the effect on the public mind, in reference to the bank, which may be produced by the recurrence of such visitations. In the progress of the controversy waged with the bank, a few new matters of detail may perhaps have been alleged against it since the report of the former committee; but many of the matters of general inculpation now brought forward, are those sifted to the bottom by that committee, and none of them possess a novelty and importance, furnishing, in the judgment of the undersigned, an equitable ground for a new investigation. Is there to be no end to visitations; The House has the undoubted right to institute them as often as it pleases—every year and every month; but if they are multiplied unreasonably, the directors of the bank, as it seems to the undersigned, are not, to be blamed, if at length they put themselves upon their rights, decline to become voluntary parties to these investigations, and submit to them only as far as the charter requires.

These considerations led the undersigned to the opinion that the Committee of the Directors of the bank were justified in the course adopted by them on this occasion. If, on a question of law so grave and delicate, the Committee of the Directors should have come to an erroneous conclusion, (which the undersigned, however, do not admit to be the case) it would seem an undue severity to consider and to treat such error in judgment as a contempt of the authority of the House.

6. This reflection leads the undersigned to a few observations on the various calls for copies or portions of the books, statements, documents abstracts, and other papers, which, at different times, were made on the bank by resolutions of the Committee. These resolutions were numerous, and covered a wide range of inquiry of the most miscellaneous character. A portion of them are believed to call for documents, in whole or in part, already communicated to Congress, and published; another portion relating to matters which could not be stated without great labor of compilation, and a resort to sources of knowledge not necessarily nor officially in the possession of the bank. Some of the calls referred to matters with respect to which no desire of concealment could, on any hypothesis, be imputed to the bank; others related to concerns (as the undersigned will presently show) involving the highest confidence of individuals, and not to be divulged, except under legal compulsion, without the grossest breach of faith.

The answer of the Committee of the Directors to these requisitions was in the following terms:

Resolved, That the Board do not feel themselves at liberty to comply with the requirement of the resolutions of the Committee of Investigation of the 29th ult. and 1st instant, and do not think they are bound to do so, inasmuch as, in respect to a part of the papers called for, the effect would be the same as the surrender of their books and papers to a secret and exparte examination, which they have already refused to consent to; and as to the other part, they relate to matters over which the board have no control; & if they could overcome these objections, and had the power over all the papers, still it would be impossible for them to comply within any reasonable time, having ascertained by a careful examination, that the copies and statements called for by the resolutions of the 29th ultimo, alone, would require the uninterrupted labor of two clerks for at least ten months, to make them out, and that the remaining resolutions, so far as they concern matters not beyond the reach of the Board would require great additional time, which they are not able exactly to compute, without causing, what they fear would be an inconvenient delay to the Committee of Investigation; and they take it for granted that it would no more comport with the views of the Committee of Investigation to wait till so distant a period, than it would with the rights of the bank, to have such a burden imposed upon it.

If the application of the Committee of the House be regarded, according to its terms, as a mere request, it was of course competent to the directors respectfully to decline a compliance with it. It can be no contempt of the House, nor even matter of complaint or ground of prejudice, that any request, which is merely such, is respectfully declined by the party to which it is addressed. But the Committee of the Directors appear to have regarded it as a matter of duty, not to return a naked refusal to the requisition of the Committee of Investigation.—The reasons of this refusal are stated, and they appear to the undersigned to be valid. Reference to the resolutions in the appendix will enable the House to judge of this matter. The reasons, as has been seen, are, that to comply with a part of these resolutions would be, in effect, to copy or abstract an essential part of some of the books of the bank, in order to their being made the subjects of a private and *exparte* examination; a measure so much the more objectionable, as it would add the inconvenience of preparing the copy to all the other evils incident to such inspection. Another portion of the calls related to matters of fact, in no way appearing on the books of the bank, and not to be ascertained but from sources of information no more accessible to the directors than to any other individual. These objections were, of themselves, particularly the first, decisive.—In addition to this, it appeared, from a careful examination, instituted for that purpose, that the answers to the first series of calls could not be prepared without the uninterrupted labor of two clerks for at least ten months.

The undersigned are unwilling to take up the time of the House by a particular examination of each of the resolutions, but they feel themselves required to express their opinions of a portion of them. They will refer first to those which call for information touching the transactions of Members of Congress with the Bank of the United States, and the correspondence of Members of Congress with officers of the bank.

One of the resolutions alluded to is in the following terms:

"Resolved, That the President and Directors of the bank be requested to furnish the committee with copies of all correspondence between the President of the bank, or any of its officers, and Members of Congress, or *of unanswered letters* received from any one of them since the first day of July, 1832, touching the renewal of the charter of the bank, the removal or restoration of the public deposites, or touching the business transactions of such members with said bank."

Another of the resolutions alluded to is in the following terms:

"Resolved, That the President and Directors of the bank be requested to furnish this committee with a detailed statement of all loans made since the first of January, 1828, to individuals who then were, who have been since, and who now are, members of Congress, stating the amount of each loan, when the same was made, for what term the security was given, and the time when such security was received; and also the security which the bank now holds, and the amount now owing by any and each of such borrowers, or other persons for the benefit of such borrowers, at the bank, or either of the branches; and stating, also, the particulars of any such loans, which have been protested, or which are now under protest, and the names of the parties to any such debts; also the names, if any, of any such persons, whose notes have been renewed after the same had become due and not protested or renewed, with the names of individuals, parties to said renewals, whose notes were under protest at the time such renewals were made; and also, whether such loan in each case were made by the directors or otherwise, and by what authority."

The undersigned suppose it impossible to mistake the general purport of calls like these. From their minuteness of specification, they may be supposed to aim at particular individuals. Of any such reference the undersigned are without accurate knowledge; and nothing is further from the. design than to impute to their colleagues the pursuit of any unparliamentary or improper object.

They cheerfully concede to them what they claim for themselves, to have acted with a single eye to the public duty, in their apprehension of it. But the undersigned are free to confess, that they regard the undeniable purport of resolutions like those repeated, as highly objectionable. They seem to them to convey a general insinuation out of place, above the region of the partisan press. The charge suggested is that of bribery and corruption, so common as to authorize a general search. This is a crime, unquestionably, which, may, if sufficient grounds exist, be rightfully charged on any director of the bank, or member of Congress; but which the undersigned regard as far too serious to be thus charged without such strong grounds for presumption. It is true that it might seem gratuitous, in the undersigned, to be over forward in repelling such a charge. In the existing division of parties, they and their political friends are not found on that side of the House which it was necessary for the bank to buy or bribe. The honorable and high-minded men who compose the majority in the House, politically attached to the Administration, and opposed to the bank, do not need the aid of the undersigned to show the injustice of a general imputation upon their characters.—But something unquestionably is due to the general reputation of the two Houses of Congress. If individuals are, on clear grounds, suspected of being thus corrupted; if the bank, on reasonable grounds, is suspected of this highest breach of privelege, let the individuals criminated be named; the charge be stated in from; the culprit brought to the bar of the House; and the guilty punished. But let not the whole body of both Houses be involved in one indiscriminate and odious because vague and anonymous delation.

As for the call for the correspondence of all members of Congress with the Bank for the last two years, and particularly for copies of all unanswered letters, the undersigned could not but regard it with painful feelings. Public life, already sufficiently discredited by the fierceness of party warfare, will cease to be a pursuit for those who have not lost all taste for the social charities, if the sanctuary of private intercourse and private correspondence is to be invaded at pleasure, and every letter, answered or unanswered, which may have been written by an indivdual who has the misfortune to be a member of Congress, (for a great misfortune under such circumstances it would be,) is subject to be brought up by the drag-net of a general search. It was declared by Mr. Dunning, in the famous case of Money and others against Leach, that "to ransack private studies in order to search for evidence, and even without a previous charge on oath, is contrary to natural justice, as well as to the liberty of the subject. To search a man's private papers, *ad libitum*, and even without accusation, is an infringement of the natural rights of mankind." (3 Bur. 1762.) It was not the least detestable of the cruel violations of justice and law which brought Sidney to the block, that he perished in consequence of the discovery of a manuscript political treatise, brought to light by a general search among the papers in his cabinet.

The undersigned perceive no more right in a Committee of this House to call for the letters which may have been written by a member of Congress to an officer of the bank, on the subject of a renewal of the charter, than to call for his letters to any other person on any other subject. Undoubtedly it is conceivable that such a letter might become legal evidence, in a process of attachment, for breach of privilege, and in that case might be called for and used. So might any letter, in any criminal cause. It is conceivable that a man's letter to his wife or child might become legal evidence in a capital trial; and in that case, if it were in the possession of a third person, the court would compel its production. But the undersigned are of opinion that a general warrant to compel the production of all the letters which may have been written by a class of individuals, for two years, in order to a search of the same, with a view to the institution of a criminal prosecution against the writers, or receivers, is now for the first time attempte to be made in virtue of the authority of a parliamentary body.

It is one of the infirmities of our nature, that, in the ardent pursuit of ends, which, as individuals or members of a party, we think justifiable, we sometimes go far beyond the line of justice, as we should understand it in our own case.—To those who, in the ardor of a protracted controversy, have become wrought up to a belief that the bank and all its offices are one great engine of corruption, and those who have defended its chartered rights and maintained its usefulness, in and out of Congress, a band of mercenary stipendiaries, it may seem a very just and proper demand that the confidence of their private intercourse should be violated, their business transactions stigmatized with corruption before the world, and their private correspondence spread on the journals of a committee of the House, and, at their discretion, sent to the newspapers. But if, pausing a moment in the career of party, they will make the case their own; suppose themselves at the mercy of those own in the minority, wielding against them the entire authority of the House, sending its committee to unlock their closets, and requiring the production of every letter they may have written on public affairs for years, they will probably form a new conception of the light in which the calls now under consideration are regarded by those against whom they were aimed, if any such there be.

The undersigned would make a reflection somewhat similar, in reference to the call for the amount of fees paid to counsel for legal advice given to the bank, and the accommodations received at the bank by editors and publishers of newspapers and periodical works. It will not be denied that there is an imputation of corruption in calls like these; for it cannot be pretended that, merely as a part of the business transactions of the bank, the sums which would fall under these heads, in any estimate, however extravagant their amount, could be of any interest to Congress. Why, then, are they singled out? There is, of course, in collecting the vast amount of debt constantly falling due to the bank, and carrying on its large concerns, continued need of legal advice and professional service. Is it disreputable to seek this advice and service & having received them to pay for them? Is the profession of the law fairly obnoxious to the stigma, which the resolution implies, on those of its members who transact the business of the bank? Are mere partisan insinuations, fabricated with all the levity and cruelty of an unscrupulous press, sufficient ground for the virtual denunciation and proscription of a whole profession? The undersigned forbear to insist on the protection which the law gives to the intercourse of lawyer and client, and which, they believe, would protect the bank from this search into the relations which exist between it and counsel employed in transacting its business.

Nor do the undersigned think the profession of editors and publishers, of right, more obnoxious to the imputation of corruption, on the ground of business transactions with the bank. The nature of their business requires bank accommodation as much as any other. The undersigned do not perceive that they are more likely than any other class of citizens to be corruptly influenced by the accommodations they receive. If they were, it is doubtful, as matter of fact, whether, with an exclusive eye to the accommodations afforded by all the banks in the country, and to the influences under which they are dispensed, it would be a better calculation at the present day, to defend or to attack the Bank of the United States. One thing is certain, that the editor who defends the Bank of the United States may be considered free from the suspicion of having an eye to political patronage, a source of corruption, when abused, as powerful, to say the least, as the favor of a mere moneyed institution.

7. But the undersigned hasten to express their views on the last step which was taken by the committee towards the discharge of their duty; in many respects, the most important of all.—On the 9th day of May, a copy of a process, somewhat of the character of a subpœna duces tecum, and which may be seen in the appendix, No 47, addressed to B. S. Bonsall, Marshal of the eastern district of Pennsylvania, was served upon Nicholas Biddle, President, Emanuel [Manuel] Eyre, Matthew Newkirk, John Sergeant, Charles Chauncey, John S. Henry, John R. Neff, Ambrose White, Daniel W. Cove, John Goddard, James C. Fisher, Lawrence Lewis, John Holmes, and William Platt, Directors of the Bank of the United States, commanding the said Bonsall to summon them to be and appear before the Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, appointed on the 4th day of April, 1834, in their chamber in the North American Hotel, in the city of Philadelphia, and to bring with them the credit books of said bank, on the 10th day of May instant, at the hour of 12, M., then and there to testify touching the matters enumerated in the said resolution, and to submit said books to said committee for inspection.

The undersigned entertained, and still entertain, great doubts of this process. The inquiry alluded to in the process is, among other things, into "the abuses, corruption and malpractices of the bank, that is, the crimes and misdemeanors of its officers and directors; and the process just recited is intended to be a summons to a majority of the directors and the chief officer of the bank, to appear and testify, as individuals, to the matters of that inquiry; that is, to their own crimes and misdemeanors, with a view, as the resolution of the committee expressed it, of inquiring whether such prosecution (viz. a criminal prosecution) should be instituted."—The undersigned have already argued at length, and attempted to show, that the power reserved in the charter, of sending a committee to inspect the books and examine the proceedings of the bank, and report whether its charter had been violated, conferred no right of compelling the production of the books out of the bank, and the appearance of the directors, to submit to an examination on oath as to their innocence or guilt, of the unspecified crimes and misdemeanors laid to their charge. In like manner the undersigned have expressed their decided conviction that the general power of inquiry possessed by the House can have no rightful extension to a case like this. It follows, by necessary consequence, that no process, having for its object to compel the directors to appear before the committee, and bring with them the books of the bank to be inspected, and to testify touching the matters of such an inquiry, could be legal. The object of the process was unauthorized by law.

Incident to this fatal objection to the process is another not less so. A *subpœna duces tecum* is a process, not issuing to the party criminated or implicated in the trial, or interested in the suit, but to a third person to appear and bring with him any paper in his possession, which may be lawfully used as evidence in the trial or suit, without prejudice to the person summoned, or his title. The process of the committee was intended to be addressed to those whose abuses, corruptions, and malpractices were the subjects of inquiry; & the books they were ordered to bring with them, were to be used in their own crimination.

The form of the process, and its mode of service, are believed by the undersigned to be not less objectionable than its object, and equally fatal to its legal character; but on this topic they omit to dwell.

Notwithstanding the strong objection to its legality, the persons to whom it was addressed, individuals unsurpassed for probity, intelligence and weight of character in the community, treating it with the respect due to the House of Representatives, obeyed its call, and appeared before the committee, at their chamber in the North American Hotel. Their answer to the summons was communicated in writing, and appears among the documents as No. 48,—They state therein, that they do not produce the books of the bank, because they are not in the custody of either of them, but in that of the Board of Directors. By the Board, it will be recollected, the books had been confided to a committee of their number, to be by them submitted to the Committee of Investigation. If it were the purpose of the committee of the House to address their process to the party having the actual possession of the books, it would seem that the Committee of the Directors was the party delegated by the Board, and recognized throughout the transaction as their agent, by the Committee of the House. If, on the other hand, it were intended to address it to the party to whom the books ultimately belonged, it would seem that it should have gone to the corporation.

The written answer of the directors (after stating their ignorance, whether they should be called on to testify) expressed a purpose not to testify to the matters of the inquiry, in consideration of the character of the inquiry, and their own relation to it, as corporators and directors. But as none of the persons summoned were required by the committee to testify, no actual refusal to testify took place, and consequently, no contempt, (supposing an actual refusal would have been such contempt, which the undersigned do not admit) was committed by the directors against the authority of the House.

The undersigned are aware that, supposing the process valid in its object, substance, form, and service, it was matter of indifference, as book or books the directors were required by it to produce. But they cannot but express the opinion, that a demand for the credit books of the bank, showing the accounts of every individual with the institution, was the last which in tender regard to the rights & feelings of third persons, it would have been expedient to make.

So sacred is the confidence of individuals dealing with the bank, that the charter exempts the state of their accounts from the weekly inspection which the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make; and the by-laws which have been in force from the foundation of the institution, forbid a director, without special authority, to inspect the cash accounts of individuals. To require the directors to take from the banking house, convey through the public street, and open for inspection in the chambers of a hotel, the book containing the account of every individual with the bank, would seem to indicate the purpose of putting to the severest test a right the question of right is concerned, what is the power of the House, the obedience of the bank, and the patience of innocent third parties, whose vital interests might be jeopardized in this procedure.

The previous demands of the committee, having assumed the form of requests, could only be objected to in their spirit and tendency. There is nothing which a committee authorized to inquire, may not request, which, as such may not be refused. The law knows nothing of requests; their refusal puts no one in contempt. But the process now under consideration assumes the form of a legal and compulsory instrument, authenticated by the seal of the House, and the signature of the clerk. Obedience to such an instrument (if it is lawfully issued) can be compelled against all obstacles and opponents, and those who maintain its legality, must maintain the power of enforcing it. How shall it be enforced, in case it be disobeyed and resisted? Shall the Sergeant at-Arms be sent to attach the directors? Shall they be brought prisoners to the seat of Government, and at the bar of the House, attached for refusing to produce and bring their books to the North American Hotel, and for avowing a purpose (which was not put to the test) not to submit to an examination on oath, touching their own crimes and misdemeanors? A satisfactory answer, consonant to reason and justice, and grounded on the Constitution and laws of the United States, must be found to this question by all persons who maintain the validity of the process issued by the committee.

That such a process is no *subpœna duces tecum*, is obvious, from the fact that it is addressed to the parties implicated. It is not process in chancery, requiring a party to produce his books and papers; for its avowed object is to inquire whether "a criminal prosecution shall be instituted," an object for which the Chancellor will require no man to produce his papers. Unlike any of the processes known to human jurisdiction of the present day, it is, in their most odious features, identical with the general warrants of the dark ages of English liberty, and the writs of assistance which first kindled the spirit of resistance in the American Colonies. It is a compulsory process to compel the good people of the United States to produce their books and papers, and submit them to general search in proof of crimes, not charged, but suspected; to be enforced by attachment, imprisonment, and infinite distress; —a search of books, a search of papers, a search of accounts, a search of letters, and an examination on oath of the persons implicated, touching the matters whereof they are suspected. In what does such a warrant differ from those which were issued under the First Charles and the second James, for which, among other things, Scroggs was impeached; and which the House of Commons, in 1763, after full argument, solemnly resolved to be illegal? Illegal for a Court of King's Bench in 1684, illegal in the judgment of the House of Commons in 1764, the undersigned are slow to believe that an American House of Representatives, in 1834, will be found to assert, or an American citizen to admit, their legality.

In conclusion, the undersigned would observe, that neither of them gave his voice for the resolution creating the committee, nor deemed the inquiry, in many of its objects, necessary or proper. They hope it is not improper to add the expression of the opinion, that, had the attention of the House been particularly drawn in debate to the terms of the resolution, it would have received some modification; and that it is owing to its passage under the operation of the previous question, and without any examination of its details, that it received, in its present from, the sanction of the House. Being, however, placed on the committee, the undersigned were desirous of discharging their duty as members of it, under the order of the House, to the best of their ability, and according to their understanding of the rights of the corporation visited—the power of the House, and the principles of justice. They were desirous of taking up the various matters of inquiry enumerated in the resolution, viz: the causes of the distress, the alleged violations of the charter, and the imputed corruptions of the bank, one by one; of considering them in the order in which they are arranged by the House; of investigating each according to its nature; of inspecting the books and examining the proceedings of the bank according to the charter, that is, in reference to all objects which by the charter, are properly subjects of such inspection and examination; or in regard to which the directors might voluntarily submit them for inspection; and of inquiring into the other matters referred to them, as far as, on consideration, they should deem the committee competent to do so.

Of all these objects, the undersigned confess that they regarded that which stands formost in the resolution as vastly the most important; an inquiry into the causes of the present distress. It was their firm persuasion that the country demanded this inquiry of Congress. A number of memorials and of subscribers to them, greater by far than have at any former period come before Congress, invoked the aid of the National Legislature to relieve them from a state of unexampled distress. An embarrassment unusually extensive and severe, and not yet essentially alleviated, demanded an inquiry into its cause. It was alleged, on the one hand to be wantonly produced by the bank; and on the other, to be the unavoidable consequence of the financial policy pursued by the Executive. The undersigned wished to make this the first, as it was infinitely the most important object of their investigations; to receive the testimony of enlightened merchants and men of business, in the intelligent community to which they were sent, (who might be willing to appear before them,) as to the extent and causes of the distress; to receive from the bank those statements of its affairs, which they are well persuaded it would most cheerfully have afforded, and which would have illustrated its whole course in the difficult and trying position into which it has been thrown; and from all other persons, on whom the committee would have had a right to call, their testimony as to the manner in which this measure of the Executive has been taken up and carried on. Such an examination, the undersigned believe, would have been useful to Congress, satisfactory to the people, and powerfully efficient in leading to the removal of the heavy burdens now lying on them. This object first accomplished, as it was the first in the precept of the House, the undersigned would have proceeded to consider the violations of the charter; and as the resolution of the House does not confine the inquiry to those violations with which the bank has been charged, they would have deemed themselves authorized to extend their researches to those of which the bank complains, particularly to removal of the deposites for reasons not deemed satisfactory by Congress, as now appears of record on the journal of one of the House of Congress. If, after these inquiries had been gone through, it had still appeared, on considering the other matters comprehended in the resolution, that they required or admitted further investigation, the undersigned would cheerfully have co-operated in the work resorting to every source of information, legally received or compelled from any other quarter. If, in the progress of such an investigation, so conducted, disclosures had been made of matter requiring or authorizing any further procedure on the part of the House, the undersigned would not have been behind the most zealous of their associates, in denouncing it to the House and the country. A different view of their duty was, however, taken by their colleagues, resulting in a series of measures, from which the undersigned unfortunately found themselves obliged to dissent.

How was it natural that such an inquiry should be met by the bank, or rather by those who have been entrusted by the stockholders with its direction? The bank is a legal abstract —To charge the bank with bribery and corruption, is to use words which have no accurate meaning, true or false. The party implicated is the directory and officers; men of character; men known to the community as some of its most useful members and brightest ornaments; men of probity, unimpeached in private life.—Some of them are merchants, whose word, in the most important transactions, would be deemed as good as their bond; and others are professional characters, who adorn the highest tribunals of the country.

But while there was a form, in which the undersigned were prepared to meet every part of the resolution under which the committee was raised—the form most consonant to the wants and wishes of the country, (to which all other matters of party crimination are insignificant, compared with the great question of the causes, the just responsibility and the remedies of the present sore distress)—the form unquestionably in which the resolution was viewed by one considerable class of those who voted for it in the House—the undersigned freely admit, that, in the range and character proposed to be given of the committee, the purpose of the majority of the House was not mistaken. They think that no candid person, contemplating all the circumstances of the case, from the first demonstrations of a policy on the part of the Executive hostile to the bank, down to the recent measures, in support of that policy in the House of Representatives, will deny that its object was the overthrow of the institution, and the impeachment of its directors before the bar of public opinion, if not before that of the judicial tribunals of the land, of gross malpractices, corruptions, and frauds; and that the inquiry to be conducted by the committee, of which the undersigned composed the minority, was proposed to be one of the measures to promote that end. So far from this being denied, the undersigned understand it to be not only admitted, but claimed as a merit, on the part of the friends of the present Administration of the National Government.

These are the party implicated—charged with a most cruel and perfidious design to bring universal distress upon the country, for the sake of paltry, selfish ends; and, to promote these ends, further charged with corrupting the conductors of the press, corrupting the people in the exercise of their elective franchise, and corrupting the members of Congress. Are honest and honorable men, charged with these odious misdemeanors, to submit to the charge without a murmur; to acknowledge the reasonableness of making it; the expediency of investigating it, all vague and unspecified as it is; the reality of a *prima facia* case against them? Does conscious innocence require them to admit that there is ground of suspicion? Does the strong and indignant feeling that their characters are outraged, while their rights are invaded, call upon them voluntarily to take the culprit's place, and endure the ignominy of what they deem an uncalled for and a vexatious inquisition? Or is it not rather the natural dictate of proud and conscious innocence to place themselves upon their rights beneath the ægis of the law? If I go to my neighbor, as honest a man as myself, and say, "you are a swindler and a knave," shall he meekly ask me to enter his house, lay open his ledger and his letter book, and invite me to collect the materials out of which I may prejudice the public against him? The directors of the bank are citizens, as honest and as virtuous as any of those, in office or out of it, high or low, who charge them with corruption. A good name is as dear to them as to their accusers. Their stake in the welfare of the country is great. The success with which they have conducted the affairs of the great institution entrusted to their care is not matter of opinion; it is notorious to all the world. At this moment, notwithstanding the fearful warfare waged against them by almost every branch of the Government of their own country, their credit is as good at London and Paris, as that of the Bank of England or of France. At this moment, in the remotest east, in the markets of China, where the silver coin of the country from the public mint, is undervalued, the paper of the Bank of the United States is an acceptable currency. In the midst of its career of usefulness, it has been, unfortunately for the country, drawn into the field of political controversy; its directors and officers villified by name, their most laudable measures misrepresented, their most innocent acts calumniated, and their slightest errors of judgment tortured into corruptions and crimes; above all, the severe distress, with which the country has been visited, for the sake of carrying on this warfare, has been cruelly imputed to the wanton action of the bank, though struggling for its own existence against the most formidable efforts to crush it. The clam and dignified tone which characterizes the communications of the Committee of Directors under circumstances like these, is, to the undersigned, a satisfactory indication of their integrity and conscious purity. They have placed themselves where, as American citizens, conscious of their rights, of their injuries, and of their innocence, they had a right to place themselves, under the protection of the law.

Firmly believing that they are innocent of the crimes and corruptions with which they have been charged, & that, if guilty, they ought not to be compelled to criminate themselves, the undersigned are clearly of opinion that the directors of the bank have been guilty of no contempt of the authority of this House, in having respectfully declined to submit their books for inspection, except as required by the charter.

All which is respectfully submitted by

EDWARD EVERETT,
WILLIAM W. ELLSWORTH,

House of Representatives, 22d May, 1834.

TWENTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

MONDAY, JUNE 2.

IN SENATE.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

The special order of the day being Mr. Bibb's resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States, so far as relates to the election of President and Vice President, were taken up; and Mr. Bibb, after concluding his speech on the subject commenced some days ago, submitted some verbal amendments which were adopted.

Mr. Benton then moved to refer the resolutions as amended to a select committee, to consist of five members, which motion having been carried the following gentlemen were chosen by ballot:

Messrs. Bibb, Benton, Webster, Calhoun, and Forsyth.

RESTORATION OF THE DEPOSITES.

Mr. Clay moved to postpone the previous orders, and to take up the joint resolutions submitted by him some days since, on the removal of the public deposites from the Bank of the United States, and their future disposition.

Mr. Brown called for the Yeas and Nays on the question, which were accordingly ordered, and it was decided in the affirmative—Yeas 24, Nays, 16.

The resolutions were taken up and passed.

HOUSE OF REPRSENTATIVES.

As soon as the Journal was read—

The Speaker rose and addressed the House as follows:

GENTLEMEN: I have attended in person to day for the purpose of resigning, as I do, the office of Speaker of this House with which I have been honored for the last seven years, and of announcing to you the fact, that I have this day communicated to the Executive of Virginia my resignation as one of the Representatives from that State in the present Congress. The dissolution, perhaps forever, of the intimate associations that have existed so long between us, is calculated to excite sentiments of a painful character. I feel it myself deeply and unaffectedly; and, in quitting a station in itself so honorable, one so repeatedly conferred, and in a manner so flattering; a station endeared to me by so many considerations of a private and a public nature, I hope I may be pardoned in availing myself on this fit occasion of taking my leave of *it* and of *you*, in person; of offering you my cordial and best wishes for your individual prosperity, and happiness, and expressing publicly, and for the last time, my grateful acknowledgments for the kindness and [illegible] which I have been [illegible] distinguished and honored. Few, probably, that have ever filled this Chair, have enjoyed more of this kindness and favor than myself; none have received, or will cherish it with feelings of warmer and more devoted gratitude. My obligation gentlemen, are, indeed, deep to this House, and go where I may or in whatever situations, I may be placed, I shall continue to the last hour of my life, to preserve and cherish those sentiments of profound respect and affectionate gratitude which your long continued and unchanging kindness have so deeply impressed upon my heart, and which never can be impaired.

The duty of presiding over a great deliberative assembly like this, is no easy task. The high and distinguished character of such a trust, and its arduous and important functions, cannot fail to inspire any incumbent with a just distrust of his own abilities and qualifications, whatever they may be. My administration of its duties for seven years, has not only taught me to know and feel this, but likewise to know how difficult, nay, impossible it is, for any man to free himself from error or censure in this Chair, or give unqualified satisfaction. In times of profound tranquillity and repose, with united and harmonious councils, this has rarely if ever been done; amid the strife and storms of political and party excitements, it would be vain and hopeless to expect it. My period of service has, moreover, gentlemen, as many of you know, been distinguished by events especially calculated to render this station one of more than ordinary delicacy and embarrassment, as well as of increased reponsibility and labor. How assiduously I have struggled to discharge the duties of this Chair, in a manner worthy of it, and of myself; with what sincere zeal I have devoted my time and my talents, and even my health, to your service, I leave for others to decide; but this I hope I may be pardoned for saying, in justice and fairness to myself, and under a deep conviction of its truth, that I have endeavored to discharge my duty not only with temper, justice, and moderation, but with a just regard for your individual rights and feelings, the character and dignity of this House, and my own honor.—This was all that I promised when I came to this Chair, and this I have endeavored to do: with what success I leave to you and to my country to determine.

I am very sensible, gentlemen, that, in such a long course of public service, and in an independent discharge of the arduous and multifarious duties of this Chair, regardless of whom it might please or displease, my conduct may sometimes have been thought too harsh and rigorous; and I may often, unintentionally, have wounded the feelings of individual members upon this floor, and incurred their censure and displeasure. Under such circumstances and while man continues what he is, we know that personal resentments are too apt to be indulged and to remain, and often perhaps difficult to be extingnished, even in the noblest minds; but revenge will not harbor there—higher principles than resentment and better principles than revenge, will animate men whose thoughts and hearts are liberal and enlarged, especially where there is high intellectual ability and moral integrity. If, then under the influence of momentary excitement and passion' if, in the eagerness of controversy or the commotion of debate, any thing unkind or harsh should have been said or done, either on my part or on yours, let us, I pray you forgive and forget it, and let us separate in the spirit of peace and good will. Let not this moment of our final seperation be poisoned or embittered by feelings of personal resentment

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc4925_scm13073-0940.jpg