EASTERN-SHORE WHIG AND PEOPLE'S ADVOCATE.

"THE PRICE OF LIBERTY IS PERPETUAL VIGILANCE."

NEW SERIES. EASTON, MARYLAND, TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1838 VOL. IV.-NO. 23

THE WHIG AND PEOPLE'S ADVOCATE
Is edited and published every
TUESDAY MORNING,
BY
GEO. W SHERWOOD,
(PUBLISHER OF THE LAWS OF THE UNION.)

TERMS:—Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, payable half yearly in advance

No subscription will be received for less than six months, nor discontinued until all arrearages are settled, without the approbation of the publisher

Advertisements not exceeding a square, inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for every subsequent insertion—larger advertisements in proportion.

☞ All communications to insure attention should be *post paid*

POETRY.

FAREWELL—BY L. E. L.

You will forget me; as the wild wind passes,
With but a moment's breathing on its wings
Of the soft wind in the long summer grasses—
Of the deep music from the forest springs.
They perish as they welcome the new comer;
The odors leave the grass; the song, the brook,
The wind that brought will bear away the summer,
Unheeding the sweet world its presence shook.

Even so carelessly did'st thou awaken
The new existence of a conscious heart;
Even so carelessly am I forsaken;
Not only with thyself have I to part,
But thou dost take with thee the hues Elysian,
Which brightened in thy presence; life has lost
In loving thee, the presence of the vision,
Which, like an angel's, lit the path it cross'd.

It matters not. Fate is beside us ever,
With gradual but inevitable doom,
And mocks the struggling spirit's vain endeavor,
For sooner or late the heart is in its tomb.
You will forget me; nay, I am not praying
For but a moment's single thought from thee;
Ah, what availeth memory's delaying
Fondly, where hope again can never be.

"BE QUIET—DO; I'LL CALL MY MOTHER."

As I was sitting in a wood,
Under an oak tree's leafy cover,
Musing in a pleasant solitude,
Who should come but John, my lover.
He pressed my hand; and kissed my cheek;
Then warmer growing; kissed the other;
While I exclaimed, and strove to shriek,
"Be quiet—do; I'll call my mother."

He saw my anger was sincere,
And lovingly began to chide me;
And, wiping from my cheek the tear,
He sat him on the grass beside me,
He feigned such pretty, amorous wo,
Breathed such sweet vows one after another,
I could but smile! while whispering low,
"Be quiet—do; I'll call my mother."

He talked so long, and talked so well,
And swore he meant not to deceive me,
I felt more grief than I can tell,
When with a kiss he rose to leave me.
"Oh, John," said I, "and must thou go?
I love the better than all other!
There is no need to hurry so,
I never meant to call my mother."

MISCELLANEOUS.

YANKEE COCK—TRUE GAME

An anecdote was a day or two since related to us by a friend, which is this:—He was on his way to Havanna some months ago, and when off Florida, a bald eagle, which had been blown out to sea, alighted exhausted on one of the lower yards. He was brought down by our informant, and his wings were cropped, and himself was nursed into vigor again. Arrived at Havanna, a companion one day suggested for a frolic, to paint up the bald eagle, whose color was dark grey, so as to make him resemble a cock to try his mettle. Accordingly after he had been kept 24 hours without food, our eagle was again trimmed and painted rooster-like, and taken to the pit. At length the owner of the cock which had been victorious in twelve rounds, dared a contest with any one. Our friend stepped up to him and told him that he had a yankee cock of the native Green Mountain breed with him, if he would like a game.—'Yes,' says the Spaniard, 'I don't care what kind of a cock it is—let him out!' The bet was $25 and the yankee cock was let into the ring; the opposite rooster squarred about, and planted his head for a fight—when what does sir yankee do but to plant one claw unceremoniously upon his back, and twist his neck with the other—and in a moment make a meal of him.' The Spaniard swore like one possessed. He paid his money, but he denounced all yankee cocks.—[Newburyport Hearld.

A gentleman finding his servant intoxicated, said—"What, drunk again, Sam? I scolded you for being drunk last night, and here you are drunk again."

"No, massa," replied Sambo, "same drunk, massa, same drunk."

The real critter at last.—We perceive by an extract from an Illinois paper, that "Squire Hog," is the Whig candidate for state senator.

JUDGMENTS.—'Husband, do you believe in the special judgments of Providence upon individuals in this life.

'Yes, my dear.'

'Do you indeed? did one of them judgments ever happen to you?'

'Yes my love.'

'And what was it, husband?

'When I married you, my dear.'

CAMP MEETING IN TEXAS.—We learn from the Natchitoches Herald, that it is proposed to hold a Camp Meeting some time during the ensuing summer or fall near the residence of the Hon. G. V Lusk, eight miles south of Shelbyville, and twelve miles north of San Augustine. The site selected for the purpose is beautiful. It occupies a handsome elevation from which the water runs off every side, and at the foot of which a limpid stream of the finest spring water bursts forth and flows off over a beautiful bed of white sand. Judge Lusk has generously offered to make a deed of ten acres of ground for the encampment. The neighbors generally, in the vicsnity, speak of encamping.

This enterprise tells well for the citizens of Texas, and is a true indication of a rapid improvement in morals which is taking place in Shelby county and throughout the republic.

SPEECH OF MR. RHETT.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

In the House of Representatives, May 13, 1838—On the Treasury note bill.

Mr. Chairman: It is not my intention, on the present occasion, to discuss at length, the various subjects embraced by the remarks of my honorable friend and colleague, [Mr. THOMPSON,] who has just taken his seat. When the Independent Treasury bill comes up for consideration, I may take an opportunity to controvert many of the positions he has assumed, with respect to this great conservative measure; but, at present, I shall confine myself chiefly to the subject strictly before the committee—the authorizing a reissue of Treasury notes, in the place of those which have been returned into the Treasury in the payment of public dues, before the period contemplated for their redemption by the act of October last. To judge of the propriety of this measure, it is necessary to look to the state of the Treasury. In a communication addressed to the House a few days since, on this subject, by the President of the United States, it is stated, that there are in the Treasury, of available means, in round numbers, $216,000, and in the Mint, but $347,000. Demands to a large amount are suspended in the departments, waiting for payment from the means to be provided by Congress and the present means will carry the Government but a few days longer, when if not provided with them, it must stop. Of unavailable means, the resources are abundant. Twenty eight millions are on deposite with the States. Fifteen millions are due from the banks and individuals—one half of which will come in with the next six months. The necessity of the Treasury is an immediate, present necessity; not extending (unless increased by your legislation) beyond the next four or six months. This, sir, is the nature of the necessity, and this the state of the Treasury. The embarrassment is accidental & temporary, occasioned by the legislation of Congress for the relief of the banks, by which the means in the Treasury have been postponed, and the premature return of the notes authorized to be issued by the October law, before the period of their redemption. The remedy proposed by the bill under consideration, is this; to authorize other notes to be issued, as the emergences of the Treasury shall require, in the place of those which have been returned into the Treasury, before the period contemplated for their redemption—not exceeding the limits imposed by the act of October, as to the amount and time of issue. The relief will be immediate, and will create the debt only when necessary, and to the amount necessary.

To this bill, there are various objections urged; but nearly all of them are but iterations of those which were pressed at the extra session against the original bill, in which this may be considered an amendment. They were then answered; but being of such a nature, I suppose, in the opinions of those who presented them, as to require repetition to ensure recollection—they are brought forward again; and to aid this very commendable design, it may not be improper, again, briefly to notice them.

First then: Treasury notes are unconstitutional, because they are bills of credit, and this Government has no right to issue bills of credit.

Mr. Chairman, I am a State Rights man. I am disposed to regard with great jealousy every power exercised by this Government; and to require in every case, that it shall be shown, either by express grant, or by necessary implication, that the power claimed is clearly given by the Constitution. Now, sir, the Government wants to borrow money, for some four or six months. I turn to the Constitution, and find no prohibition to this Government to "emit bills of credit," but the power "to borrow money" given without any limitation or restriction as to the manner or form in which it shall be done. What is the meaning of borrowing money? Is it not getting money on your credit? The shape in which you put out your credit or promise to pay is perfectly immaterial. I hold in my hand a Treasury note, and a certificate of stock. To "borrow money" in the latter form, gentlemen say, is constitutional, in the former not. The Treasury note is a promise on the part of the United States to pay to B or his order a certain sum, one year from date; with six per cent. interest; the certificate of stock is a due bill, certifying that a certain sum is due by the United States to B, or his assigns, one year after date bearing five per cent. interest. Now sir, what is the difference between these two methods of borrowing money? Both are promise to pay, one year after date, at nearly the same rate of interest. Both are transferable—the one by endorsement—the other by assignment which may be in blank; and thus afford the same facilities for passing from hand to hand. There is in fact, but one metalic difference between the two forms of loan, and that does not appear upon the face of either. The Treasury note may be received, according to a clause in the October law, in payment of public dues; and thus be redeemed before the expiration of the year. Yet even this peculiarity in these notes, is not uncommon in the issue of stock; which is often made redeemable at the time & manner of redeeming the loan, in the least degree, affect the constitutional power of making it? If so, then the constitutionality of the form, depends upon the greater or less convenience of redeeming the loan. If the method is prompt and easy, as is provided with respect to these Treasury notes, it is unconstitutional, I suppose; if it is postponed, and rendered difficult, then it is constitutional. Nor can the interest to be paid, at all affect the constitutionality of the issue. If you have the power to 'borrow money,' it is your duty to the people, who must ultimately pay the debt by the sweat of their brows to borrow it upon the cheapest terms possible. If from the abundance of capital, and the superior credit of the Government, and the use to which this credit may be applied, you can borrow money at two or three per cent. interest, or at no interest at all, it is your duty to do it. The only question is, do you want money, and do you design to borrow it? The Constitution leaves the method absolutely at your own discretion and control.

My colleague has quoted the case of Craig *vs.* the State of Missouri, by which it has been determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, that *a State* cannot emit a bill of credit. Now, sir, suppose that there was in the Constitution, an express prohibition (which there is not) to the United States emitting bills of credit, as there is to the States; this case would not at all affect the measure before you? In that case, Chief Justice Marshall, in delivering the opinion of the court, (every Republican Judge upon the bench dissenting,) put the decision upon the fact, that the certificates of the State of Missouri were designed to be the currency of the country, and a substitute for the Constitutional currency of gold and silver. Is that the case here? The Treasury notes authorized by the bill on your table are limited to the amount of $10,000,000. None can be issued after the first day of December next, when they are all redeemable; and when received into the Treasury cannot be reissued. Do these failures show any design of furnishing a currency to the country, as a substitute for the constitutional currency, and make these notes "bills of credit," in the meaning of the Constitution? The word "emit," says the Judge "is never employed in describing those contracts by which a State binds itself to pay money at a future day, for services actually received or for money borrowed; nor are such instruments bills of credit." Now, what are these Treasury notes, but "contracts for the payment of money at a future day for services actually received?" to pay your army—your navy—your civil and diplomatic officers—you, yourselves? What are they, but evidences of debt for "money borrowed" to carry on the machinery of Government? Why, sir, it is most apparent, that even upon the authority of this case, every State in the Union, despite the express prohibition to "emit bills of credit," would be authorized to issue these notes. Our minds are sometimes like our eyesight, capable of seeing things only at every remote distances. Gentlemen who deny the constitutionality of these Treasury notes, yet maintain that Congress may establish a United States Bank; and either as part or the entire proprietor of the stock, through its instrumentality, issue such notes, to any amount, expressly designed to be currency. We have no right to issue these notes say these gentlemen, because they may enter into the currency; yet, under the power "to regulate commerce," they maintain that we have the power to supply a currency for the Union—and control and crush, if we please, all the banking institutions of the States. Thus it is, that things which are most obvious, are undiscerned and the remotest inferrences, and most metaphysical deductions' are apprehended with the clearest distinctness and conviction. During the whole period of the last war, Treasury notes were freely issued, in all respects, similar to those authorized by the bill. Mr. Dallas recommended them—Mr. Madison approved of them, and Cheves, Randolph, Clay, Lowndes, and Webster filled some of the seats we now occupy. To these men the constitutional objection did not even occur.

The following table shows the issues:

1812—June 30. In Treasury notes bearing interest of 5 and 3-5th per cent. redeemable in one year	$5,000,000
1813—Feb. 25. Same interest, redeemable in one year	10,000,000
1814—March, 4. Same interest, redeemable in one year	10,000,000
1814—Dec. 26. To be issued in lieu of that amount of loans heretofore authorized	7,500,000
1814—Dec. 26. To be issued	3,000,000
1815—Feb. 24. Do. do.	25,000,000
	$60,500,000

The next objection urged against the bill by my honorable colleague is, that by the issue of the Treasury notes it authorizes, a Government bank will be established. I cannot but suppose, Mr. Chairman, that my colleague in making this objection must have misapprehended the provisions of the bill. He must have supposed, to justify any thing like an argument in support of such a position, that both as to time and the amount of the issue, the bill is entirely unlimited. He cannot be aware, that no notes can be issued by its authority, after the first day of December next when all are redeemable, and that the amount can at no time exceed ten millions of dollars. A bank without any capital, with a charter for six months! Surely the argument is answered by the statement of the facts.

It is said, however, that another form of borrowing is better. Go in at once for a regular loan on time, by issuing stock for some $10,000,000. That will be proper and constitutional, and will be doing the thing in a dignified manner. Now, Mr. Chairman, in the first place, no loan such as gentlemen propose for the time is needed by the government, can be negotiated in this country, in the present situation of the banks and the currency, unless the Government will receive the irredeemable paper of non-specie paying banks. If the object of gentlemen is to drive the Government into the arms of these banks, and to implicate it with the irredeemable currency of the country, for the support of the banks, certainly a loan in their paper will be a very good way to accomplish the object, and place the Government in their power. But if the loan is to be negotiated in specie or the notes of specie paying banks, it cannot be done. Would any such bank or banks in the doubtful position in which they are now placed, venture to take a loan of ten, or even five millions of dollars, at the rate of five per cent. and pay for it in specie, or by an issue of their notes? Would individual capitalist do it? They could carcely obtain the notes of specie paying banks, or specie, with which to carry the loan into effect. There are now, I am told, not more than nine millions of specie in New York, and but little more than half of that amount of the notes of their banks in circulation. But could the capitalists or the banks easily obtain the means, what inducements would there be to take a loan for six months, which the wants of the Treasury only required. What compensation would there be in an investment for so short a time, to induce the capitalist to call in his bonds and mortgages, and sell his stock or real estate? The same obstacle exists to the sale in this country of the bonds of the United States, due to the Government. These bonds are of $2,000,000 each; and payable within six months, and the other the year after. Suppose however, that the loan could be effected in New York; how do gentlemen reconcile this operation with their tender professions of an exclusive regard for the welfare of the banks? There would be an immediate demand upon the banks of New York for $10,000,000 in specie, or their notes, convertible into specie. Do gentlemen want another crash—another stoppage of specie payments upon which new changes may be rung of the liability of the Government, and their own entire devotion to the banking institutions of the country? A loan ought not to be effected in the present situation of the banks. It cannot be effected, unless made upon time; redeemable in some five or ten years. Gentlemen from the North may go for such a measure to gratify desire a debt upon the country; and the sooner, and the longer continued the better for them. But how will gentlemen from the south reconcile this policy with their views of duty? To place a permanent debt upon the country of $10,000,000, to meet an emergency of but six months' necessity. My colleague proposes, however, that the loan should be negotiated in Europe, and the amount brought back *in specie*. But this, sir, would be postponing the cure until the patient is dead. The wants of the Treasury are now, at the present time, chiefly within the next two or three months. Long before the loan could be negotiated in Europe, and the avails be returned the Government will be bankrupt and disgraced—its faith and its engagements dishonored. If the relief could be postponed for six months, why not authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to recall back a portion of the amount deposited with the States? That be a far more Southern measure; for then the amount contributed would be, as it was deposited, upon the principle of direct taxation; and the South would not be compelled through indirect taxation by duties on importations, to pay a disproportionate share of the contribution.

But the most remarkable part of my colleague's proposition is that the loan, when negotiated in Europe, should be brought back to this country in *specie*. He has just made a most elaborate argument to show that every importation of specie from Europe must necessarily depress the price of our cotton. To him the importation or the existence of specie in the country brings no satisfaction, because it is at the expense of our great staple, and consequently injurious to the South. Well, sir, under the increased abstraction of specie from Europe, which his operations will occasion, what will become of our cotton, declined and now declining in Liverpool? If his argument is good, his whole plan of relief will operate as a double injury to the South; it will establish a debt, and depress the price of our cotton. The veins and arteries will be opened at the same time. Sir, my friend's project for relief will not do. The other projects for a loan will not do. We must pass this bill, or disgrace and dishonor the country. If this measure stood alone on its own merits, gentlemen know that it would pass this House with scarcely a dissenting voice. Although the necessities of the Treasury are far greater and more immediate than at the extra session, many gentlemen who then supported the Treasury bill to which this is an amendment, oppose now most bitterly this measure. Why this change? Why the combination, so obvious, and so apparently incoherent, to defeat this bill?—It is, sir, because gentlemen connect this measure with the Government, and the Government with the great financial and political contest now waging in the country. In ordinary times, with $28,000,000 on deposite with the States, and $15,000,000 due the Government by the banks and individuals, one half of which will come into the Treasury within the next six months, no man would think of denying to the Government the use of its own credit for a few months, in a form sanctioned by unbroken usage, at the only period the necessities of the country required its use. No one, for such an emergency, would think of proposing impracticable methods of relief to the Government; and useless, if practicable. The idea would be spurned, that any triumph of party, or measure of policy, could compensate the country for the degradation and dishonor which would attend a violation of its faith and engagements. But unfortunately, sir, the country is divided—this House is divided, upon the great issue which the president of the Pennsylvania Bank of the United States, on the part of the banks, has presented to the country. The Government and the banks, he says, are in the field face to face, and one or the other must be driven from it. My colleague utters the same opinion, and says that "a mortal conflict is now waging between the Government and the banks." I do not admit that any such contest exists in the Southern States; and especially on the part of the banks of that State which I, in part, represent. In that quarter of the Union, the banks have the good sense to perceive that, if united to the Government, the banks will soon become the Government, or the Government the banks.—Patriotism and interest, therefore, in their estimation, alike dictate an entire separation of the Government from the banking institutions of the country. But, sir, I agree with my friend that such a conflict does exist in another part of the country. I deny, however, that this Government has made or seeks the contest; or has placed itself in the field against the banks. On the contrary, if facts can show any thing, they all show, if fairly viewed, that so far as the present Government is concerned, it has neither sought any contest, nor evinced any hostility, to the banks of the country. Suppose, sir, that the Specie Circular was a cause of embarrassment to the banks—did the Government do more than it had a right to do with respect to its own property? Had it not a right to sell or not to sell its own lands, and to dictate the terms on which it would sell them? Admit that the deposite of the surplus revenue with the States was clumsily executed—were the banks, in that operation, required to do more than they had engaged to perform? Did they not, for compensation received, of their own accord, agree to do what was required of them? and will any man seriously assert, or expect others to believe, that these measures originated in hostility to the banks? and that implicated, as the Government was, with millions on deposite with the banks—committed, as it was, against the re-establishment of an United States Bank, contrary to every principle o duty or common sense, it would seek a contest in which it had nothing to gain, and every thing to fear, from the combination of the banks and capitalists against its measures and power? Even the corporation bankrupt law, so much declaimed against, suggested by the President of the United States, but which received no support in this House, meditated no hostility to banks; but was only intended to apply to those banks which should cease to be banks, by becoming insolvent.

Sir, it is a truth unquestionable, that if the banks had fulfilled their own promises and engagements, the idea that this Government had warred upon them never would have been raised; and if they have not been able to meet their engagements, in their too eager pursuit of gain, who is to blame but themselves?—The Government did not control their issues, nor has it taken away any of their means to meet them. On the contrary, since their suspension of specie payment, what indulgence has been refused on the part of the Government, that their warmest friends have required, consistent with the laws and safety of the revenue? What functionary of the Government; what member on this floor, or in the other wing of the Capitol, has expressed any hostility to these institutions? The real ground for offence—the whole war—exists in the proposition to separate the Government from all connection with the Banks. The Banks do not like the separation; and, because it is proposed by the Government, they declare that it is war. To have nothing to do with them, and to leave them unmolested in the full enjoyment of all their chartered privileges, is atrocious hostility. To avoid them—to fly away from their agency or assistance, is to make a "mutual conflict" with them. The Government only asks what the humblest citizen has a right to require, that it should be let alone, to manage his own fiscal affairs in its own way; but the banks and the capitalists will not let it alone. They insist that they shall be taken into the Government, and participate in managing its revenues; and, because the Government declines their intervention or co-operation, they proclaim that they and the Government are in the field, face to face, and that one or the other must perish. Whilst hypocritically crying out that they are pursued, they are, in fact, in combination with the great Federal party of the country, hunting down the Government, and storming the battlements of the Constitution for its overthrow. Sir, although distress brings confusion, and, in times of trouble, the people are most liable to be deceived, it will be impossible to conceal from them the true issue forced upon the country, according to the vaunting declarations of the banks themselves. It is a contest between the banks and the Government—the capitalists and the people. The Government, and the people to whom the Government belongs, are on the defensive, and I trust, they will calmly and immovably remain so. The demands on the one side are another United States Bank, capable of controlling the whole currency of the country—or a reconnection of the Government with the State banks. On the other side, it is insisted that the Government has no more right to connect itself with banks than with individuals; and that an absolute and entire separation from them is its right and duty. Such are the measures of the assailants and the assailed.

To divert attention from their own aggressions and designs, it has been urged by the banks, that by the Government separating itself from all banks, two covert measures of hostility are meditated. By receiving in payment of the public dues nothing but specie or its own paper, it is alleged, it is designed to drain the whole currency of the country to gold and silver, and thus dispense with all bank paper; and secondly, by using its own paper, it is intended to supply a paper currency on the part of the Government for the whole country, and thus destroy all bank paper. Neither of these assertions have any foundation in fact; and are, in truth, inconsistent and antagonistical to each other. If the Government should issue a paper currency, which should be a substitute for all bank paper in circulation, how would the circulation be a mere metalic circulation? And if the country is reduced to a mere metallic circulation, how could a Government paper currency be in circulation?—My colleague has dwelt upon both of these points. He has gone elaborately into statistics to show how impracticable for the use of the country would be a currency of gold and silver without any paper, in the form of credit in circulation. Sir, he should have first shown that receiving specie in payment of the public dues by the Government, would have the effect of destroying all the solvent banks in the country, abolishing all credit, and reducing the currency to nothing but gold and silver.—According to the most liberal calculation, the Treasury, under such a policy, will not require more than ten millions of specie to carry on its operations; and this, according to the plan proposed by its friends, will be gradually drawn, in a series of years, from the metallic supply of the whole world; whilst there is in the United States alone, at the present time, not less than eighty millions of dollars. To argue gravely that such a cause can produce such an effect, and that, by the employment of ten millions of specie, the Government designs forcing upon the country the use of no other currency than gold and silver, and the prostration of the banks and all credit, is as poor a compliment to the sagacity of the Government as it is to the intelligence of the people. Sir, I have never yet met the man, either in or out of Congress, who has ever maintained the propriety or possibility of reducing this great and enterprising country to a mere hard money currency. If you were to abolish to-morrow every bank in the land, paper credit, in the shape of the notes of individuals or some other form, would crowd into your circulation. Is it not remarkable, that gentlemen should be so eager to attack what no body defends? They stuff up a man of straw, and they show their dexterity in shooting it down. And that other diversion from the true issue before the country—that the Government designs to establish a Government bank, and to destroy the State banks by a substitution of its paper in the place of theirs. Where is the proof of any such design? In the destitution of facts, even the paltry and carefully restricted issue of Treasury notes authorized by the bill before you, has been relied on to make out the charge. In another part of this building the same charge has been made, because the Government proposes to do what it has done ever since it was established—draw upon its own funds—a privilege undenied to the humblest citizen of the country.—The only measure which gives the least semblance to any such design, was a measure proposed, not by the Government, but by myself, at the extra session of Congress, and voted down by a large majority—that bills receivable in payment of public dues should be issued instead of Treasury notes. But this measure was intended to be confined strictly within the wants and operations of the Government.—There was no assigned capital—no discounting of notes, or dealing with individuals, proposed. Sir, neither the banks, nor the capitalists of the country, believe that any hostile designs exist towards them on the part of those who oppose their association with the Government, or refuse to bend it before their ambitious and selfish pretensions. We intend to maintain the banking institutions of the States, in all their powers and privileges, with as much fidelity and energy as they can evince. These are mere tubs to the whale—mere pretexts to divert the attention of the people from their true designs. They know that the banks rest in security, beneath the protection of the State sovereignties who created them, and to whom alone they are responsible. They know that there are not twenty men on this floor, who would consent that this Government should touch, much less destroy them; and that those who are most strenuous for the separation of the Government from all banks, oppose the re-establishment of the United States Bank, (their panacea for all the ills of the currency,) expressly upon the ground, that this Government has no right, by the establishment of such an institution, to enter the States, and cripple or crush the banking institutions they have established. Not then, upon policy only, but upon constitutional principles, we are necessarily the fast friends of the banks of the States. Sir, the capitalists are in no delusion as to this matter. These pretexts are but feints in the battle, to disguise the true point of attack. If they can succeed in making the people believe that they are the party wronged—that the Government, and not their own imprudence and weakness, caused them to fail in redeeming their promises, and that it is now seeking their destruction; why then, the more confusion and distress to the people, the greater the odium to the Government, and the more power they will possess of accomplishing their design of controlling its action, and making it contributary to their credit and aggrandizement. Hence, the violent and sudden contractions and expansions in the currency a few years since, by which thousands were injured or ruined. Hence, the innumerable suits which crowd the courts of the country on the part of the banks, whilst refusing to meet their own promises to pay. Hence, the refusal lately to resume specie payments. Through the agitations of distress, and the mists of tears, the people are to be confounded and blinded, and the Government is to be struck down and throttled beneath the gripe of monopolists and money changers. The last blow—the "crowning mercy;" may be the measure alluded to by my honorable colleague,—"stopping the supplies" to the Government—destroying the bill upon your table, without any adequate substitute to meet the wants of the Government. "If ever there was a time," he says, "when this old method, common with our English ancestors, of redressing the rights of the people against their Government, was justifiable, it was now."

[Mr. Thompson rose and said, that he did not recommend such a measure, or say that he would vote for it; on the contrary, he had declared his willingness to vote for a loan or any other constitutional method of supply.]

I have stated, Mr. Chairman, the words of my colleague as I understood him to utter them, and my statement is not incompatible with what he says. I know that he did suggest a method of supply, in connection with his remarks—a loan in Europe—for which he said he would vote, but which he expressly declared at the same time he should not propose. This scheme I have already considered, and have shown, I think, that it will not answer the emergency of the Treasury; but if adopted, would, in fact, be "stopping the supplies." Let it be, sir, that my friend has merely *hinted* at this grand remedy. It is followed up by a proposition of the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. Hopkins,] for another form of supply, who declares at the time, that he shall not vote for his own proposition.*—The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Bell) proposes another form, but he does not say that he will vote for it. Mr. Chairman, I trust that I mistake these intimations, and that gentlemen do not intend to carry them into effect.—Is it come to this, that for usurping power or aggressing upon the righis of the citizens, but because the Government will *not* act—will *not* unite itself to banks—will *not* usurp a power, [establishing a United States Banks] questioned from the very first origin of the Government—that it is to be violently suspended and overthrown? No one can doubt our control over the supplies. It is absolute—unlimited. But to stop them, is a revolutionary measure, justifiable only when we are prepared to dissolve the Government; throw away the shield of the Constitution and the laws—and reconstruct from the entangled elements of society, a new political fabric. I call upon gentlemen to look to the consequences boldly, before they trifle with them. Neither your civil nor military dependants are bound to serve you without bread or pay. Your army—your navy—your Judicial and Executive officers all over the land, will have a right to disband and leave your service. Suspend for a single day the laws and the Constitution of the country—and when, and where may it end? Let the spirit of anarchy and lawlessness at a time like the present, full of confusion and distress of violent political agitation and fierce contention for power, once lift its hydra head in our land—and who shall strangle it? Sir, I bid gentlemen beware. They may sow to the wind, and reap the whirlwind. I am a friend to the banks, although no apologist for their abuses. I can be no enemy to capitalists, for I own property; and hold that its accumulation is the necessary fruit and reward of civilization itself; but if they, in conjunction with the great Federal party to which they are allied, shall make this experiment upon the patience and patriotism of the people, their madness will be their ruin. Banks and capitalists are the natural allies to Government. They are the creations of law, and essentially depend on its steady and certain administration for their support. Credit is a delicate plant, often of slow growth, and can only live in the sunshine or peace, and the calm of confidence. Forgetful or regardless of their true nature and policy, for the first time in the history of the world, the banks of the country are arrayed against the Govern-

*Mr. Hopkins in the debate subsequently declared, that he would vote for no supplies, until their custody was properly provided for, by new legislation. He had just proposed an amendment to the Treasury bill, [illegible] Rives's bill uniting the government to [illegible] of twenty five State banks. Mr. [illegible] League Randolph of New Jersey, in the course of the debate expressed also the opinion that the abuses of the Government justified the House in "stopping the supplies."

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc4925_scm13074-1000