to a party devoted to the support of sound Democratic principles. We were called Democrats by way of reproach. What was intended as a stigma, we adhered to us an honor; we cherish the name; it designates principles. We do not change our name annually as the serpent changes his skin. I am a Democrat, simply and purely; not, thank God, a Democratic Whig, nor a Whig Democrat.

But the Senator has referred to a state-slender that he has picked up in some newspaper or other. I will not descend to answer a charge made on such authority. I would scarcely notice any charge on the authority of the Senator himself—much less the stories which he picks up out of Whig newspapers. No, sir; when a charge is brought against me, it must have an endorser, and a good and substantial endorser, and then I will answer it.

The Senator has asserted that the policy of the Administration tends to the establishment of "one currency for the Government and another for the people." One currency for the Government and another for the people? Who are the people? Are you, Mr. President, and is he not one of the people? Does the mere fact of his holding a seat in this body raise a man above the level of the people? Sir, he may have a seat on this floor, and yet be in character and standing, among his fellow men, even below the average of the people of his own State. This has been an oft-repeated charge, that the Democratic party have established one currency for the Government and another for the people: that, while we pay ourselves in gold and silver, the great mass of the community are compelled to use a depreciated currency. He would admit that the fact exists of two currencies: one the constitutional currency, the other the cur-

rency of private companies; but whose fault is it? Did the Government or the Democratic party establish the State banks? The banks of all the States except Ohio, south of New York, have refused to redeem their paper, and they are now fighting against resumption, and endeavoring to suppress the constitutional currency with their irredeemable trash. And we find the Senator from New York [Mr. TALLMANGE] and the party of which the Senator has become a member, associating with these banks, and giving them countenance and support in their effort to suppress the circulation of the legal currency of the country. With a disregard of all truth and decency, the Administration are charged with causing this state of things. I thank the Senator for his taunt; it will be remembered and profitably even in this District, where we have restrictions refuse to redeem their notes. (Mr. TAPPAN) hoped, when the subject came up for consideration, as it would show that the Senators would, so far as their legislation concerned, relieve themselves from the odium of being instrumental in establishing "one currency for the Government and another for the people." I would sanction but one currency for the Government and the people, and that a gold and silver one. I have no more to say, sir. I have been told to repeat an unjust and improper attack; to let the Senator know that if he persists in such attacks on me and my party, I must expect to be answered plainly and fully. I go no further; for, from my soul, I pity the man who, to court the favor of new associates, is necessary to abuse and vilify his old friends. On motion by Mr. WRIGHT, the resolutions were ordered to be printed, and laid on the table.