SPEECH

OF

MR. TRUMAN SMITH, OF CONNECTICUT,

ON

REMOVALS AND APPOINTMENTS TO OFFICE.

DELIVERED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 21 AND 23, 1850.

The following resolution, introduced by Mr. BRADBURY, having been made the special order for this day, viz.:

Resolved, That the President be requested to cause to be laid before the Senate all charges which have been preferred or filed in any of the Departments against individuals who have been removed from office since the 4th day of March last, with a specification of the cases, if any, in which the officers charged have had opportunity to be heard, and a statement of the number of removals made under each Department, including subordinates in the custom-houses and other branches of the public service."

Mr. SMITH, of Connecticut, who was entitled to the floor, addressed the Senate as follows:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I did not vote for the postponement of the census bill, for the reason that I desired to leave the subject to the judgment of the Senate, without any interposition on my part. If the body had seen fit to proceed with the consideration of that bill, it would not have given occasion to any complaint by me, although I have believed, and still believe, that the pendency of this resolution has been attended with considerable inconvenience to the public service. It is well known that most of the nominations of the President still remain undisposed of; in many cases the offices to be filled are vacant, by reason of expiration of the terms of the late incumbents; and I more than suspect that this resolution and considerations connected therewith have caused the delay. I have been rather surprised that Senators have not manifested more earnestness, not to say anxiety, to have a disposition of the question now before the body. I do not know but that there may be some stern necessity (to me, however incomprehensible) impelling us to an incessant discussion of the slavery question. We have been engaged for more than three long months in considering nothing but preliminaries. We have not been permitted to vote even on a question of reference. We have much of the time had but two speeches a week—one for Monday and Tuesday, another for Wednesday and Thursday; and when the latter day has arrived, we have adjourned over to the succeeding Monday, to resume the same topic, and to end the week in the same way. In the mean time, it has been utterly impossible to bring the attention of the Senate to the ordinary business of the session. We have not recurred to any one of the important suggestions and recommendations contained in the annual message of the President, and a vast number of bills, public and private, have accumulated on our calendar, and are likely to fall with the session. I regard these discussions, which have so long embarassed us, as of very little practical utility. Under these circumstances, I think, Mr. President, that it will not be without some use to have a slight interruption of this disputation on the subject of slavery, when every member of the Senate knows that the questions are settled already, so far as the judgment of the Senate is concerned. Perhaps I shall not be able to interest the body, but I can at any rate, do one thing—I can create a sort of a hiatus in a dispute which should have been brought to a close long ago. (Laughter.)

I presume, Mr. President, that there is not a single member of this Senate that could feel a stronger repugnance than I do to embarking in a discussion which must partake, more or less, of a party character. During the considerable period that I was a member of the House of Representatives, (associated with you, sir, for one-half of that period,) I have no recollection of having, in any instance, availed myself of the privileges of the floor, except to attend to some matter of business, or to consider some question of a broad national interest. I desire that it may be understood that such will ordinarily be my course as a member of the Senate. And, sir, if I depart from that rule of conduct now, it is because I consider this resolution and the remarks of my friend from Maine, (Mr. BRADBURY,) in their scope and purport, as tending to cast dishonor upon the President of the United States. I am among the number of those who repose a high confidence in the integrity of our Chief Magistrate. I believe that he has been actuated in his course by liberal, patriotic, just, and elevated views and sentiments. I believe him to be entirely worthy of the affections and the confidence of the American people. Under such circumstances, notwithstanding the repugnance I feel to this sort of discussion, I enter with alacrity upon the task of vindicating his conduct, and of showing that he has not departed one hair from the position which he assumed before the American people when a candidate for the highest office in their gift.

TOWERS, *printer.—Price* $2 00 *per hundred.*

We know that his name, character, and conduct have been the theme of incessant calumny and abuse, from the hour of his inauguration to the present day. But, sir, it has been wholly confined to the columns of a licentious press, until now; and my friend from Maine, for whom I trust that I entertain a proper respect, has the unenviable notoriety of bringing such topics into this chamber, and of submitting them to the attention of this body. It is with infinite regret that I noticed that the majority here determined, on the motion of my honorable friend from North Carolina, (Mr. MANGUM,) to lay this resolution on the table, as a test vote to countenance the proposition. Every member of the majority, with the exception of the honorable Senator from Alabama, (Mr. CLEMENS,) voted in the negative. The majority, therefore, have adopted this resolution, and made it their own. Whether they intend to make themselves parties or not to the expositions of the honorable Senator from Maine, and whether they concur with him in all the imputations which are contained in his speech, the future must reveal.

But let us consider for a moment what are the alleged reasons for bringing to our notice a resolution of this singular and unprecedented character. They are in substance that the President of the United States, both before he became the candidate of the Whig party, and also during the canvass, and even in his inaugural address, held out expectations to the American people, in the nature of pledges, which he has now departed from and violated in the most atrocious manner. The honorable Senator (Mr. B.) represents that while the assurances of the inaugural yet lingered on the lips of him who uttered them, the President commenced breaking faith with the people, or entered on a violation of what he is pleased to denominate pledges, and has continued such violation from that time to this. The charge of the Senator is, that he gave to the country assurances and pledges, positive and peremptory, for the purpose of reaching the highest office in the gift of the American people; and that, immediately upon entering on his duties as the Chief Magistrate of the country, he commenced a systematic violation of all those pledges. The whole sum and substance of this charge is, that he has *swindled himself* into the presidency; that he has obtained that high office by "*false pretences.*" I regard the inaugural address as partaking in some degree of the solemnity and obligations of the presidential oath: it is contemporaneous therewith, and is declaratory of the purposes and views of the party on taking the oath. If he commenced violating the pledges which the Senator pretends are to be found in the inaugural, while "the accents" thereof "yet lingered on his lips," then he must have taken on his soul the guilt of perjury. If there is any foundation for this allegation of the honorable Senator, then the President of the United States is utterly unworthy of the confidence of the country. Whatever others may think of it, I should consider him as a dishonored man—one who ought to be cast from the respect and association of all honorable and all upright men.

I will, without further preliminary remarks, address myself to the examination of this subject in all its bearings. And, in the first place, I desire to call the particular attention of the Senate to the character of this most extraordinary resolution. Before entering on that topic, however, I would observe that I am entitled to consider the remarks of my honorable friend as part of the resolution itself; or, rather, they fix its true intent and meaning. Upon this point I have satisfactory authority to produce—an authority to which I shall have occasion to refer several times in the course of my remarks. At the second session of the 24th Congress, a committee was raised by the House of Representatives for the purpose of inquiring into certain abuses, said to have been committed in the Departments in this city, at the head of which was placed the Hon. H. A. Wise. The committee met and passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested, and the heads of the several Executive Departments be directed, to furnish this committee with a list or lists of all officers, or agents, or deputies who have been appointed, or employed, or paid since the 4th of March, 1829, to the 1st December last, if any, without authority of law, (or whose names are not contained in the last printed register of public officers, commonly called the Blue Book,) by the President or said heads of Departments respectively, and without nomination to or the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States; showing the names of such officers, or agents, or deputies, the sums paid to each, the services rendered, and by what authority appointed and paid, and what reasons for such appointments."—*Vide House Docs. 2d sess. 24th Cong., Rep. of Committees, No.* 194, *p.* 28.

This resolution was communicated to President Jackson, and, in reply, he addressed a characteristic letter, dated January 26, 1837, to Mr. Wise, from which I submit the following extract:

"It also appears, from the published proceedings of the House, that this resolution was accompanied and supported by a speech of considerable length, in which you preferred many severe but vague charges of corruption and abuse in the Executive Departments. The resolution adopted by the committee, as well as that adopted by the House itself, must be taken in connexion with your introductory speech, which gave a character to the whole proceeding."

So I say the introductory speech of the honorable Senator (Mr. BRADBURY) gives a character to this resolution, and with these lights we cannot mistake its true purport and object.

No one can read the remarks of the honorable Senator without seeing that the real purpose of this movement is political agitation, at the expense of President Taylor. His motives are to be questioned, his conduct traduced, his honor and rectitude maligned, and his administration rendered, if possible, odious to the American people.

I have greatly mistaken the character of this body, if it shall lend itself to such an object. But I can only develop the true character of this resolution by entering into some details.

I. I would observe that it is sweeping, universal, and indefinite. It comprehends not only all that the President has done himself, but every thing done by all the heads of Departments. It comprises not only the cases where the President has the appointing power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, but also those where the absolute power of appointment is vested in the heads of the Departments. It is proposed to charge the President with the duty of entering all these Departments, gathering up all the papers, searching out all the pigeon-holes, for charges preferred against officers removed, in all the cases, no matter how the power of appointment may be vested. And this is proposed, when the Senator does not say that he has any authentic information on this subject whatever;

when he does not even represent to the Senate, or the country, that he knows that any charges have been preferred; so that it is altogether a matter of inference upon his part. The President is required not only to furnish papers supposed to exist in the Departments, but he is also to furnish a list of cases in which the parties removed have been put on trial. The honorable Senator seems really to suppose that in all cases of removals the President was bound to serve notice upon the parties and give them a hearing. Whether there should be a jury trial in each case, the Senator does not suggest; but there is to be both notice, hearing, and judgment entered up in due form of law. Therefore he calls upon the President to furnish a list of all the cases wherein a lawsuit has been raised between the Executive and the party removed. He goes beyond this; for he not only requires the President to search out all of the pigeon-holes of the various Departments here, but also to visit all the custom-houses of the country, so as to ascertain what removals have been made there. The honorable Senator is not satisfied with an examination of all the establishments on the Atlantic coast, but the President must make an excursion to the Pacific, in order to respond to this resolution. Besides, he is to ascertain what removals have been made in all the subordinate offices of the Government; not simply in the custom-houses, but in all the various post offices of the country.

Perhaps the Senator will say that the information can be obtained here, or that it should be upon the files of the various Departments in this city. The fact is not so. There is a large number of subordinates or employees who were appointed by the chief of the particular office where they exercise their duties. There never is any return made here of changes of such officers. And this is particularly true in the post offices of the country. There is a rule that such postmasters as have an income of over $2,000 a year may appropriate the surplus for the compensation of such clerical force as may be necessary to the despatch of the public business. During the last fiscal year there were sixty-six such offices in the country, leaving out the Pacific coast; and the whole clerical force therein employed during that year amounted to six hundred and forty-six.

What, then, is the President to do, if the resolution is passed? He is to send to all these post offices, and, for aught I know, he will have to send to San Francisco, to ascertain what may be the state of things there, in order to comply with the resolution. Indeed, sir, to make the resolution complete, the Senator ought to add an appropriation of some fifty or a hundred thousand dollars to carry it out. If we are to believe the representations of the honorable Senator, we must come to the conclusion that all the pigeon-holes in all the Departments are crowded with what he is pleased to denominate "libels." The whole clerical force in these various Departments, if his statements are true, are to be employed in copying these libels. The Senator says he believes there had been removed (at the time his speech was delivered) five thousand deputy postmasters—and how many more are claimed in other Departments I know not. In every case the Senator supposes charges were preferred. I would suggest to him the addition of a further appropriation to employ an extra clerical force to execute this order, as it will be required on his hypothesis.

Mr. BRADBURY, (interposing.) If the Senator will allow me, I will state that the resolution contemplates handing over the original charges, so that the expense and necessity of employing clerks in copying will be saved.

Mr. SMITH resumed. Then it seems that the Senator intends to take the original papers out of the custody of the President and the heads of Departments for our use, and to leave nothing in their hands to vindicate their course. I do not know what my friend contemplates doing with them when they are brought here; whether they are to be carried over to the "Union" office, and there used for purposes of party agitation, or what is to be done with them. It is sufficient for me to remark that it is contrary to the whole practice of the Government, and the honorable Senator may rest assured that it is one of the last things which the President will do. He will not part with a single original paper, but copies will be made, if any thing is to be done, in compliance with the requisitions of this resolution.

I object, then, to the vagueness and indefiniteness of this resolution, and to its sweeping character. It is totally unprecedented. If any call is to be made, it should be in conformity with the uniform practice of the Senate, upon the President, for information in those cases coming under his own jurisdiction, where he has the power of appointment by or with the advice and consent of the Senate; but when the power is vested in heads of Departments, he must make his call on the functionary exercising the power. If the honorable Senator supposes that there is a large mass of libels on file in the General Post Office, and if he wants to get an insight into the matter, and to inspect those libels, he must make a call upon the Postmaster General; but as to directing the President himself to make inquiries into all the Departments, and reporting here the result, it is, I insist, unprecedented and inadmissible.

But I have a little sound democratic authority upon this point, to which I wish to invite the attention of my honorable friend. It will be found in the same characteristic response which President Jackson gave to Mr. Wise's committee, (2d session, twenty-fourth Congress,) to which I have already invited the attention of the Senate. He says:

"The heads of department may answer such a request if they please, provided they do not withdraw their own time, and that of the officers under their direction, from the public business, to the injury thereof;" to which he adds, "*I shall direct them to devote themselves.*"—*Rep.* 194, *p.* 31, 2*d sess.* 24*th Con.*

Sir, the character of the resolution of Mr. Wise is simplicity itself, in comparison with that which is now under consideration. What did it call for? Merely a list of clerks and other subordinates employed without authority of law, the amount of salaries, and the duties assigned to them respectively. Gen. Jackson, in answer to such a requisition, after denouncing it as indefinite and vague, says that the heads of Department may answer if they please, provided they can do so without interfering with the public service.

In reply to the same requisition, Mr. Kendall, then Postmaster General, said:

"Nearly the whole force of the department and of the Auditor's Office would have to be withdrawn from the current business, to the incalculable injury of the public service." * * * * "I do not feel authorized, in discharge of my duties to the public, to suffer the clerks furnished to me for other purposes to be so employed."—*Rep.* 194, 2*d sess.* 24*th Congress.*

Gen. Jackson told the committee, in effect, that he would not suffer the Departments to reply to it during office hours. And Mr. Kendall said he would be obliged, in order to answer it, to employ the whole clerical force of the Department, which he did not feel authorized to do. What force, then, will be required to respond to such a call as this? So much for the sweeping and indefinite character of the resolution.

II. In the next place, I shall advert to the *partial* and *injurious* character of this resolution; and here I ask the Senate to attend to the following particulars:

1. The call is limited to "charges which have been preferred or filed in any of the Departments against individuals who have been removed from office since the 4th of March last." Why this limitation to the 4th of March, 1849? The honorable Senator is very curious to know what has taken place since that time, but takes care to make no calls for papers filed in order to effect removals under the late administration. Why did not the honorable Senator make a requisition for all papers in the nature of charges filed in the various Departments since the 4th of March, 1845? It would seem to me that he ought to have gone back to that time, in order to do justice; nay, to do full justice, he should have covered the whole period from the 4th of March, 1829, and have brought before the Senate and the country all the particulars of twenty long years of proscription of one-half of the people of this country, as pure, patriotic, and intelligent as any. He should have called for papers appertaining to cases of multitudes, who, without fault or crime, have been, by successive democratic administrations, hurled out of office, in violation of pledges—yes, sir, PLEDGES—a thousand times stronger than any the honorable Senator can pretend to extract from the language used by the President in advance of his elevation to office.

There is often a most intimate connexion between old and new papers; and, indeed, no head of a Department can dispense the patronage appertaining thereto safely and properly without bringing into view the grounds on which his predecessor has acted in the particular case or office under consideration. The honorable Senator himself admits the principle when he says:

"I will suppose a case: A man deliberately engages in getting up and presenting false charges against an officer, in order to procure a removal, and is successful, and obtains a nomination for the place: if, when his name is presented for our approval, the evidence of his conduct should be furnished with it, should we not feel the information to be pertinent and important? There can be but one response to the interrogatory."

Now, if it would be proper for the Senate to reject a nomination on such grounds, surely it would be equally proper for the Executive to remove on the same grounds.

Now, Mr. President, I wonder why it did not occur to my honorable friend that, if we bring in the papers filed during the late administration, it may appear that some of the very men who have been turned out were concerned themselves in proscribing others. And I here produce what I doubt not will be deemed on the other side of the chamber highly satisfactory authority. It is an extract from a speech delivered early in Gen. Jackson's administration by the honorable Senator from Missouri, (Mr. BENTON,) in this chamber, wherein he says:

"It is incontestably true that many of those who have been dismissed, and not reappointed, were themselves the proscribers of those who were in their power; dismissing not only clerks and under officers for political opinions, but mechanics, workmen, and laborers."—*Vide Gales & Seaton's Reg. Deb., vol.* 11, *pt.* 1, *p.* 374.

Thus it would seem it is right for an administration coming into power to ascertain whether incumbents of office were concerned in proscribing others. Indeed, it is believed many of the appointees of President Taylor were turned out for political reasons; and no doubt it will appear, if we can see all the papers, that those who succeeded under the late administration were themselves participants in the enormity. Besides, may it not appear that, in some cases at least, the favorites of the late administration were appointed in defiance of public opinion in their respective localities, or on grounds which no just or good man can approve? In short, it is certain that there is and must, sir, be no small degree of sympathy between the papers (if papers there be) of the late and present administrations, and all must be brought into view to enable us to form a just appreciation of the true state of the cases. Therefore, I give notice that, if the resolution is persisted in, I shall move to amend it so as to substitute for the 4th of March, 1849, the 4th of March, 1845; and then we shall see how much ground the supporters of Mr. Polk have to complain of President Taylor.

2. The next particular, Mr. President, to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate is, that, by the resolution of the honorable Senator, the President is required to submit a statement of the removals which have taken place since he came into power, and to produce all the papers, without any exhibit of the cases in which he has refused to make removals.

Mr. President, what is the question before the Senate and before the country, to which the resolution and the speech of the honorable Senator relate? It is, or ought to be, what has been the entire policy of the President and his cabinet in dispensing the patronage of the Government? The resolution of the Senator calls only for the cases in which removals have actually taken place, while all cases of refusal to remove are carefully excluded; and this obviously comprises only one half of the subject. I do not hesitate to declare my full and entire belief that the cases in which the President and the various heads of departments, acting in conformity with his views, refused to dismiss, are more numerous than those in which removals have actually been made. What is more, I may state, upon the strength of what I deem reliable information, that democratic members of Congress have gone to the President and made appeals to him to save their political friends, and he, with a magnanimity peculiar to him, has spared them, and has thus given no small offence to his own supporters, and occasioned, perhaps, some damage to his administration.

Yes, sir, if the proof could be properly brought forward, it would be ascertained that honorable Senators who voted for this resolution have made such appeals in person, and made them successfully. It is indispensable that we should have before us the list of cases in which the President has refused to remove, to enable us to determine whether he has or has not been moderate, reasonable, just, and true. I venture to affirm that the names of those who held over will comprehend a larger portion of the Blue

Book than those that have been appointed under the present administration. I am strongly inclined to think, if the facts were fully developed, that the impression would be universal that injustice has been done to the whig party; but I am not disposed to scrutinize the matter very closely, for no man can be more dissatisfied than I am with the scrambling propensities of both the great political parties in this country. Every administration has been for a long time past tormented with office-seekers; and if we could get rid of them altogether, it would be a very great relief. I wish there could be a law made, as irreversible as that of the Medes and Persians, that no man coming to this city in pursuit of an office should be gratified.

Mr. FOOTE, (interposing.) I have not the least objection, Mr. President, to the honorable Senator's denouncing the whig party for its office-seeking propensities. I see no reason to doubt that he may be right in all he says in that regard. But when the honorable Senator includes both parties—when he speaks of the democratic party—I would suggest that it is hardly generous. The Senator should be too magnanimous to attack a party that is broken down and prostrate, as is the great democratic party of this country.

Mr. MANGUM. You are in a clear majority on this floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I do not consider the democratic party as *prostrate* so long as the honorable Senator from Mississippi is *incessantly on his legs*. [Laughter and demonstrations of applause, immediately checked by the Chair.] Mr. President, I only denounce the spirit of office-seeking which the spoils system has made so rife in the country, and those who make of politics a mere trade. There is not a more patriotic, a more intelligent, and a more virtuous body of men on earth than the whig party, taken as a whole, and I am willing to do justice to the masses of the democratic party. But the applicability of these considerations to the subject before us is too apparent to escape notice. Zachary Taylor is denounced and abused for making removals; but he receives no credit for the moderation, firmness, and sense of justice which he has displayed in cases equally if not more numerous, where he has resisted importunities and left his opponents in office. For his magnanimity he now receives a poor return—he may have carried it too far. The proceedings in this chamber would seem to indicate the necessity of a change of policy.

3. But I take another exception to the character of this resolution; and this is founded on the fact that it is a mere call for the charges filed, and not for reasons for removals. My friend says that he does not desire the reasons, or to quote his exact language, that "the resolution asks the President for information and not opinions." But, when we come to examine the resolution, we find it calls for "the charges preferred," i. e. for an inspection of papers, and not for information as to the grounds on which the Executive acted. Now, does not the Senator know (if he does not, every other member must) that removals are not made on *mere papers* in nine cases out of ten? The dispensation of patronage is or should be a matter of sound discretion and the exercise of an enlightened judgment. But papers are to be produced here without explanation; we are not to know whether the Executive did or did not act on them; we are to infer that they were all false, and that the persons dismissed are pure, worthy, and unexceptionable. The moment the papers fall into the hands of the honorable Senator, the conclusion is to be that they contain nothing but falsehoods and libels, on which the innocents of the democratic party have been sacrificed, without once stopping for a moment to ascertain whether they constituted the true basis of executive action. But I can show by good authority that this would be an exceedingly unjust treatment of the appointing power.

At the second session of the 23d Congress, a committee was raised in the Senate to inquire into the abuses practised in the Post Office Department, of which Mr. Grundy was chairman, and they made the following requisition on Major Barry, then Postmaster General:

"To send to the committee all the original letters and papers in his possession concerning the removal of H. Stafford and the appointment of H. Herron, as deputy postmaster at Putnam, Ohio."

The resolution simply called for the papers in a single case, and not, as now, for all the papers on file in the respective departments in this city, in a vast multitude of cases, according to the representations of the honorable Senator. Major Barry gave a response of unusual ability, from which I shall quote extensively hereafter, in which he says, (speaking of removals and appointments:)

"The head of the Department might have been governed by reasons within his own knowledge, but not stated in any document received by him."—*Vide House Doc., 2d sess. 23d Cong., Rep. Com., No. 103, p. 690.*

Now, I have to say that if any high officer of the Government were to form a judgment on papers merely, it would be a monstrous dereliction of duty. Major Barry utterly refused to comply with the request of Mr. Grundy's committee, and took the very exception on which I now rely. He insisted it could not be safely inferred that any papers on file constituted the real basis of his judgment. But the honorable Senator does not want "the opinions" of the Executive. Ah! Will you not give the President and the heads of Departments an opportunity to say whether they did or did not consider or give effect to the papers, and, if so, to what extent? Nothing is more notorious than that recommendations and representations of all sorts can be obtained with the utmost facility, and no wise or prudent man will rely on them for a moment. Hence executive officers must depend, in a good degree, on their own knowledge and the opinions of members of Congress, (usually verbally expressed,) and of other reliable friends. The mere production of papers without explanations is, then, only calculated to deceive and mislead.

4. The procedure contemplated must impose on the Senate an endless task, if there be the slightest disposition here to do justice to the Executive, and to presume otherwise would be disrespectful to the body. The idea predominating in the mind of the Senator seems to be that, on the production of the papers, we are to presume that all the suggestions and allegations therein contained are basely false; and that, too, without knowing whether the Departments gave them the slightest credence: whereas the

plainest dictates of justice would require a thorough investigation in each case, and a reference to the appropriate committee, with power to send for persons and papers, and an inquiry as full as it shall be solemn. So that we are to have innumerable lawsuits raised in this chamber, or we are to jump to conclusions that will do the greatest injustice to all concerned. Where will all this end? The impossibility of making any just or proper use of the information sought constitutes an insuperable objection to the proposed call.

5. As a further development of the partial and injurious character of this resolution, I invite attention to the fact that the information is to be gathered up (at what expense I know not, and when, no one can tell; certainly not at this session,) and brought into the Senate sitting in its legislative capacity, and exhibited to what end? To enable the Senator, as he would have us believe, to discharge properly his executive duties. Then, it would seem that all considerations which induce the Senate, when considering questions of removals and appointments, to sit with closed doors, are to be set aside? Why did he not make this call in executive session? Was it because the accents of abuse which have fallen from the Senator's lips would not thus reach the public ear? A little sound doctrine from Major Barry's letter to Mr. Grundy's committee will serve to convince the Senator that I cherish more of the sound democratic spirit and principle which predominated under the auspices of President Jackson, than would seem now to prevail, if we are to take this resolution as a fair expression of the progressiveness of modern times. Major Barry says:

"The impropriety of yielding to an indiscriminate call for letters and papers is obvious to all who will reflect on the subject. Much of the correspondence of the Department is necessarily in its nature strictly confidential, and the injunction is imposed by the writers. They do not usually consider the importance of separating confidential matter from that which is not so. Hence, in many cases, the same communication contains both, and it would be impossible to separate them. In such cases, the Postmaster General could not, with any degree of propriety, yield the papers; were he to do so, all confidence between him and his correspondents would be at an end. Facts and the opinions of individuals of credit and respectability in the neighborhood, respecting the conduct, character, and capacity of persons in office, and of applicants for appointment, would be withheld from the Department. No one who regards his domestic comfort, and the peace of his neighborhood, would venture to state matters that would lead to recrimination, controversy, and litigation. In cases of mail depredations, which often lead to removals from office, it is all important that the Department should invite free communications, both as to facts and opinions. By these means it is enabled to make discoveries."

"It often happens that, in these inquiries, which are daily going on, circumstances are communicated which would seem to implicate persons who are found, upon a full examination, to be entirely innocent. The publication of such papers would be an act of cruel injustice, as well to the accusers as the accused, and put neighborhoods at enmity that are now in peace and harmony. If the Postmaster General should yield to an unlimited call for papers, all confidence will be withdrawn from the Department. Depredations and defaults of every description will take place, not only on the part of postmasters, but of contractors and other agents; the power of restraints over subordinates will, to a great extent, be at an end, and the wholesome control now exercised will cease to exist."

Bring in all the papers, I say, from the 4th of March, 1845, (to say nothing about the 4th of March, 1829,) and then we shall see how many lawsuits will be raised, and how much disorder and confusion will be created in the country!

6. The next point which I make is, that, if the allegations of the honorable Senator are true, the President has been guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors. If the members of the House believe one-half of what the Senator has said, it is their duty to impeach the President. An abuse of the removing or appointing power is an impeachable offence. This was admitted by the leading statesmen who held seats in the first Congress, many of whom were concerned in framing the Constitution itself. Is it the object of the Senator to qualify himself for trying the articles of impeachment? What would be his situation, and what the situation of the Senate, (should this resolution pass,) if an impeachment shall be instituted? It would seem to be the object of the Senator to qualify us to sit in judgment on the President when he comes to be publicly arraigned. But it is the duty of the House to prefer charges, and not that of the Senate to ascertain their truth in advance. The House is "the grand inquest of the nation," and the Senate has "the sole power to try all impeachment." This very distinction was taken by Major Barry, in the case of the deputy postmaster at Putnam, Ohio. He wholly refused the information to the committee of the Senate, of which Mr. Grundy was chairman, but promptly communicated it to the committee of the House, of which Mr. Connor was chairman, saying:

"A similar call was made by a committee of the Senate, whose authority to inquire into the motives and reasons which might have influenced a department of the Executive branch of the Government in the exercise of power vested in it by laws I could not recognise. * * * But there is a difference in the authority of the two Houses from whose committees the call has emanated. The House of Representatives constitutes the grand inquest for impeachment, and, when acting in view of that object, may rightfully examine into the inducements which were presented to the Postmaster General for making a removal or appointment, and his motives for performing such act. And although I have not been apprized of any such object in calling for these papers, yet, presuming in this case that the call was made for a legitimate purpose, within the scope of the powers of the committee, I have thought proper on the present occasion to furnish the whole of the correspondence required by their resolution, without excepting any portion of it whatever.—*Vide House Docs., 2d sess. 23d Cong., Rep. Committees, No.* 103, *p.* 689.

7. In the next place, I have to observe that this is a call on the President to furnish means to criminate himself, to which I shall permit President Jackson to state the objection. In his answer to Mr. Wise's committee, already referred to, he says:

"The first proceeding of the investigating committee is to pass a series of resolutions, which, though amended on their passage were, as understood, introduced by you, calling on the President and heads of the Departments not to answer any specific charge, not to explain any alleged abuse, not to give information as to any particular transaction, but assuming they have been guilty of the charges alleged, calls on them to furnish evidence against themselves. * * * In open violation of the Constitution and of that well-established and wise maxim, that all men are presumed to be innocent until proved guilty according to the established rules of law, you request myself and the heads of Departments to become our own accusers, and to furnish the evidence to convict ourselves; and this call purports to be founded on the authority of that body in which alone, by the Constitution, the power of impeaching us is vested. * * * I shall resist all such attempts as an invasion of the principles of justice as well as of the Constitution, and I shall esteem it my sacred duty to the people of the United States to resist them as I would the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition."—*Vide House Documents, 2d sess. 24th Cong., Reps. of Committees, No.* 194, *p.* 23.

In the same document, page 45, Mr. Forsyth, says:

"Self respect forbids a reply as to myself; as to my predecessors, I should not become their accuser if they had committed errors, and certainly shall not vindicate them while following their example."

It appears from the same document, page 46, that Amos Kendall, then Postmaster General; from do. page 47, Levi Woodbury, Secretary of the Treasury; from do., page 48, Mahlon Dickerson, Secretary of the Navy; and from the journal of same committee, page 32, B. F. Butler, acting Secretary of War, gave similar answers.

It thus appears that my honorable friend has introduced a procedure here in the nature of the Spanish inquisition. "I shall resist it," exclaims President Jackson, "as I would the establishment of the Spanish inquisition." And therefore I suppose I shall do no injustice to the Senator if I consider him as the grand inquisitor.

8. In speaking of the injurious character of this resolution, I must not omit a very extraordinary paragraph in the speech of the honorable Senator, which is as follows:

"If any friend of the Administration will, in his place here, on its behalf, candidly acknowledge that these pledges and professions, made previous to the election, and reaffirmed in the inaugural address, have been violated, and that 'democrats are removed because they are democrats, and not for moral or official delinquency'—if he will make these frank admisiions, and thus relieve honorable and honest men who have suffered proscription for their political opinions from the unjust imputation of dishonesty, infidelity, or incapacity, I repeat, I will not ask for the adoption of the resolution."

With respect to the suggestion that the parties removed were laboring under unjust imputations, for the reason stated, that can be shown to be groundless on authority which the Senator must respect, being that of the opinions of the late Mr. Grunby, one of the leaders of the Democratic party. In a debate which took place in this chamber on the 18th of February, 1835, that gentleman said:

"It is no disparagement to a man's standing or character that another individual has been found who can perform the duties of the office as well as he can, and that another has been appointed in his place. If the office has been advantageous and profitable, he should not enjoy the whole benefits in preference to all his contemporaries. On the other hand, if the office has been burdensome, he ought, in proper time, to be relieved from it."—*Vide Gales & Seaton's Register of Debates, vol.* 11, *part* 1. *p.* 531.

These opinions were expressed by Mr. Grundy, in face of avowals by President Jackson, as to grounds of removals analogous to those of President Taylor, to which the Senator refers; and hence there is no foundation for the pretence that the information is wanted to relieve the parties removed from imputation. But, if the fact be otherwise, how does the Senator propose to relieve them? By sacrificing the character of the President of the United States for honor and rectitude. The honorable member, after enumerating about a score of supposed breaches of faith, which he calls "the grand result," coolly proposes, that if his friends "will candidly acknowledge" that Zachary Taylor has violated his word, he will not press his resolution. It is manifest, then, that the resolution is introduced for no practical purpose whatever. No useful measure of legislation is to be founded upon it; nothing for the benefit of the toiling millions in this great country. But we are required to admit that the noble man at the head of our Government is infamous, or we are to lie under the terrors of this resolution. Does the honorable Senator really suppose that we are about to acknowledge that he who has spent his whole life in the service of his country—who has won for the stars and stripes an imperishable renown, and whose purity and integrity no man ever doubted before—has all at once become the basest of mankind? Mr. President, I hold no such commission; and if any one should attempt to impose it upon me, every impulse of my heart would lead me to spurn it.

Having thus fully developed the injurious character of this resolution, I leave it in the hands of the Senate, and I bid the Senator welcome to any laurels which he is likely to win in such a contest.

But, Mr. President, it will now be my duty to examine in some detail the basis upon which my honorable friend has erected his whole superstructure of reprehension of the Chief Magistrate of this country. The honorable Senator takes generally the ground that the President and his friends gave a series of pledges to the country, in advance of the late presidential election, of a distinct and specific character, and he insists that the effect of these pledges was such as to impose upon the present Executive the obligation to remove no one from office, except for reasons that would lay a just foundation for impeachment. He holds out the idea that these pledges or assurances were so binding upon the President, that it was not competent for him to make a single removal from any department of the public service, without giving notice to the party interested, and without affording him an opportunity to be heard, to examine witnesses, and to defend himself by counsel. And where does the Senator find his basis for such an exposition as this? It is to be found, in the main, in certain extracts made from seven letters of the President, communicated to the public in advance of the late presidential election, on remarks made by some two or three of his leading friends during the canvass, and in a few short sentences produced from the President's inaugural address.

Now, I have to say, in the first place, that very great injustice has been done to President Taylor in regard to this correspondence. I utterly deny, and I can prove conclusively, that he never made any assurances or gave pledges of any sort in reference to this matter. While I cannot doubt that my honorable friend, in making the selections from the seven letters referred to, acted in good faith, yet I will say that if the most ingenious man in the country had been employed to select passages from the correspondence of the President, which would give a view of his position more injurious than any other, he certainly could not have been more successful than the honorable gentleman has been in bringing forward these extracts. Indeed, I have very seriously doubted whether he made them himself, and I have been led to suspect that he must have taken them from some of the political effusions of the day, or, in other words, that it was the work of some newspaper editor, whose object was to traduce and slander the President. But if the honorable Senator made these selections, I have to say to him and to the Senate, that it is entirely apparent that he could not have been as conversant as I was with what I may properly call the Taylor literature of 1848. The honorable gentleman seems not to have been at all conversant with that sort of literature; and if he had been as diligent and as thorough a student of it as I was, I am very sure that my friend would have made a much more just and faithful exhibition of this entire matter than he has done.

Now, sir, before I proceed to recur to this subject in detail, I wish to make some preliminary remarks. In the first place, I would observe that there is no sort of doubt but that, when the idea was first suggested to President Taylor that he could by any possibility be elected President of the United States, he received that suggestion with the utmost repugnance. I believe he is not the first man in the history of the country, or rather the first man who has held the presidential office, who felt and expressed a similar repugnance. I have always understood that General Jackson, when the idea was first communicated to him of his being a candidate for the presidency, received it not only with incredulity, but almost with contempt and ridicule. Every one knowing any thing of the character of the President must be convinced that he felt a sincere aversion to having his name brought before the public in connexion with the presidential office in any form. At this period, sir, he was at the head of our army in Mexico, and he believed that it was improper for him, occupying the position he did, commanding Whigs and Democrats, to consent to become a party candidate for the presidency. And this he explains in a letter addressed to Capt. Allison, dated at East Pascagoula, Sept. 4, 1848, as follows:

"I was surrounded by whigs and democrats, who had stood by me in the trying hours of my life, and whom it was my destiny to conduct through scenes of greater trial. My duty to that army, and to the republic whose battles we were waging, forbade my assuming a position of seeming hostility to any portion of the brave men under my command—all of whom knew I was a whig in principle, for I made no concealment of my political sentiments or predilections. Such had been the violence of our party struggles during our late presidential elections that the acceptance of a nomination, under the rigorous interpretations given to the obligations of a candidate presented to the public with a formulary of political principles, was equivalent almost to a declaration of uncompromising enmity to all who did not subscribe to its tenets. I was unwilling to hazard the effects of such a relationship towards any of the soldiers under my command, when in front of an enemy common to us all. It would have been unjust in itself, and it was repugnant to my own feelings as it was to my duty. I wanted unity in the army, and forebore any act that might sow the seeds of distrust and discord in the ranks."

There can be no doubt, Mr. President, that General Taylor, thus situated, and having a very strong repugnance to having his name brought into the canvass for the presidency, did write letters, and many letters, containing expressions like those produced by the honorable Senator from Maine. But many of these letters were never intended for publication; they were private letters, but were very indiscreetly thrown before the public by the persons to whom they were addressed. Referring to this very subject, the President, in the letter last quoted, says:

"Had these letters and scraps of letters been published, or construed in connexion with what I have heretofore said on this subject, I should not now have to complain of the speed with which my answers to isolated questions have been given up to the captious criticism of those who have been made my enemies, by a nomination which has been tendered to me without solicitation or arrangement of mine, or of the manner in which selected passages in some of my letters, written in the freedom and carelessness of a confidential correspondence, have been communicated to the public press."

Yes, sir, many men wrote letters to General Taylor, and he responded to them with the frankness of a soldier and of an honest man; and, wishing to obtain some notoriety in their respective neighborhoods, they very improperly threw those answers into the public press, giving them over to the captious criticism of those who had become his political enemies, simply because his name had been brought before the country in connexion with the presidential office. The President, in the letter last referred to, adds:

"But, riven from the context, and separated from a series of explanatory facts and circumstances which are, in so far as this canvass is concerned, historical, they are as deceptive as though they were positive fabrications."

Now, I do not say that the honorable Senator, in grouping together, as he has done, a few isolated passages, intended to mislead and deceive the public. I know nothing of that honorable Senator but what is adapted to inspire me with confidence and respect; but, in the language of the President, I do say that this collection of extracts, brought together in the manner they have been, are just as deceptive and as well calculated to mislead as if they had been *positive fabrications.*

In order to do justice to this subject, it is necessary for every man to draw a broad line of distinction between the earlier and the later correspondence of the President. In the first instance, it was his purpose not to be brought before the country as the candidate of any party, and he said so over and over again. He wrote many letters undoubtedly when such was his purpose, and I will directly produce extracts and submit them to the Senate. But, after a considerable period of time, he became convinced that, if his name was to be used in connexion with that office at all, with success, it must be on a nomination by one of the great parties of this country. It is obvious that the idea which many of his friends entertained, that he or any other man, no matter how distinguished, could be brought forward and elected President of the United States as an independent candidate, was utterly preposterous.

I repeat, it is undoubtedly true that, being utterly averse to having his name used in that connexion; feeling a sincere doubt as to his qualifications to discharge the duties of that high office; taking into consideration his position, then at the head of the army, he did take the ground, and did so over and over again, that he would not become a mere party candidate; that he did not desire the office, but preferred that some one of the eminent civilians of the country should be raised to that exalted position, and more than once indicated a gentleman, now a member of this body, (Mr. CLAY,) as being his choice in preference to all others, as he certainly was, on the score of experience, abilities, and a long life of devotion to his country, my choice. For I say here that I have ever preferred a trained statesman for the presidency to any man who has been brought up to the profession of arms. I do not say that I prefer any civilian to any military character by any means. I prefer President Taylor to many of the civilians of this country, for whom I have generally a high respect.

Now, sir, I ask the indulgence of this body in recurring to this earlier correspondence, with a view of presenting it to the Senate and to the country in its true light, and to show that in that correspondence the President assumed no obligation such as the Senator from Maine insists.

In the first place, I call the attention of the Senate to passages in this earlier correspondence, in which he declared that *he would give no pledge whatever, and would reach the Presidency, if at all, untrammelled by obligations of this kind.*

1. In a letter dated at Monterey, July 6, 1847, he says:

"I can only say, with all candor, that if elected to that office, (the presidency,) it must be by the spontaneous will of the people at large, and without agency or *pledge on my part in any particular*."

2. In a letter dated at Monterey, August 3, 1847, he says:

"If I am to occupy the White House, it must be by the spontaneous movement of the people, without any action of mine in relation to it—*without pledges* other than I have previously stated—a strict adherence to the provisions of the Constitution; so I could enter on the arduous and responsible duties appertaining to said office *untramelled;* so that I could be the President of the country, and not of a party."

3. In a letter dated at Monterey, August 10, 1847, he uses language to the same effect:

"That he would not submit to the exaction of any other *pledge* as to his course than that of discharging his functions according to his ability, and strictly in accordance with the requirements of the constitution."

4. In a letter dated at Monterey, September 23, 1847, he declines expressing

"Any sentiment having the nature of a *pledge to any political party*."

5. In a letter dated at Baton Rouge, February 12, 1848, he says:

"I deem it but candid, however, to add, that if the whig party desire at the next presidential election to cast their votes for me, they must do it on their own responsibility, and *without any pledges from me*."

6. In a letter dated at Baton Rouge, February 28, 1848, he says:

"I have no aspirations for civil office, and am only a candidate so far as the good people of the country has made me so; and *those who are not willing to vote for me for the presidency without pledges*, let them cast their votes at the proper time for those who will make them."

7. In his letter to Captain J. S. Allison, dated at Baton Rouge, on the 22d of April, 1848, he says:

"One who cannot be trusted WITHOUT PLEDGES cannot be confided in merely on account of them."

We have here, then, this extraordinary state of the case. The Senator from Maine insists that the President did give pledges, and the most positive pledges—and that, too, at a period when he was asseverating that he would do no such thing!—that if he was to fill the office of President, he would go into it wholly *untramelled*, and would then take any position that he might be pleased to take; that he would place himself at the head of either of the great parties, or neither of them, and remove from office or not as he might see fit. And yet the honorable Senator contends that though the President found (as I can demonstrate) nine-tenths of the offices in the hands of his political opponents, and enjoyed by a party who had carried on the prospective system for twenty long years, he was under a solemn pledge not to remove from office, the President saying all the while that he would give no pledges. I have this to say, in regard to the extracts presented by the honorable member, that he, or some one for him, has steered entirely clear of every passage in this correspondence in which this declaration of the President is contained. A vast ingenuity hrs been displayed in this regard. There is in no one of those extracts the word "pledge" or "pledges," except in the last; and there it is used in a manner not to produce the slightest impression upon the public mind. How comes it about that the honorable Senator has omitted entirely all those repeated and reiterated declarations of the President that he would give no pledges, and that when he came into the President's office he would do just as he pleased; that he would discharge the duties of that office as he felt bound in conscience to do, and according to the constitution? If my honorable friend ever publishes another edition of his speech, (I understand it has gone through several,) I hope he will state in a foot note that President Taylor said repeatedly that he would make no pledges of any sort; and then the conclusions of the public will be against the whole tenor of the Senator's speech, and in conformity to justice and truth.

In the next place, I call the attention of the Senate to a series of passages in the earlier letters of General Taylor, in which he declared that he would not be the candidate of any mere party, and would not consent to be elevated to the presidential office except by a spontaneous expression of the public will.

1. In a letter dated at Monterey, May 18, 1846, he says:

"In no case can I permit myself to be the *candidate of any party*, or yield myself to *party schemes*."

2. In a letter dated at Monterey, July 6, 1847, he says:

"I do not desire the presidency, and only yield thus far my assent to be considered a candidate in the same proportion in which it is desired by the people, *irrespective of party*."

3. In a letter dated at Monterey, July 13, 1847, he says:

"I am not willing to become the candidate of *any party*, *to pledge myself* to any political creed, save that which proceeds directly from the constitution, and the best and paramount interests of the country, and which they solemnly demand."

4. In a letter dated at Baton Rouge, January 23, 1848, he says:

"I shall offer no active opposition to the use of my name in connexion with this responsible office, (the presidency,) as long as they continue to use it *independent of party* distinctions."

In extract No. 1 the President says he will not "yield himself to party schemes." Now, I can name one scheme to which the President has not, and will not, yield himself; and that is, the great predominating scheme of the Democratic party, to hold on to all the offices in the country, and to deter the Executive from making salutary reforms by clamor and abuse. The realization of this scheme lies very near the democratic heart of the country. I dare say this was one of the schemes which the President had in his mind when he made this declaration. And then it will be observed that in extract No. 3 he again recurs to the subject of pledges, and it would seem impossible for him to write a paragraph of four lines without eschewing all such obligations.

Well, sir, the President undoubtedly at one time said (vide extracts above) that he would not be a mere party candidate. What is the inference which the honorable Senator draws from that? That when he should reach the presidency, he would be a no-party President; that he would take no ground; connect himself with no party; call for the support of no class of the American people; sympathize with no portion of our fellow-citizens, and would expect none to symyathize with him. Now, I desire to ask, in all candor, what an expression of the views of the President, in regard to the position in which he chose to stand before the public as a candidate, has to do with his conduct after he comes into office? Is it

fair, is it ingenuous, to seize hold of an expression which related merely to his position as a candidate, and undertake to infer from that an obligation to administer the presidential office in a particular way? After all, Mr. President, this is only another form of asserting that he would not give pledges. He knew perfectly well that to consent to become the candidate for the presidency of any party would involve a pledge, and a very high pledge, too; and I never heard of but one man in the history of this country, (I do not choose to name him here,) who did not feel the binding obligation of that pledge. Sir, if any man accepts the nomination of any party, and goes in consequence to the head of this Government, he is bound by the very highest of all obligation to administrate that Government in general conformity with the views of those who elevate him to the presidential office; and I say this has been acknowledged by every President who has held that office from 1789 down to the present day, with a single exception, constituting a very remarkable case of perfidy in the civil history of this country, in my judgment not less infamous than the perfidy which marked our military annals at an early day. The President understood this very well. He knew that if he consented to become the candidate of the Whig party, he would come under the obligation of pledges; and the language now referred to was only another form of saying that he would give pledges to no party or body of men whatever.

III. In the next place, I invite the attention of the Senate to passages from this same class of letters, in which the President said that he would not, if elected, lend himself to party schemes, and would be the President of the people.

1. In a letter dated Monterey, July 20, 1847, he said:

"Should I ever occupy the White House, it must be by the spontaneous move of the people, and by no act of mine; so that I could enter on the duties appertaining to the Chief Magistrate of the country *untrammelled and unpledged*, beyond what I have previously stated as regards the Constitution; *so that I could and would be the President of the nation, and not of a party.*"

2. In a letter dated at Baton Rouge, February 12, 1848, he says:

"Should I be elected to that office, (the presidency,) I should deem it to be my duty, and should most certainly claim the right, to look to the Constitution and to the high interest of our common country, and not to the *principles, of a party*, for my rule of action."

3. In a letter dated at Baton Rouge, May 1, 1848, he says:

"I must be permitted to add that as they have with so much confidence placed my name before the country on their own responsibility, free from *party action* and *the exaction of pledges from myself*, I shall serve them humbly as a constitutional and *not* a *party President*, (in the event already alluded to,) and as my ability will permit."

I find in "The Campaign," (a paper published in this city to promote the election of Gen. Cass,) of September 27, 1848, the following view of this part of Gen. Taylor's correspondence:

"It is eminently ridiculous to speak of a candidate being so much of a party man as to prevent him being the President of the whole country. Why, the President's oath of office settles that matter—party candidate or no party candidate. The fact is, this phrase, which has appeared so often in General Taylor's letters, means just nothing at all."

This I suppose appeared about the same time in the Union. Then, when the object was to defeat Gen. Taylor, the declaration referred to meant "just nothing at all," but now, when the object is to slander and abuse him, it means a great deal.

Mr. Polk, in his inaugural address, held similar language, as follows:

"Although in our country the Chief Magistrate must almost of necessity be chosen by a party, and stand pledged to its principles and measures, yet, in his official action, he should not be the President of a party only, but of the whole people of the United States. While he executes the laws with an impartial hand, shrinks from no proper responsibility, and faithfully carries out in the Executive department of the Government the principles and policy of those who have chosen him, he should not be unmindful that our fellow-citizens who have differed with him in opinion are entitled to the full and free exercise of their opinions and judgments, and that the rights of all are entitled to respect and regard."

Nothing in any of the letters of President Taylor can be stronger than this; and yet Mr. Polk was (as will appear hereafter) by far the most proscriptive President that has hitherto administered this Government. The whole argument of the honorable Senator can be directed to prove the late President guilty of treachery and breach of faith.

IV. I come now to the last of the series of extracts to be produced from the same letters, in which the President declared himself to be a whig, and to sympathize with that great party in principle and opinion.

1. In a letter dated at Monterey, July 21, 1846, he says:

"Although no politician, having always held myself aloof from the clamors of party politics, I am a whig, and shall ever be devoted in individual opinion to the principles of that party."

2. In a letter dated at Monterey, August 3, 1847, he says:

"At the last presidential canvass, without interfering in any way with the same, it was well known to all with whom I mixed, both whigs and democrats, (for I had no concealment in the matter,) that I was decidedly in favor of Mr. Clay's election, and would now prefer seeing him in that office to any individual in the Union, certainly much more so at any time than myself. Independent of his great talents and long experience in government affairs, I consider his views and those of the whigs, for the most part, are more nearly assimilated, as regards political matters, to those of Mr. Jefferson than those of their opponents."

He then adds, that he was reared in Mr. Jefferson's political creed and opinions in matters of State, and had never lost sight of them, conforming thereto as near as circumstances would permit.

3. In a letter dated at Baton Rouge, Feb. 12, 1848, he says:

"I have no hesitation in stating, as I have stated on former occasions, that *I am a whig, though not an ultra one*, and that I have no desire to conceal this fact from any portion of the people of the United States."

4. In his first Allison letter, dated at Baton Rouge, April 22, 1848, he says:

"I reiterate what I have often said: *I am a whig, but not an ultra whig.* If elected, I would not be the mere President of a party. I would endeavor to act independent of party *domination.* I should feel bound to administer the Government untrammelled by party schemes."

And here, Mr. President, is the proper place to take notice of a paragraph in the honorable Senator's (Mr. Bradbury's) speech, which has awakened much surprise in my mind. The Senator says:

"He occupied a different position from that of other candidates for that high office, who were his competitors at the Philadelphia Convention. They could present no such varied claims. They could make no such pledges and professions. They were conspicuous members of a political party whose principles were well understood; and they could not claim to place themselves independent of party. His great competitor from the West never hesitated to make the avowal to the people of the country, 'I am a whig.' And the distinguished statesman from the North, who stood in the same position, gave the same response."

Here is a plain intimation that General Taylor did not and would not claim that he was a whig; and that, too, when his whole correspondence is filled with asseverations to that effect. Is this fair? Is it ingenuous?

I have thus carefully analyzed all the earlier correspondence of the President; and what does it amount to? It is apparent that he would not give express pledges, and equally certain that he was determined to avoid the pledges implied by becoming the candidate of a party; but, at the same time, we see clearly that he was a whig, though not an ultra one, and that he was "devoted in individual opinion to the principles of that party."

How is it that the honorable Senator deduces the conclusions stated in his speech from such a source? How can he, with any show of fairness, contend that the President pledged himself even in his earlier letters to any particular course? If he had been elevated to the presidency on the platform or basis thus presented, would he not have been at liberty to act as a sound judgment, a well-informed understanding, and an honest heart might dictate? I cheerfully refer the entire matter to the appreciation of such Senators as desire to do justice, and to the arbitrament of an enlighted public sentiment.

But, sir, I now come to the essential part of the case—to the later correspondence of the President, and to the position which he saw fit to take at the Philadelphia Convention. We all know that he has been reproached with inconsistency in this regard. The most unqualified abuse has been poured out upon him for daring to become the candidate of the Whig party. It has been assumed that if any man once takes the ground he will not be a candidate, or, if so, only on conditions, he is committed irretrievably, and cannot depart one hair from his position without dishonor. Nothing can be more false than this. He may say, at one time, he will not be a candidate, and alter his mind at a subsequent period, provided he does not compromit and embarrass a candidate or candidates who have become such in the faith of his assurances. At the time the letters were written on which the honorable Senator relies, there were no presidential candidates in the field—it was all preliminary to the selection of candidates. Before any convention was held, he manifested a change of purpose, and at the Philadelphia Convention it was proclaimed so as to be understood and known of all men. The brave old soldier acted with his characteristic frankness. The reasons which originally induced him to insist that he could not be the candidate of any party having ceased, he concluded to let his name go before that body, to be considered in connexion with those of other distinguished citizens. Judges Winchester and Saunders (both delegates from Louisiana) appeared as his representatives, and the latter, in behalf of the President, read the following statement:

"General Taylor, we are also authorized to say, will hail with entire satisfaction any nomination besides himself, being persuaded that the welfare of our country REQUIRES A CHANGE OF MEN AND MEASURES, in order to arrest the downward tendency of our national affairs. On making this announcement, the delegates of Louisiana wish it to be distinctly understood that it involves no inconsistency on the part of General Taylor, in case the choice of this convention should fall on another. If General Taylor's friends in this convention withdraw him, it will be their act and not his; and by the act of uniting with this convention, his friends withdraw his name from the canvass, unless he be the nominee of this convention; and we deem it proper to assure the Whigs of the Union, that we desire the nomination and election of General Taylor to the presidency on no other than national grounds."

I find nothing about "A CHANGE OF MEN AND MEASURES, in order to arrest the downward tendency of our national affairs" in the speech of the honorable Senator. Will he have the goodness to put this also in a foot-note?

The position thus announced by his friends, he afterwards adopted and ratified in a letter to the independents of Baltimore, dated at Baton Rouge, June 29, 1848:

"I substantially informed them further, (Judges Winchester and Saunders,) that unless they should discover an evident disposition to treat me unfairly, which I had no reason for supposing would be the case, I thought that my frrends should go into the convention, as they had been selected by their fellow-citizens for this purpose; but that, having once entered it, they were of course bound, if I were not nominated, to sustain and support the nominee, whoever he might be, and that I hoped they would do so, heart and soul." * * * * * * *

"Under the general authority, then, thus given these gentlemen, (Judges Winchester and Saunders,) I shall deem whatever statements they may have made to be right and proper; and, confident in their integrity, and in the sincerity of their friendship for me, I shall sustain them without qualification. I now, therefore, take upon my own shoulders the responsibility of the acts of the Louisiana delegation, and am prepared to stand by their consequences, in their length and breadth."

And then he adds:

"I cannot expect or desire that any of my friends whom you represent should do violence to their own sense of right and wrong, by supporting my election, while they believe I have changed my political views."

The effect of this communication on the independents of Baltimore was their immediate disorganization, and a discontinuance of their organ, called the Buena Vista. In the last number thereof, the editors say:

"It is needless for us to say that the ground on which we have heretofore stood in our support of General Taylor is thus taken from under us deliberately and unequivocally by the individual in whose behalf we assumed it, and there can be neither doubt nor difficulty in regard to the alternative which such a state of things presents to us. * * * The act of the Louisiana delegation we treat as General Taylor's act. It is his in its length and breadth—consistent or inconsistent—in good faith or bad faith, fair or false, it is all his."

Thus General Taylor became the candidate of the Whig party. In no other way could he have been either nominated or elected. Having been a member of that convention, I am free to say that my ultimate vote for him, after I had given a full expression to the predominating sentiment of my own State in favor of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was based wholly on this ground. He had submitted his pretensions to the arbitrament of that body, and not only agreed to abide its decision, but even insisted that his friends should "sustain and support the nominee, whoever he might be, heart and soul," upon the principle that "a change of men and measures" was indispensable "to arrest the downward tendency of our national affairs." The nomination of the Senator from Kentucky having become unattainable, and General Taylor having placed himself before the body on the precise ground occupied by his distinguished competitors, I went over to him, I admit, mainly for the reason I believed him to be *available*, having at the same time the utmost confidence in his rectitude, and also in his

ability to administer the Government. He was nominated and elected, and is now the Chief Magistrate of this great republic. He has, in the eyes of the Democracy, committed the unpardonable sin of daring to be the President of the United States. He has been too successful, and has too strong a hold on the confidence and affections of the American people.

The honorable member refers to some remarks made in and out of Congress by the leading friends of the President on his views in regard to the proscriptive policy. He says that the Hon. Mr. Crittenden declared, at some public meeting, that he (the President) "hates, loathes, proscription;" and that the present Secretary of State (Mr. Clayton) made in this chamber suggestions to the same effect. To say nothing of the injustice of holding any candidate for the Presidency responsible for the views presented by his friends in various parts of the country, I maintain that there has been nothing in his course that conflicts with these statements. I should suppose that, coming into office and finding the whole Government in the hands of one party, and those his political opponents, who had obtained their situations by proscribing the rest of their fellow-citizens—a party that have maintained their proscriptive policy resolutely for a long course of years—I should think, sir, that finding himself thus situated, if he "hated and loathed proscription," the very first measures which he would adopt would be to proscribe proscription itself, by making a reasonable and suitable number of removals and changes. Has it not occurred to the honorable Senator that the President would have been a proscriber if he had continued proscription, and just as responsible as if he had introduced it originally? It is precisely for the reason that he is opposed to that detestable system that his whole course can be vindicated and sustained.

I postpone to a subsequent part of my remarks all comment on the charges against the President, based on an extract from his inaugural address, importing that he should make "honesty, capacity, and fidelity indispensable prerequisites to the bestowal of office, and that the absence of either of these qualities would be deemed sufficient cause for removal," as I wish to hold these sentiments up in contrast with similar language used by several Democratic Presidents on occasion of their induction into office.

I will now proceed, Mr. President, to adduce other evidence in confirmation of the position which I have assumed. My honorable friend holds out the idea (though he does not say so in so many words) that General Taylor came into the canvass and suffered his name to be submitted to the consideration of the people in an equivocal attitude—that there was something doubtful in his position, and that solely in consequence of this he was enabled to reach the highest office in their gift. On the contrary, I insist that his position was unequivocal; that he was a Whig candidate for the Presidency, and was understood to be such by the Democracy throughout the length and breadth of the land. After he was nominated by the Philadelphia Convention, and had accepted that nomination, he was a party candidate, and was admitted to be such on all hands. He was the Whig candidate for the Presidency precisely in the same sense that the honorable Senator from Michigan (Mr. Cass) was the Democratic candidate, and his election was resisted upon that ground throughout the country. This is the inevitable conclusion from his correspondence; and my object now is, to confirm that conclusion (if confirmation be necessary) by authority which I am sure honorable Senators will receive with respect.

I might, if I pleased, refer to the testimony of the public press, which would be legitimate on a mere question of fact, but I choose to recur to much higher sources for proof.

Up to the period when the result of the State election in Pennsylvania (October, 1848) was known, the Democracy in this city reposed in fancied security. They had not the slightest doubt of success at the great struggle in November. They were taken completely by surprise by that event, and, indeed, could not have been more astonished if a thunderbolt had fallen in their midst. With the utmost trepidation and alarm, they addressed themselves to the work of warding off, if possible, impending ruin; and, among other measures, on the 20th of October, got up a procession, and marched to the house of the Hon. Mr. Buchanan, then Secretary of State, on F street, where he delivered them an address, characterized with his usual ability, from which I submit the following extract:

"Let no Democrat lay the flattering unction to his soul, that General Taylor's Administration would not be a proscriptive Whig Administration." * * * "A Whig himself, elected by Whigs, and surrounded by a Whig Cabinet, he would be compelled, by the necessities of his position, to carry into effect Whig measures and Whig principles. Indeed, he would prove faithless to his party if he were to pursue any other course!"

Thus, Mr. Buchanan anticipated removals in the event of the election of General Taylor; but, in conformity with the uniform course of his party, he speaks of such removals as being *proscriptive*. The new Administration, he says, will be "a proscriptive Whig Administration." I suppose there would have been no proscription in the event of the success of General Cass, though "the little finger" of the latter had proved thicker than "the loins of the former." We also learn from the late Secretary of State, that he would "be faithless to *his* party" if he did not administer the Government in conformity with their views. So that it is treachery any way—treachery to the Democracy if he does make removals, and treachery to the Whigs if he does not!

I will finish this part of the subject by calling as witnesses the two Houses of the last Congress. On referring to the appropriation bill for the civil and diplomatic service, passed at the last session of Congress, it will be found that provision was made for the recall of the whole diplomatic corps, and for the appointment by the new administration of its friends to every situation therein. The appropriations were as follows:

1. "For the salaries of the ministers of the United States to Great Britain, France, Russia, Prussia, Spain, Brazil, and Mexico, sixty three thousand dollars; and for outfits of said ministers sixty three thousand dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

2. "For the outfit of a minister to the Germanic Confederation, nine thousand dollars; and for one year's salary of said minister, nine thousand dollars."

3. "For the outfit of a minister to the Government of Chili, nine thousand dollars; and for salary of said minister nine thousand dollars."

4. "For the salaries of charges des affaires to Portugal, Austria, Denmark, Sweden, Holland, Belgium, Naples, Sardinia, the Papal States, Chili, Peru, New Granada, Venezuela, Buenos Ayres, Bolivia, Guatamala, and Ecuador, seventy six thousand five hundred dollars; and for outfits of said charges des affaires, seventy six thousand five hundred dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

From this it appears that the last Congress (with the House about equally divided, and the Senate largely democratic) provided outfits for nine full ministers and sixteen charges, amounting in all to no less than $153,000, thus intimating that it would be proper for the President to recall the whole diplomatic corps. Nothing like this amount has ever been appropriated before for the same purpose. The 28th Congress allowed Mr. Polk only $80,500, being a balance of liberality in favor of President Taylor of $72,500. Having myself, as Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, moved these provisions as amendments to the civil and diplomatic bill then pending in the House, my particular attention was turned to the subject, and I can say that the amendments proposed received the support of a large number of the democratic members; but it is certain the bill would not have passed this body without the votes of some portion of the democracy here. This was truly generous; but what are we to think of the consistency of those who, after suggesting if not inviting the course so plainly indicated, turn round and denounce it to the country as treacherous and vile? How can the honorable Senator draw a distinction between the diplomatic corps and other branches of the public service?

I will merely add that the President acted, in point of time, in exact conformity with the views and opinions of Congress on this subject. The appropriations were made for the current fiscal year, and this we know commenced on the first of July last; and, out of deference to Congress, he wholly refused to make any appointments until after that date.

Mr. BRADBURY. Mr. President, I understand the honorable Senator to claim, as a matter of merit, that General Taylor refrained from making any removals of the diplomatic corps until the commencement of the fiscal year. I would like to ask of the honorable Senator, whether he did not make the changes as soon as he was authorized to use the appropriations?

Mr. MANGUM. He could undoubtedly have acted on the appropriations in advance, and could have used the money when due. It has always been done by other administrations.

Mr. BRADBURY. I have supposed that there was no authority for it.

Mr. MANGUM. Besides, there is always a fund in the hands of the Secretary of State for the use of the service, and this could have been used if necessary.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; and the honorable Senator (Mr. MANGUM) might say a great deal more than that. It is not uncommon to send a minister abroad when there is no appropriation; and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, during both the 29th and 30th Congresses, I was repeatedly called upon for appropriations for the outfits and salaries of ministers sent out in that manner. I hold that the President has the power to send a minister abroad, whether there is any appropriation or not, though Congress can refuse payment. But this is wholly unknown in the history of the country. The President, then, waited until the very hour arrived indicated by Congress. He allowed the appointees of the late administration to hold their places for one-third of a year after he came into power, and then proceeded to make changes gradually. How far he has carried the work, and whether his course has or has not been moderate, will appear hereafter.

Having thus shown fully under what circumstances President Taylor became a candidate, the relations in which he stood to the whig party, and a recognition of that relation both by the late honorable Secretary of State and the two Houses of Congress, and he having been triumphantly elected, it may well be asked what, on coming into power, should he do? He finds nearly all the places under the Government filled by one class—men who had been engaged in hunting down and proscribing others—and that his political friends had been treated as if they were enemies to the republic, and utterly excluded from all participation in the honors and emoluments of office. Was he bound to lend himself to this vile system, by continuing the proscribers in place and power? Or might he, by adopting the principle of equalization, do justice to every class, and uphold the rights and just pretensions of all? It was alike his duty and his inclination to observe the rule of moderation; and this he explains in his second letter to Captain Allison, dated at East Pascagoula, September 4, 1848, as follows:

"I have said I am not a party candidate; nor am I, in that straightened and sectarian sense which would prevent my being the President of the people, in case of my election." * * * * "I am not engaged to lay violent hands indiscriminately upon public officers, good and bad, who may differ in opinion with me." * * * * "That is what I mean by not being a party candidate."

Precisely so. He has not laid "violent hands indiscriminately on public officers, good and bad," who belonged to the opposite party; but, nevertheless, he has endeavored to carry out *the pledge* which he gave in face of the Philadelphia Convention and the whole country to make such "a change of men and measures" as was required by the high interests of the republic. But now we hear one universal cry, set up all over the country, of proscription! breach of faith! promise-breaking! The democracy can carry on proscription *ad libitum*. They spare no man, no matter what may be his age, his integrity, experience, or ability to advance the public interests. But the moment the people, in their good pleasure, hand over the Government to their political opponents, the world is filled with denunciations if a single hair of the democracy is touched. Indeed, the Senator and his friends are to have all the offices anyhow. If we have a democratic Executive, then they take them because they are for the proscriptive policy; and if a whig Executive, then they are to hold on because we deprecate that policy. The Senator says, "It is not the policy of removals that I assail or call in question; it is the inconsistency between the professions and practices of the party in power." Even so. There is always a clamor about whig inconsistency and whig violation of pledges. Indeed, it is apparent that the democracy intend to make good their hold on the treasury lid, (which they have had possession of for so long a period,) by a torrent of abuse alike impudent and false. They fasten themselves on "the spoils" with the grasp of death! But it will be in vain. The people are too intelligent not to see through these shallow pretences. They know that Zachary Taylor has given no assurances such as are set up here. Pledges are not to be extracted or inferred even from his early correspondence. Hence the President is at liberty to pursue such a course as will best subserve the public interests. He has a right to do justice to his own political friends.

Saturday, March 23, 1850.

The same subject being again under consideration, Mr. SMITH resumed and concluded as follows:

Mr. President: I now come to a part of the discussion to which I desire to invite the attention of those Senators who have countenanced this resolution, as I propose to show that the undertaking of my honorable friend is highly hazardous to the Democratic party. How far have you kept your own pledges, and how far have you held them binding on your Presidents for a long course of years? I am not about to excuse promise-breaking by the practice and example of the democracy. Fortunately, I have no occasion to put in any such plea in behalf of Zachary Taylor. But the honorable Senator has constituted himself prosecutor of this claim of "violated pledges;" and I take an exception to his competency. I set up against him what the lawyers call an *estoppel in pais*, and will show that neither he nor his party are in a condition to take the exception now urged on the attention of the Senate. In a review of the political history of the country from 1828 down to this day, I have been able to find scarcely an instance of assurances held out to the public by the Democratic party, as the basis of a Presidential canvass, which they have not departed from utterly in practice. This recurrence to the past will not be without its use, as it will show those who are so free to impeach the motives and assail the conduct of others, that possibly they may require some little indulgence themselves, and hence may conclude to be a little more reserved in casting reproaches at others. A little self-examination would, I think, be highly useful to the Democracy. They should search out their own skirts, and perhaps they will find there the ghosts of too many broken promises to make it worth while for them to say much on the subject of a violation of pledges by any one.

It will be recollected that the party known in 1828 as the Jackson party obtained possession of the Government, as the result of the Presidential election of that year, on the faith of numerous pledges and assurances, all of which I will show were set aside in practice and came to nothing. Up to that period, the party had not arrogated the Democratic name and character; but soon after—I believe in the winter of 1829—they held a meeting in this city to commemorate the battle of New Orleans, when they baptized themselves with the seductive name of the Democracy, and have continued to rejoice therein ever since. By that designation I shall speak of them hereafter, as I have hitherto, though I am far from admitting that there has been much of true republicanism displayed in their course. What, then, were the pledges given by the Democracy at and before the Presidential election in 1828, and how were they observed and kept?

1. They took ground distinctly and emphatically in favor of the one-term principle. They held that no incumbent of the presidential office should be re-elected. On this ground they opposed the re-election of Mr. Adams, and insisted, unless this limitation could be adopted, at least in practice, serious evils would follow; the President would busy himself during the whole of his first term in efforts to secure a second. The political press favorable to the election of General Jackson was incessant in the advocacy of this principle, and public speakers and declaimers, enlisted in the same cause, were everywhere active and zealous in urging its necessity and importance on the people. We know what the result was. Mr. Adams was defeated, and the hero of New Orleans became the seventh President of the United States. President Jackson, in his first annual message, referred to and recognised the obligations which he and his party had assumed in this respect. He says:

"It would seem advisable to limit the service of Chief Magistrate to a single term of either four or six years."

In his second annual message, he says:

"Experience abundantly demonstrates that every precaution in this respect is a valuable safeguard of liberty—one which my reflections upon the tendencies of our system incline me to think should be made still stronger. It was for this reason that, in connexion with an amendment of the Constitution removing all intermediate agency in the choice of the President, *I recommend some restrictions upon the re-eligibility of that officer and upon the tenure* of offices generally. The reasons still exist; and I renew the recommendation with an increased confidence that this adoption will strengthen those checks by which the Constitution designed to secure the independence of each department of the Government, and promote the healthful and equitable administration of all the trusts which it has created."

In his third annual message, after referring to his former recommendation of amendments of the Constitution, giving the choice of the President directly to the people, and rendering the office of President ineligible after one term, he says:

"So important do I consider these changes in our fundamental law, that I cannot, in accordance with my sense of duty, omit to press them upon the consideration of a new Congress."

As a fitting commentary on the fidelity of Gen. Jackson and his friends to this pledge, it is sufficient to state that Mr. Donelson, then private secretary of the President, in the winter of 1831-'32, addressed a letter to Gen. Kripps, a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature, with views and for purposes which will be readily appreciated, in which (speaking of the re-election of Gen. J.) he said that "the President would no doubt feel it a most grateful compliment to be assured that the course of his Administration has not disappointed the wishes of Pennsylvania, to whose partiality and early support he is so much indebted." This letter was, it is said, franked by the then President; but justice to Gen. J. requires it should be stated that Mr. Donelson denied that he (Gen. J.) had any knowledge of its contents.

In due season he was nominated by his friends in the Pennsylvania Legislature, and responded thereto in a letter dated February 9, 1831, in which he admits that "he had not anticipated" that "the approbation of his fellow-citizens would subject him to any future calls in the service of his country." He then refers to his recommendation of an amendment of the Constitution rendering a President not re-eligible, and suggests he had expected to retire in conformity with that principle, but finally concludes to be overruled by his friends. He says: "*I feel it to be my duty to yield my personal wishes to their solicitations.*"

It will hardly be a sufficient answer to say that General Jackson merely recommeded an amendment of the Constitution; for if any practice be an evil so great as to require that extreme remedy, one would suppose that it would be advisable to change the practice itself. On the re-election of President Jackson, this subject was dropped. He did not deem it expedient to refer to it again in his communications to Congress, and the Democracy have been profoundly silent in that regard from that day to this.

2. Another ground assumed in the canvass of '28 was, that members of Congress should not be appointed to office, either during the term for which they were elected, or within two years thereafter. This last addition to or qualification of the rule was indispensable to its efficiency. The object was to place Congress beyond the reach of Executive influence—to make it truly independent—an object which would certainly be evaded or defeated, if members could become recipients of Executive favor immediately after the expiration of their terms. It will be recollected that General Jackson was, during the canvass of 1824, a member of the Senate; and that soon after his defeat in the House of Representatives, in the winter of 1824–'25, he resigned his seat, and returning home was, on the 14th of October, 1825, honored with a public reception by the General Assembly of Tennessee, and, in an address then delivered, dwelt emphatically on the evils resulting from this source, from which I submit the following extract:

"With a view to sustain more effectually in practice the axiom which divides the three great classes of power into independent constitutional checks, I would impose a provision rendering any member of Congress ineligible to office under the General Government during the term for which he was elected, or for two years thereafter, except in cases of judicial offices." * * * * "But if this change in the Constitution should not be obtained, and important appointments continue to devolve on the Representatives in Congress, it requires no depth of thought to be convinced that corruption will become the order of the day, and that under the garb of conscientious sacrifices to establish precedents for the public good, evils of serious importance to the freedom and prosperity of the Republic may arise. It is through this channel that the people may expect to be attacked in their constitutional sovereignty, when tyranny may well be appreheded to spring up in some favorable emergency. Against such inroads every guard ought to be interposed, and none better occurs than that of closing the suspected avenue with some necessary constitutional restrictions. We know human nature to be prone to evil—we are early taught to pray that we may not be led into temptation; and hence the opinion that, by constitutional provision, all avenues to temptation, on the part of our political servants, should be closed."

I have no doubt those remarks were intended as an indirect blow at the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Clay,) who was then broadly charged with "bargain and corruption," with having entered into an intrigue to promote the elevation of Mr. Adams to the Presidency, in consideration of being made Secretary of State—a foul calumny which has long since been shown to have been as groundless as it was malignant. But whether General Jacdson did or did not intend to countenance that base slander, it is certain that the exclusion of members of Congress from office, in conformity with his views, was a prominent feature of the canvass of 1828, and constituted an essential part of "the platform" from which he vaulted into the presidency. So much for profession. We now come to practice, which, as usual with the democracy, we find directly the reverse. No sooner had General Jackson reached the White House than he commenced appointing members of Congress to office. He not only made numerous such appointments within two years after the expiration of their terms, but, in some cases, even while they were occupying their seats in one or other of the two Houses. Five members of his cabinet were taken from Congress, and only one (Major Barry, as Postmaster General) from the people at large. I have before me a list of twenty-three members appointed by President Jackson to offices of every grade, from a cabinet minister down to an appraiser of customs. The most remarkable case was that of a distinguished citizen of Virginia, who, while Speaker of the House of Representatives, was in effect appointed Minister to England, and is said to have had his commission in his pocket for many weeks, while discharging the duties of the Chair. No one can doubt, who is acquainted with the history of the times, but that "corruption did become the order of the day;" but whether from this cause alone, or other causes in connextion therewith, the Senate will judge when I have finished my remarks.

3. I now come to a more prominent issue made in the canvass of 1828: it was that of "retrenchment and reform." It was insisted that the administration of Mr. Adams was prodigal to the last degree, and that patronage "had increased, was increasing, and should be diminished." The Democracy called for reform in all departments of the Government. They were vehement in their denunciations of abuses, and loud in their professions of anxiety to enter upon the work of reform. If the good people would only intrust them with place and power, there could be hardly an end to their labors in the cause of regeneration and amendment. I recollect that a great deal was said in those days about cleaning out "the Augean stable," and we had an abundance of what the honorable Senator from Maine would call *pledges* that the work should be done effectually, if Mr. Adams could only be down and Gen. Jackson up! But, having got possession of the Government, this same Democracy commenced pitching into the doors and windows of the aforesaid "stable" all manner of vileness. Not an effort was made to redeem these pledges. By some hot-bed process, the Blue Book commenced growing rapidly: page after page was added, until it reached more than double its proportions during Mr. Adams's administration. The public expenditures were frightfully augmented. Numberless frauds and defalcations ensued. The treasury was plundered of millions, and more than one department of the Government was thrown into the utmost disorder and confusion. The General Post Office was bankrupted; and at the called session of the 27th Congress we had to appropriate, from the treasury, the sum of four hundred and ninety-seven thousand six hundred and fifty-seven dollars, "to enable the Department to meet its engagements and pay its debts." (Vide act of the 9th September, 1841.) Shall we reproach the memory of President Jackson with a violation of pledges for this reason? If I were disposed to imitate the example of the honorable Senator, and to pour out on his name a torrent of vituperation and abuse, I would refer to his first inaugural address, in which he said: "*I shall depend for the advancement of the public service more on the integrity and zeal of the public officers than on their numbers.*" No doubt General Jackson was perfectly honest and sincere when he said this; but how miserably he and his party failed to realize this assurance will appear from the history of the New York custom-house. On examining the Blue Book at the close of Mr. Adams's administration, and for ten years subsequent thereto, I find that Mr. A. left the Government with only one hundred and seventy-five employees in that establishment; and then the story of Democratic reform proceeds as follows:

Number of employees in the New York custom-house, under General Jackson's administration and the two first years of Mr. Van Buren's:

1829	212	1835	328
1831	268	1837	415
1833	324	1839	490

being an increase of three hundred per cent., wanting only twenty-five. At the close of Mr. Adams's administration, the expenses of collecting the revenue at that port were only $194,687 76; but for the ten succeeding years, they are written down in Rep. 669, p. 170, 2d session 27th Congress, as follows:

1829	$212,531 57	1835	$385,121 75
1830	295,066 06	1836	450,984 31
1831	376,920 34	1837	468,045 96
1832	408,791 28	1838	506,018 10
1833	429,501 29	1839	594,269 64
1834	365,592 50		

being an increase of three hundred per cent., with a surplus of $10,446 30. The average amount of revenue collected in New York during this period was just about the same it was under Mr. Adams's administration, to wit, $13,000,000; though there were great fluctuations in consequence of the disorders which pervaded every branch of national industry, by reason of the ill-advised measures of President Jackson and his immediate successor. So much for the reliance which that distinguished man placed, "for the advancement of the public service, on the integrity and zeal of the public officers, rather than their numbers;" and so much for fulfilment by the Democratic party of their promises under the head of "retrenchment and reform?"

4. I now advert to the topic which mainly induced me to undertake this review of so much of the political history of the country as appertains to the election and administration of General Jackson. And here I shall have occasion to consider the rise and progress of the proscriptive policy, which was transferred, at this era, from Albany to the city of Washington, by the influence (as is believed) of Mr. Van Buren, (the Northern man with Southern principles!) and which has here given a highly injurious direction to public affairs. The honorable Senator exclaims, "it is not the policy of removals that I assail or call in question!" just as if the democracy had always been consistent on this point! So far from it I can show that they distinctly pledged themselves, both in 1824 and 1828, to oppose that policy. They insisted that the patronage of the Government should not be brought in conflict with the freedom of elections, or, in other words, that removals and appointments should not be made on political grounds or in reference to party distinctions. In furtherance of this idea, the celebrated letter of General Jackson to Mr. Monroe, dated on the 12th of November, 1816, was then first produced and thrown before the public, from which I submit the following extract:

"In every situation party and party feelings should be avoided. Now is the time to exterminate that monster called party spirit. By selecting characters most conspicuous for their probity, virtue, capacity, and firmness, without any regard to party, you will go far to eradicate those feelings which on former occasions have thrown so many obstacles in the way of Government, and perhaps have the pleasure of uniting a people heretofore politically divided. The Chief Magistrate of a great and powerful nation should never indulge in party feeling; his conduct should be liberal and disinterested, always bearing in mind that he acts for the whole and not for a part of the community. By this course you will exalt the national character, and acquire for yourselves a name as imperishable as monumental marble." * * "These are the sentiments of a friend; they are the feelings, if I know my own heart, of an undissembled patriot."

General Jackson, in May, 1824, in a letter to the Hon. George Kremer, repeated and reaffirmed these generous and patriotic sentiments; and in a debate in the House of Representatives, February 24, 1827, the honorable Senator from Texas, (Mr. HOUSTON,) then a member from Tennessee, in remarking on this letter, insisted that its inport was as follows:

"Let patriotism, talents, and integrity, be the passport to office. The President ought not to be the head of a party, but the President of a nation; and it is just that the tree should be judged by its fruits."

There is no doubt but this letter was produced at the instance of General Jackson; he probably furnished it from his letter-book. The object was to make capital for him, and it had a most powerful effect on the public mind. It carried over to his support a large body of the old federalists, now constituting a highly respectable portion of the modern democracy.

The same ground was taken by his friends in the two Houses of Congress, particularly after his defeat in the House at the session of 1824-'25. In the Senate, at the first session of the 19th Congress, a select committee was raised "to inquire into the expediency of reducing the patronage of the Executive Government of the United States, at the head of which was placed the honorable Senator from Missouri, (Mr. BENTON,) who, in due season, submitted an able and interesting report, from which I submit the following extract:

"Patronage will penetrate this body, subdue its capacity of resistance, chain it to the car of power, and enable the President to rule as easily, and much more securely, with than without the nominal check of the Senate." * * * "We must, then, look forward to the time when the public revenue will be doubled; when the civil and military officers of the Federal Government will be quadrupled; when its influence over individuals will be multiplied to an indefinite extent; when the nomination by the President can carry any man through the Senate, and his recommendation can carry any measure through the two Houses of Congress; when the principle of public action will be open and avowed, that the President wants my vote and I want his patronage—I will vote as he wishes, and he will give me the office I wish for. What will this be but the government of one man? and what is the government of one man but a monarchy?"

I should not do justice to myself if I did not disclaim producing this extract under any idea of involving the distinguished Senator from Missouri in the charge of inconsistency, for I believe he would now administer the Government, so far as he could, on the principles here laid down, if called to that high duty. My sole object is to show how entirely the democratic party committed itself against the proscriptive policy. It will be recollected that during Mr. Adams's administration the then Secretary of State (Mr.

CLAY) deemed it to be his duty to take the publication of the laws from certain editors or printers, (not to exceed a half-dozen in all,) for pursuing (it is supposed) a course of unexampled detraction and abuse of him and the existing administration. This created a great commotion both in and out of Congress; it was resisted and denounced every where as "an enormity," and was treated as an alarming assault on the freedom of the press, and the liberties of the people of this country. In a speech delivered by Mr. SAUNDERS, of North Carolina, in the House of Representatives, on the 1st of February, 1828, he said:

"It (the dismissal of the editors) seemed to speak a language of the department, and to say to the various editors now employed, that they were not to expect a continuation of the favor of Government, unless they would submit to support, to the fullest extent, the doctrines and wishes of the Department of State. But the effect of such a course of things was calculated to operate not only on those who now print the laws, but on all those who might have any desire to print them. It was thus calculated to operate, and did actually operate, (so far as it went to control the freedom of the press,) to enlist throughout the country that powerful instrument in behalf of the views of the State Department. *In this respect it was much more effectual and much more dangerous than the far-famed alien and sedition laws.*"

On the 5th of February, 1827, Mr. Hamilton, of South Carolina, while considering the same subject, said:

"If an Administration thus circumstanced has any patronage incident to the press, it will be sure to use it in a manner best calculated to render the power of this mighty engine subservient to their peculiar and exclusive interest. This, however, is a matter of great delicacy, and must be managed with consummate caution. The lion must be muzzled before the noose is thrown round his neck. It will, therefore, be found that the process of subsidizing new converts, and of proscribing stubborn and intractable incumbents, will be gradual, that the public mind may not be alarmed by any sudden and violent changes—that in the good work there may not be more haste than speed." * * * * "Sir, depend upon it," the press "would be put on the diet of a wholesome regimen, and in the course of a salutary discipline. The sturdy and independent would be turned out to be fed on such offals as they might be able to pick up, until the whole pack should open in full and harmonious cry, in one common note, from she sturdy mastiff, that howls at the door of the Treasury, to the most starvelling turnspit that barks in the furthest verge of our frontier—even to the wilderness of our Indian solitudes."

Thus I have shown that General Jackson was carried into and through the canvass of 1828, with the avowal of the most liberal and generous sentiments on his part as to the administration of patronage, and with declarations of the utmost repugnance and abhorrence on the part of his friends to the proscriptive policy. He was elected triumphantly, and on the eastern front of this Capitol, in his inaugural address, threw before the country the following just sentiment:

"The recent demonstration of public sentiment inscribes on the list of Executive duties, in characters too legible to be overlooked, the task of reform, which will require particularly the correction of those abuses that have brought the patronage of the Federal Government into conflict with the freedom of elections, and the counteraction of those causes which have disturbed the rightful course of appointment, and have placed or continued power in unfaithful or incompetent hands."

No doubt it was his duty to correct such abuses as had "disturbed the rightful course of appointment, and placed or continued power in unfaithful or incompetent hands;" but this was to be done in such a way as not to constitute another abuse, by bringing "the patronage of the Government into conflict with the freedom of elections." General Jackson did not say, with the honorable Senator, "it is not the policy of making removals I assail;" but he denounced it as an abuse. No competent or faithful officer was to be turned out for opinion's sake, but he was to act on the noble principle of the Monroe letter: "*The Chief Magistrate of a great and powerful nation should never indulge in party feeling; his conduct should be liberal and disinterested, always bearing in mind that he acts for the whole and not a part of the community.*" In order to a just appreciation of what followed, it should be borne in mind that the proscriptive policy was then entirely unknown to this Government.

1. It appears from House document No. 132, first session 26th Congress, that General Washington, in his administration of eight years, removed (of officers appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate) only ten, to wit: two in 1792, two in '94, five in '95, and one in '97.

2. That Mr. Adams, (the elder,) in his administration of four years, removed only eight, to wit: three in 1797, one in '98, two in '99, and two in 1800—one of the last being Timothy Pickering, Secretary of State! Also, that he refused to renominate to the Senate, at the expiration of their respective commissions, three, to wit: one in 1798 and two in '99.

3. That in the administration of Mr. Jefferson, of eight years, there were fifty-eight removals, to wit: thirty-three in 1802, twenty-three in 1803, and two in 1804; and that he did not renominate, at the expiration of their commissions, four—two in 1802, one in 1803, and one in 1807.

These removals were made upon the principle of equalization.

In 1801, Mr. Jefferson appointed Samuel Bishop collector of the port of New Haven, removing Elizur Goodrich, a revolutionary character, at which the merchants of that city took offence, and addressed him on the subject. He replied as follows:

"If a due participation of office is a matter of right, how are vacancies to be obtained? Those by death are few—by resignation none. Can any other mode than that of removal be proposed? This is a painful office; but it is made my duty, and I meet it as such."

In a speech delivered in the Senate, February 9, 1835, the honorable Senator from Missouri (Mr. BENTON) stated the principle upon which Mr. Jefferson acted, as follows:

"The elder Mr. Adams appointed none but Federalists, and Mr. Jefferson had to turn a portion of them out, in order to get in a portion of the Republicans; and Mr. Jefferson had told him (Mr. B.) that he never carried changes far enough—that he had not done justice to his own party."

May not President Taylor do justice to his own friends? May he not act on the old Jeffersonian principle of equalization? The honorable Senator (Mr. B.) seems to have forgotten that he received his first commission at the hands of Mr. Jefferson, and was, as he says in a letter already cited, "reared in his political creed."

4. It also appears, from the same document, that in Mr. Madison's administration of eight years there were seventeen removals, to wit: one in 1809, two in 1811, one in 1812, one in 1814, three in 1815, one in 1816, and eight in 1817; and that he did not renominate to the Senate two, to wit: one in 1807, and one in 1814.

5. That in Mr. Monroe's administration of eight years there were seventeen removals, to wit: four in 1817, one in 1818, one in 1819, two in 1820, two in 1821, one in 1823, four in 1824, and one in 1825; and that he declined to renominate to the Senate only one.

6. That in Mr. J. Q. Adams's administration of four years there were four removals, to wit: two in 1825, two in 1826, and one in 1828; and that he did not renominate to the Senate eight, to wit: one in 1827, four in 1828, and three in 1829.

RECAPITULATION.

Washington removed	10	Not renominated	0
Adams, John "	8	"	3
Jefferson "	58	"	4
Madison "	17	"	2
Monroe "	17	"	1
Adams, J. Q. "	4	"	8
	114		18

In all, 132 in six administrations, and covering a period of 32 years—being a little over four per annum.

In this state of the case, General Jackson came into power, more fully pledged to pursue a moderate course than any other man ever has been.

There was not the slightest cause for sweeping removals. Mr. Adams had been remarkably tolerant. He even retained in his cabinet a distinguished citizen, who favored the election of his competitor, and who afterwards received a high expression of confidence at the hands of General J. Mr. A. himself belonged to the old republican party; and a large majority of the employees of the Government obtained their situations at the hands of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. What, then, did Gen. Jackson and the new Democracy do, under such circumstances? And how did they keep their promises?

1. He or his Secretary of State, at an early day, transferred to his own partisan press the printing of the laws, dismissing all others, and thus did the very thing which had been so bitterly denounced in Mr. Clay.

Soon after his elevation to the presidency, General Jackson commenced appointing editors and others connected with the Democratic press to office. These people had powerfully contributed to his success, and were among the most unscrupulous as well as talented of the editorial corps; they were usually, if not uniformly, appointed on removals. I have recently seen a list of not less than fifty-five such appointments made within the two first years of his administration. Of these, one was appointed an auditor; one a comptroller; nine clerks in the Departments; one librarian to Congress; one a district attorney; one register of a land office; one a surveyor of the public lands; one a receiver of public moneys; one secretary of a Territory; one a marshal; one a purser in the United States navy; two Indian agents; three naval officers; nine custom-house officers; and twenty-two deputy postmasters—the latter usually lucrative and important offices. In most cases, the editors appointed to local offices continued to edit their papers, supporting the administration and assailing the opposition with spirit and vigor.

This is a sufficient commentary on the horror affected by the friends of General Jackson at the dismissal by Mr. Clay of a few publishers of the laws.

3. General Jackson, at an early day after his accession to office, entered on a wholesale system of proscription or removals for opinion's sake.

In a little over a year after his first inauguration he removed about fifty collectors of the customs, ten surveyors of the customs, five naval officers, fifteen district attorneys, thirteen marshals, twelve registers of land offices, and fourteen receivers of the public moneys. By Senate document No. 120, 1st session 21st Congress, it appears that, between the 4th of March, 1829, and the 7th of April, 1830, thirty weighers, gaugers, and measurers, were dismissed; and by document No. 106, 1st session 21st Congress, that, between the 4th of March, 1829, and the 22d day of March, 1830, four hundred and ninety-one deputy postmasters were removed. In addition to these, during the same period, numerous removals were made in the Departments in this city, and the diplomatic, consular, and other branches of the public service.

During the first year he dismissed probably not less than fifteen hundred officers—the appointees of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and the younger Adams—all of the old republican school, and, in the language of the Senator from Maine, (Mr. BRADBURY,) "men of the purest virtue, upon whose characters no stain was ever fixed before—men who were regarded by all who knew them as eminently possessing honesty, capacity, and fidelity."

The system was prosecuted with relentless vigor during the residue of the Presidency of Gen. JACKSON, and the victims were equally estimable and worthy.

On removal, they were subjected to the same imputation which the Senator (Mr. BRADBURY) says arises at the present time; for General Jackson declared in substance, in his first inaugural, that he would make ability, probity, integrity, and zeal the test. His language (after speaking of the abuses which had brought the patronage of the Government in conflict with the freedom of elections, and had placed or continued power in unfaithful or incompetent hands, and after declaring his purpose to correct such abuses) was as follows:

"In the performance of a task thus generally delineated, I shall endeavor to select men whose diligence and talents will insure, in their respective stations, able and faithful co-operation—depending for the advancement of the public service more on the integrity and zeal of the public officers than on their numbers."

Were the officers dismissed unfaithful? Were they incompetent? According to the doctrines of the honorable Senator's speech, they were all libelled and traduced!—all stigmatized as base and worthless!

The extent and manner of violation of pledges by President Jackson and his friends have been sufficiently admitted and set forth by a leading member of the Democratic party, now a member of the Senate, (Mr. CALHOUN.)

In a speech delivered in the Senate, on the 13th of February, 1835, Mr. CALHOUN said:

"The party then in opposition" (at the era of Mr. BENTON's report) "and now in power *pledged* themselves to the community, that should they be elevated to power they would administer the Government on the principles laid down in that report. It is now high time to inquire how *this solemn pledge*—which, in my opinion, imposed a sacred obligation—has been redeemed. Has the *plighted faith* been kept which the committee gave in the name of the party?"

After having referred to the names of the committee, consisting of Messrs. Benton, Macon, Van Buren, Dickerson, Johnson, of Kentucky, White, of Tennessee, Holmes, Hayne and Findlay; and after after quoting extensively from the report, he adds:

"It is impossible to read this report, which denounces in such unqualified terms the excesses and abuses of patronage at that time, without being struck by the deplorable changes which a few short years has wrought in the character of our country. Then we were sensitive in all that related to our liberty, and jealous of patronage and Government influence—so much so, that a few inconsiderable removals of three or four printers roused the indignation of the whole country—events which would now pass unnoticed. We have grown insensible, become callous and stupid."

In a speech delivered in the Senate, February 17, 1836, the same distinguished Senator said:

"I would tell the coming administration to beware. If there be any one who expected the presidential nominee (Mr. Van Buren) could successfully play the game which he has, he would be wofully disappointed. With all my objections to the President, I would not deny many high qualities—he had courage and firmness; was bold, warlike, audacious, though not true to his word or faithful to his pledges!"—*Vide Gales & Seaton's Register of Debates, part* 1, *pages* 418, 420.

Perhaps the honorable Senator (Mr. BRADBURY) will find in these facts a sufficient justification of the terms of denunciation which he says were applied to Gen. Jackson by the then opposition. The Senator says that

"No language was too strong, no rebuke too scathing, no term of reproach too gross, to be heaped upon the head of the venerable President, for having removed certain officers of an opposite political party, and appointed his political friends in their places, still leaving in office a great body of the former."

This language is wholly inapplicable to the case of a new administration who were brought into power in opposition to a system of proscription for twenty years, and whose sole object is to correct the procedure, by letting in its own friends to a fair and just participation in the offices of the country.

The administration of Mr. Van Buren was a mere appendix to that of President Jackson. The same policy was pursued; but in the field of proscription little work remained to be done. It appears from Senate document No. 292, 3d sess. 25th Congress, that he removed from the 4th of March, 1837, to the 27th of February, 1839, three hundred and sixty deputy postmasters, and I suppose a corresponding number of officers were dismissed in other branches of the service; but this was merely *gleaning*, as the crop had already been swept from the field. I will not be so unreasonabe as to set this up as a violation of promises—the statute of limitations having doubtless run in favor of the Democratic party. Mr. Van Buren was the last man to revive it by a new promise!

Mr. President, it is now my duty to come down to more modern times; and this will lead me to consider the pledges given and promises violated by the last Executive.

1. I advert to the course taken by the late President on the subject of the tariff, and to his celebrated letter to J. K. Kane, Esq., of Philadelphia, on that subject. It may be found in Niles's Register, volume 66, page 295, and is as follows.

COLUMBIA, Tennessee, June 19, 1848.

"DEAR SIR: I have recently received several letters in reference to my opinions on the subject of the tariff, and, among others, yours of the 30th ultimo. My opinions on this subject have been often given to the public They are to be found in my public acts; and in the public discussions in which I have participated. I am in favor of a tariff for revenue—such a one as will yield a sufficient amount to the treasury to defray the expenses of the Government, economically administered. In adjusting the details of a revenue tariff, I have heretofore sanctioned such moderate discriminating duties as would produce the amount of revenue needed, and at the same time afford reasonable incidental protection to our home industry. I am opposed to a tariff for protection *merely*, and not for revenue. Acting upon these general principles, it is well known that I gave my support to the policy of Gen. Jackson's administration on this subject. I voted against the tariff act of 1828. I voted for the act of 1832, which contained modifications of some of the objectionable provisions of the act of 1828. As a member of the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, I gave my assent to a bill reported by that committee in December, 1832, making further modifications of the act of 1828, and making also discriminations in the imposition of the duties which it proposed. That bill did not pass, but was superseded by a bill commonly called the compromise bill, for which I voted. In my judgment it is the duty of the Government to extend, as far as it may be practicable to do so, by its revenue laws, and all other means within its power, fair and just protection to all the great interests of the whole Union, embracing agriculture, manufactures, the mechanic arts, commerce and navigation. I heartily approve the resolutions upon this subject passed by the Democratic National Convention lately assembled at Baltimore.

"I am with great respect, dear sir, your obedient servant, "JAMES K. POLK.

"J. K. KANE, Esq., Philadelphia."

It would aid us to form a just estimate of the motive or design of this letter, if we could see the communication of Mr. Kane to the late President which drew it out. It would doubtless pour a good deal of light on the subject. But that has been carefully suppressed. At the date of Mr. Polk's letter, he had already been nominated as a candidate for the Presidency at the Baltimore Convention. Pennsylvania was entirely devoted to the protective policy, and would not be likely to support a candidate unequivocally opposed to it. No doubt grave apprehensions were entertained that she would not go for Mr. Polk; hence this letter was written and thrown before the people of that State. It will be seen that it is equivocal, and may be made to conform in meaning to the taste of the reader. No doubt, in Tennessee, it passed for a good free-trade letter. But how was it regarded in Pennsylvania, where vast coal and iron interests were at stake? No sooner did it appear than the leaders of the Democracy in that Commonwealth took the ground that Mr. Polk was as much for the protective policy as Mr. Clay. The letter had been made adroitly to conform to language which Mr. Clay had used in some recent communications to the public on the subject. Thus both were found saying that they were willing to "afford reasonable incidental protection to our home industry;" and I recollect well that this identity of language was paraded in our Northern Democratic papers, in parallel columns, to prove that our domestic interests would be as safe in the hands of the one as the other. The Democracy of Pennsylvania went with a rush for their nominee—every where raising the cry, "Polk! Dallas! Texas! and the tariff of 1842!" This motto, or something equivalent, was inscribed on every banner exhibited in all their processions,

and paraded in all their political assemblies. I am informed that the distinguished citizen who presided with so much ability and dignity over the deliberations of this body during the last Presidential term, more than once addressed political assemblies during that canvass with this inscription flaunting before him. To show more fully the extent to which this imposition was carried, I produce here the "Clarion letter," from Wilson McCandless, Esq., who was one of the Senatorial candidates for the electoral college of Pennsylvania, on the Polk and Dallas ticket:

"PITTSBURG, *August* 8, 1844.

"GENTLEMEN: Your cordial invitation of the 30th ultimo to be present with you at your mass meeting on the 3d September came to hand during my absence in the northwestern counties of Pennsylvania.

"I assure you that I never wrote an apology for my inability to attend any public assemblage, in the whole course of my political career, with more reluctance than I do this. Clarion has not only been firm and steadfast in her adherence to *Democratic* principles, but she has been inflexible in her love and support of the *tariff*—that public measure which, (aside from the bank question,) like the rod of the prophet, is destined to swallow up all other topics of political controversy. You have properly appreciated the importance of the *protective principle* to the success of the manufacturing and agricultural interests of Pennsylvania; and in the abandonment of that principle by Mr. Clay, in the compromise bill, you have the best guaranty that, if elected to the Presidency, he will carry out the principles of that bill, and afford you a horizontal duty, to enable you to contend with the pauper labor of Sweden and Russia. In doing so, he would give you and the *tariff* the same *support* that the *rope* does the *hanging* man—instant death, and without 'benefit of clergy.' Support him, if you can; for my own part, I shall go for Polk and Dallas who have at heart the true interests of Pennsylvania.

"My engagements, gentlemen, in the supreme court, will prevent me from attending your mass meeting With the *brightest prospect* of Democratic success—20,000 majority—

"I have the honor to be truly yours, WILSON McCANDLESS.

"Messrs. Adam Mooney, Seth Clover, and others, committee."

This letter having been recently republished in a Pittsburg paper, with comments, Mr. McCandless addressed to the editors the following note:

"Messrs. D. N. WHITE & Co.

"GENTLEMEN: Thank you for the republication of the 'Clarion letter.' A wise man changes his opinions when dictated by experience and the truth—a fool never.

"Yours, most cordially and respectfully, WILSON McCANDLESS."

This would seem to intimate that Mr. McCandless was himself deceived by "the Kane letter;" and, if so, how certain must it be that the plain, honest, sensible, and worthy farmers, mechanics, and working men of that Commonwealth, were also deceived and deluded by it. I will not undertake to say what the late President really intended by the letter to Mr. K.; but one thing is certain, he must have known what use was made of it in Pennsylvania. There never has existed a man in this country who kept a more vigilant eye on the political movements of the day than the late President. He was pre-eminently a party man, thoroughly schooled in party tactics. Besides, there was associated with him a citizen of Pennsylvania, as candidate for the Vice Presidency, who had ever been a warm advocate of the protective policy. He therefore knew well that the people of that Commonwealth expected him to favor the same, at least in a reasonable and moderate degree. To this extent I insist he was pledged, though not, perhaps, to maintain the tariff of 1842, in its whole length and breadth. How did he respond to the expectations of the people of Pennsylvania, who had put their dearest interests into his hands? The records of this Government can answer. He not only took strong ground against the protective policy in his communications to Congress, but he placed at the head of the Treasury Department a gentleman of commanding abilities, who prosecuted the overthrow of the system with untiring industry and unsurpassed vigor. A new tariff was introduced, and carried through the two houses, based on chimerical principles, which is rapidly undermining the prosperity of the Keystone State, as it will ultimately of the whole country. Even the Vice President forgot that he was a son of Pennsylvania, and gave his casting vote in favor of the tariff of 1846.

We have proof conclusive that the people of Pennsylvania never would have voted for Messrs. Polk and Dallas, if they had known what their course would be on this subject. In the House of Representatives, 29th Congress, (which passed the tariff of 1846,) the delegation from that State stood twelve Democrats to ten Whigs and two Native Americans. A great political revulsion was occasioned in Pennsylvania by the passage of the tariff of 1846. Both branches of the State Legislature were revolutionized, and the delegation to the 30th Congress was reversed, so as to stand fifteen Whigs to only seven Democrats and one Native; and this notwithstanding the Democratic Senators and members of the House, (29th Congress,) with one exception, resisted the Tariff of 1846 to the utmost. But, nevertheless, the people would not spare them; nor would they spare the Democratic party of the Union; for the vote of Pennsylvania was cast for General Taylor, as much from repugnance to the tariff of 1846 as admiration for his brilliant public services and respect for his high qualities as a man.

I am confident that not a State north of the Potomac would have sustained Mr. Polk in the policy of such a tariff as that of 1846, with, perhaps, the exception of New Hampshipe and Maine. "The Kane letter" was effective far beyond the limits of Pennsylvania; it in fact made James K. Polk President of the United States. No one can accuse him of ingratitude, as, soon after his elevation to the Presidency, he conferred on his correspondent a valuable office, which he now holds. Would it not be well for the honorable Senator to explain the suspicious circumstances attending this transaction before he accuses President Taylor and his friends of perfidy?

2. It will now, Mr. President, be my duty to turn to a very painful chapter in the history of Texas annexation, which will supply us with another striking example of Democratic promise-breaking. It will be recollected that the annexation resolutions were passed at the second session of the twenty-eighth Congress; they originated in the House of Representatives, on motion of an honorable member from Tennessee, (Mr. BROWN,) and, as they passed that body, looked for annexation by the concurrent legislation of the two countries. It was ascertained, soon after their appearance in the Senate, that they could not possibly pass this body, as there were at least a half dozen Democratic Senators who believed that they were grossly violative of the Constitution. The proposition suggested by the House was regarded as a mere overture for a treaty with Texas, and the whole scheme was denounced as a contrivance to evade that

provision of that instrument which requires the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate to the validity of a treaty. In the 74th volume of Niles's Register, page 106, will be found a full account of what ensued, in the form of a letter from Mr. Tappan, late a member of this body from Ohio, and also one from Mr. F. P. Blair, late editor of the Globe, long the organ of the Democratic party in this city. Mr. Tappan (after adverting to the opposition of Democratic Senators to the resolution as it came from the House) says:

"In this stage of the matter it was proposed that, instead of rejecting the House resolution, we should amend it by adding, as an alternative proposition, the substance of Mr. Benton's bill to obtain Texas by negotiation." * * * "Mr. Polk was in the city; it was understood that he was very anxious that Congress should act on the subject before he came into office. It was also understood that the proposition to amend the House resolution originated with Mr. Polk. It had been suggested that if we did so amend the resolution, Mr. Calhoun would send off the House resolution to Texas, and so endeavor to forestall the action of Mr. Polk; but Mr. McDuffie, his friend, having met this suggestion by the declaration that he would not have the audacity to do such a thing, it was no more thought of. One difficulty remained; and that was, the danger of putting it in the power of Mr. Polk to submit the House resolution to Texas. We understood, indeed, that he intended to submit the Senate proposition to that Government; but without being satisfied he would do this, I would not vote for the resolution, and it was well ascertained that without my vote it could not pass. Mr. Haywood, who had voted with me, and was opposed to the House resolution, undertook to converse with Mr. Polk on the subject, and did so. He afterwards told me that he was authorized by Mr. Polk to say to myself and other Senators, that if we could pass the resolution with the amendment proposed to be made, he would not use the House resolution, but would submit the Senate amendment as the sole proposition to Texas."

Mr. Blair tells substantially the same story, except he adds that he saw Mr. Polk personally, and he gave him "full assurance that he would appoint a commission as contemplated in the bill proposed by Colonel Benton, if passed in conjuction with the House resolution as an alternative," * * "and that the first men of the country should fill the commission." Mr. Blair says that Messrs. Benton, Bagby, Dix, and Tappan were absolute in their opposition to the House resolution; and, I can add, my predecessor (Mr. Niles) was so also, as I have ever understood. It is believed all these Senators voted for the amendment, and for the resolution as amended, on the faith of this positive assurance of Mr. Polk. It is certain Mr. Tappan did so; for he says "upon this assurance I voted for the amendment moved by Mr. Walker, containing the substance of Mr. Benton's bill, and voted for the resolution as it now stands upon the statute-book." It appears from the Senate journal, 2d session 28th Congress, page 220, that the resolution was ultimately passed by a vote of twenty-seven in the affirmative, to twenty-five in the negative; so that it was in the power of Mr. Tappan, or any other Democratic Senator, to defeat it, as there was then no Vice President to give a casting vote. The truth of the statements of Messrs. Tappan and Blair have not been contradicted to this day by any other of the parties named; the facts alleged must therefore be regarded as indisputable. Mr. Polk did give this pledge. How did he perform it? Let Mr. Tappan tell the story:

"It is (he says) matter of history that Mr. Calhoun did have the audacity to send off a special messenger with the House resolution to Texas, on the 3d of March, a few moments before he went out of office, and that Mr. Polk adopted and confirmed this act of Mr. Calhoun, so admitting Texas into the Union, and placing the United States in a state of war with Mexico."

That Mr. Tappan was right in asserting that Mr. Polk "adopted and confirmed" the act of the retiring Executive, appears from his annual message to Congress, of the 2d of December, 1845, in which he says:

"In pursuance of the joint resolution of Congress for annexing Texas to the United States, my predecessor, on the 3d of March, 1845, elected to submit the first and second sections of that resolution to the republic of Texas, as an overture on the part of the United States for her admission as a State into our Union. This election I approved; and accordingly the charge de affaires of the United States in Texas, under instructions of the 10th of March, 1845, presented these sections of the resolution for the acceptance of that republic."

In the language of the honorable Senator from Maine, I ask, "how was this pledge" of Mr. Polk "fulfilled?" Is it not notorious that, "while it yet lingered upon the lips of him who uttered it," he commenced violating it in the most atrocious manner? Hence the war with Mexico; and hence the origin of all the evils now present with us!

3. But, Mr. President, in this history of party tergiversation, deceit, and perfidy, I should not do justice to the subject if I did not refer to the course of the democracy in the matter of Oregon, and the distinct pledge which they gave, only to be violated, to the American people, that they would, in the event of the election of Mr. Polk, assert for us a title to the whole of that territory. The utter exclusion of the British from that country up to 54 40 constituted one of the principal issues of the canvass of 1844. At the Democratic Convention held in Baltimore on the 27th of May of that year, the following resolution was passed:

"*Resolved*, That our title to *the whole* of the territory of Oregon is clear and unquestionable; that no portion of the same ought to be ceded to England, or any other foreign power; and that the reoccupation of Oregon and the reannexation of Texas, at the earliest practicable period, are great American measures, which this Convention recommends to the cordial support of the democracy of the Union."

Thus it would seem we were to have a "reannexion of Texas" and a "reoccupation of Oregon." Everything was done with a "RE" in those days. The South was to be won over by reannexation, and the North conciliated by reoccupation! And on this platform Mr. Polk was elevated to the presidency. That gentleman saw fit to renew the pledge in his inaugaral address, as follows:

"Nor will it become in a less degree my duty to assert and maintain, by all constitutional means, the rights of the United States to that portion of our territory which lies beyond the Rocky mountains. Our title to the territory of the Oregon is 'clear and unquestionable,' and already are our people preparing to occupy it with their wives and children."

It will be observed that on this occasion he even condescended to quote the very words used by the Baltimore caucus, and concurred with them in affirming that our title to the whole country was "clear and unquestionable." In furtherance of the same idea, he remarked in his annual message to Congress, already referred to, (after stating that the parallel of 49 degress had been offered to and rejected by the British government,) that—

"The right of any foreign power to the free navigation of any of our rivers, through the heart of our country, was one which I was unwilling to concede." * * * "The extraordinary and wholly inadmissible demands of the British Government, and the rejection of the proposition, made alone in deference to what had been done by my predecessors, and the implied

obligation which their acts seemed to impose, afford satisfactory evidence that no compromise, such as the United States ought to accept, can be effected. With this conviction, the proposition of compromise which had been made and rejected was, by my direction, subsequently withdrawn, and our title to the whole of the Oregon Territory asserted, and is believed maintained by irrefragable facts and arguments." * * * "At the end of the year's notice, should Congress think it proper to make provision for giving that notice, we shall have reached a period when the national rights in Oregon must either be abandoned or firmly maintained. That they cannot be abandoned without a sacrifice of both national honor and interest is too clear to admit of doubt."

That this meant the expulsion of the British from the country is manifest, not only from the fact that the Baltimore Convention declared for the whole of Oregon, or, as the Democracy was in the habit of expressing themselves in those days, for "54 40 or fight!" but also from the further fact that both parties had been in joint possession of the territory for more than a quarter of a century, under and by virtue of the conventions of the 20th of October, 1818, and of the 29th of February, 1827. The British, therefore, were to be driven out of the whole country. The opening of the 29th Congress found the Democracy rampant for 54 40. Nothing could exceed the heroism which they exhibited on that parallel. But soon the British lion made his appearance; and he had scarcely thrown himself into his usual attitude of defiance before the Democracy came down to 49 deg., with the speed of the lightning telegraph. They even surrendered a portion of the territory below 49 degs.—so much of Vancouver's island as is situated south of that parallel, and conceded "to a foreign power the free navigation" of the Columbia river "through the heart of our country," as Mr. Polk expressed it; and this notwithstanding "our title to the whole territory was asserted and maintained by irrefragable facts and arguments." This violation of pledges by Mr. Polk and his party is sufficiently set forth by Mr. Hannegan in a speech delivered in this chamber, 1st session 29th Congress, from which I produce the following extract:

"If the President has betrayed that standard—which the Baltimore Convention put into his hands, whereby he committed himself to the country—into the hands of the enemy, I will not do as the Senator from South Carolina threatens—turn my back upon him—I suppose he cares little whether both of us do that—but I shall hold him recreant to the principles which he professed; recreant to the trust which he accepted; recreant to the generous confidence which a majority of the people reposed in him. * * * What is this, need I ask, but charging on the President conduct the most vile and infamous? If the allegations be true, those intentions of the President must sooner or later come to light, and, when brought to light, what must follow but irretrievable disgrace? Long as a human eye remains to linger on the page of history, the story of his abasement will be read, sending him and his name together to an infamy so profound, a damnation so deep, that the hand of resurrection will never be able to draw him forth."

This is not my language. In view of the recent death of the late President, I would not venture to use it. But, sir, was there not here a most gross and outrageous violation of pledges by the late administration? And it is the more enormous, because the Democratic party of the North was drawn into the support of Texas annexation in consideration of having the whole of Oregon.

Mr. DODGE, of Iowa. The Senator will allow me to interrupt him for a moment. I have to say that this wholesale charge against the Democratic party is exceedingly unjust; and he should not make it with the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BENTON) in his eye. He, in effect, makes an attack on the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH. Not at all.

Mr. DODGE. Well, sir, qualify your charge.

Mr. SMITH. I take the expressions of the party from the avowals of the Baltimore Convention; and these were, sir, 54 deg. 40 min. at the hazard of a war with Great Britain.

Mr. DODGE. I deny it, Mr. President. The resolution says nothing about 54 deg. 40 min.

Mr. SMITH. Well, it says "the whole of the Territory of Oregon."

Mr. DODGE. The Senator from Missouri, who has sometimes been ranked with the Democratic party, in a speech which has not as yet perhaps been answered, did show that the territory above 49 deg. was formerly known as New Caledonia, and was no part of Oregon."

Mr. SMITH, (resuming.) There is no more unqualified admirer than I am of that speech, fraught with learning and characterized by distinguished ability. The honorable Senator, (Mr. BENTON,) after remaining silent in his seat a long time, and until all the leading men in Congress had been heard, rose and poured a flood of light on the subject. He demonstrated most conclusively (in accordance with the opinion I had ever entertained) that we had no just pretension to anything above 49 deg. But this does not alter the state of the case at all. The Democratic party did go for "the whole of the Territory of Oregon." This constituted the basis of the whole controversy. It is what Mr. Buchanan contended for in his whole correspondence with the British Minister, and the surrender of any part was what Mr. Hannegan denounced so bitterly in his speech already quoted. It was "the standard which the Baltimore Convention put into the hands" of Mr. Polk, and which he betrayed. What I object to is the conduct of the Democratic party in making up such an issue—that they should have joined "the re-annexation of Texas" to "the re-occupation of Oregon"—of the "whole territory"—that they should have carried the presidential election on such grounds, and then prove recreant, as Mr. Hannegan expressed himself, "to the generous confidence which a majority of the people reposed" in them.

4. If, Mr. President, I were disposed to adopt the train of reasoning contained in the speech of the honorable Senator, (Mr. BRADBURY,) I could show that Mr. Polk, in his inaugural address, pledged himself against the proscriptive policy. On that occasion, after saying, "although in our country the Chief Magistrate must almost of necessity be chosen by a party, and stand pledged to its principles and measures," "yet," he adds, "in his official action, he should not be the President of a party only, but of the whole people of the United States." This would seem to draw a distinction between measures and men; for how, otherwise, can the Chief Magistrate be, "in his official action," the President of "the whole people?" But, without insisting on any positive pledge, I may say that there is obviously in these remarks an avowal of liberal views and a declaration of magnanimous purposes. We had a right to expect that his dispensation of patronage would be characterized by modification, to say the least. How far were the expectations realized, let his disposition of all the vast patronage which devolved upon him by reason of the late war with Mexico tell. If there be any case in which the Chief Magis-

trate is bound to be the President, not of a party only, but of the whole country, it is that of a foreign war. He certainly should dispense the patronage conferred by reason of the war without the slightest reference to party distinctions. When we come to meet our country's foe, we should know no distinctions. We should be all Whigs—all Democrats; or, rather, all American citizens, ready to strike for the honor of our flag, and to uphold the rights of the North American Republic. That the Senate may understand the extent and magnitude of this patronage, I submit the following statement:

It appears that there were 11 general officers, 25 majors, (staff,) 111 captains, 124 medical officers, and 28 paymasters—total, 299 officers—*appointed* by the President for the volunteer service, from June 1846, to the early part of the year 1848. For names, see the official registers for January, 1847, pages 7 and 37; and also the official list, published February, 1848, pages 7, 55, and 56.

It appears that officers of the following grades and numbers were appointed for the regular army, to wit: 5 major generals, (one only taken from the old army, General Taylor,) 5 brigadier generals, (two, Twiggs and Kearney, taken from the old army,) 11 colonels, 11 lieutenant colonels, 23 majors, 115 captains, 111 first lieutenants, 113 second lieutenants, 111 additional second lieutenants, 12 surgeons, and 22 assistant surgeons; total, 539 officers appointed for the additional force. For names, see Army Register, 1848; and for *changes* by death, resignation, &c., see pages 52, 53 and 54.

Recapitulation: General officers, 21, (three taken from old army;) field officers, 70; captains and subalterns, 561; paymasters and medical officers, 186; total, 838.

To this list may be added the rifle regiment organized in May, 1846. None of the officers were taken from the regular army, except the lieutenant colonel (Fremont) and a lieutenant, (Rhett, of South Carolina)—making no less than eight hundred and seventy eight appointments, (including the rifle regiment, and excluding officers from the old army.)

How did Mr. Polk bestow these appointments? It is well known that all the general and field officers, and it is believed nearly all the commissioned officers, were appointed on strict party principles. They were all selected from the Democracy, unless occasionally a Whig was made captain or lieutenant; but such cases were few and far between. I make no objection to character or qualifications of the appointees: they were good citizens and brave men; some of them, now highly useful members of this body, who, by their gallantry and good conduct in the field, merit the approbation of their country. But the narrow, unjust, and illiberal conduct of the late President—for he is said to have controlled the whole matter—merits the severest condemnation, and but poorly accords with the doctrines of his inaugural address. What his course was in relation to the civil departments of the Government will appear hereafter.

I have thus, I believe, put the honorable member (Mr. B.) out of court in his plea of promise-breaking against President Taylor and his political friends. I have shown that he is not competent to carry on the prosecution. If the honorable Senator will first "cast out the beam in his own eye," then shall he "see clearly to pull out the mote that is in his brother's eye." One thing is certain: when the Democracy are in power they require much indulgence—a liberal interpretation—a generous view of conduct and motives; but the moment their opponents obtain the control of affairs the state of the case is entirely altered. They all at once become severely virtuous, and roll up their eyes in holy horror at the slightest departure from their new rule of right, though but "the small dust of the balance" in comparison with their own conduct. The casual correspondence of a successful candidate is ransacked only to be garbled and perverted, and "a pledge" found lurking under every line, though nothing of the sort was intended. In the mean time, they open the flood gates of calumny and abuse, notwithstanding their own broad pledges remain unredeemed. They "bind heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders, but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers."

I will next, Mr. President, consider what treatment the President has received at the hands of the opposition, and how ungracious it is for them to set up objections here to his course in the matter of removals and appointments.

And here I would observe that if he had, in fact, assured the country that he would, in the event of his election, observe the law of kindness, and treat all parties alike, administering the patronage with rigid impartiality, all those who desire to take benefit of such a generous policy should prove themselves, by kind and respectful treatment of the Executive, to be worthy of it. If he was bound to be the father of all, then there should be found everywhere filial deference, reverence, and respect. The conduct of the opposition has been such as not to entitle them to the benefit of any favorable assurances given by the President in advance of the election. They have broken the condition necessarily implied, and put themselves out of the pale of all pledges—all assurances, if there were any. And here I invite attention to—

1. The treatment which the President has received at the hands of the opposition press.

It has incessantly, since the 4th of March, 1849, insisted that he is totally incompetent to discharge the duties of the Presinency, without waiting to see whether he would prove himself such by his administration of the Government. It has represented him to be a weak, feeble, imbecile old man, who had no opinions of his own, and was totally incapable of forming any; who was held in leading-strings by his cabinet, and guided all the while to results which he had not sense enough to comprehend.

Every measure adopted by him has been tortured into some odious form, and all the while held out to the country as alike unworthy of the Chief Magistrate of a free people and as disgraceful to the American name and character. Strenuous efforts have been made to condemn him in advance, and so to poison public sentiment (the source of all power in this country) as to render an impartial consideration of his course impossible. The vocabulary of scurrility and abuse has been exhausted, and every species of obloquy has been poured out upon him. A long life of strict honor and integrity, a public career more glorious than has fallen to the lot of many men to exhibit, and exploits which have conferred an imperishable renown upon our flag, have been forgotten, and his conduct and motivos traduced and maligned, merely because he dared to be President, in conformity with the high behests of the people.

At length the astounding declaration has been put forth that he shall be resisted and opposed, whatever he may do.

"We mean (said the Democratic organ in this city a few months since) to do our duty; and whatever face the future may wear, we mean to oppose the administration of General Taylor and his cabal to the bitter end."

2. It has also been the manifest purpose of the opposition to exclude his views and policy from a proper examination, and even from any consideration whatever. This was disclosed by concerted efforts to carry the present House of Representatives against him, when it was not of the slightest importance with a view to uphold the measures of the last Administration, as they have a fixed majority in this body. To elect a Chief Magistrate at one period, and then, within a short time thereafter, to constitute a Congress to thwart and oppose him, is but a sorry compliment to the consistency and intelligence of the American people; and this is exactly what the opposition sought to do, so far as the House of Representatives in concerned. And they succeeded, if we may add to their strength the third party vote; and this, perhaps, may be done without injustice, as the discordant powers were allied at one time to make a *distinguished* member from Indiana Speaker of that body, and that, too, in hostility to the Administration.

3. The President tried a conciliatory line of policy in Virginia. He reappointed George Loyall, esq., navy agent at Norfolk, and Thomas B. Bigger, esq., postmaster at Richmond; but his advances were treated with scorn. It did not appease the violence of the opposition in the slightest degree. Every effort was made in Virginia, at the April elections in 1849, to put down his administration, and all the Congressional districts were carried against it, save *one*.

4. In many of the free States the Democracy joined the abolitionist party, with a view to local advantages, and partly to embarrass the President and his administration. This was so in Connecticut at the last general election, (1849.) A coalition was formed to carry not only the 1st, 2d, and 3d Congressional districts, but also the State Legislature.

The Democratic candidates in the three districts indicated gave *written pledges* to the abolitionists, which are before me; but I will not trouble the Senate by reading them. By such means the friends of the President were defeated in these districts, and a fatal turn given to the Congressional elections. This, it will be recollected, was within one month after the inauguration, and there could not have been, in any thing done here, the slightest excuse for this course. Mr. Polk hurled out of office many Democrats in the State of New York and elsewhere for joining the Free-soil party. I have before me a list of no less than eighty-four deputy postmasters dismissed in that State for this reason; and I will produce here a highly interesting letter, relating to one of those cases, from the Hon. William J. Brown, lately the Democratic Free-soil candidate for the Speakership, (on pledges, too:)

"APPOINTMENT OFFICE, P. O. DEPARTMENT, *July* 26, 1848.

"SIR: Your letter has been received, and submitted to the Postmaster General. I think your reasons for abandonding the Democratic party wholly unsatisfactory. The Postmaster General has heretofore refused to listen to applications for the removal of postmasters for such reasons. But the party to which you are now attached having taken ground against the Administration, and the regular nominee of the party for President, I do not see how the Administration can further refuse to act in these cases, without subjecting it to the charge of lending its influence to defeat the candidate of the party.

"I am yours, &c.,

"H. J. SICKELS, esq. P. M. W. J. BROWN."

I wonder if this letter commended Mr. Brown to the three members from my State, and wonder if Southern Senators will shed tears over the fate of the Democratic office-holders of Connecticut? If so, I venture to predict they will be crocodile tears. I would by no means insinuate that General Taylor or his cabinet have acted on such grounds. Certainly I have not brought this factious coalition to his or their notice, and I only use it now to show how ridiculous it is for the Northern Democracy to complain of his dispensation of patronage in that quarter of the Union.

I will now, Mr. President, turn back, as I intimated I should, to the President's inaugural address, and particularly to the passage on which the honorable Senator (Mr. B.) relies. He, it is true, on that occasion, remarked that "the appointing power vested in the President imposes delicate and onerous duties. So far as it is possible to be informed, I shall make honesty, capacity, and fidelity indispensable prerequisites to the bestowal of office; and the absence of either of these qualities shall be deemed sufficient cause of removal." From this the honorable Senator (Mr. B.) deduces the conclusion that all officers removed from the fourth of March must be regarded as stigmatized for the want of either honesty, capacity, or fidelity—a conclusion which would equally follow from the language of Gen. Jackson and Mr. Polk in their respective addresses. But this is all a mistake, which I will prove by producing here an extract from Gen. Jackson's first annual message to Congress, as follows:

"There are, perhaps, few men who can, for any great length of time, enjoy office and power without being more or less under the influence of feelings unfavorable to a faithful discharge of their public duties. Their integrity may be proof against improper considerations immediately addressed to themselves; but they are apt to acquire a habit of looking with indifference upon the public interests, and of tolerating conduct from which an unpractised man would revolt. Office is considered a species of property, and Government rather as a means of promoting individual interests than as an instrument created solely for the service of the people. Corruption in some, and in others a perversion of correct feelings and principles, divert Government from its legitimate ends, and make it an engine for the support of the few at the expense of the many."

I am almost provoked at myself for not adverting to this authority earlier; it would have saved a world of trouble. What a corrupting, hardening effect long office-holding has, according to General Jackson, on the minds and morals of men! Why, the Democracy have been in possession of nearly all the places under the Government since the 4th March, 1829. President Taylor should have turned most if not all of them out long ago on presumption. The idea of the honorable Senator that the dismissed have gone out on papers, or libels, as he would have us believe, is all imagination or moonshine. It is true President Taylor says "the want of honesty, capacity, or fidelity, shall be deemed sufficient cause for removal;" but General Jackson tells him he may infer this from long enjoyment of office; that in

such cases, if the integrity of incumbents "be proof against improper considerations immediately addressed to themselves," he may at least infer that they look "with indifference on the public interest," and tolerate "conduct from which an unpractised mind would revolt." Removals under such circumstances do not attack the rectitude of particular individuals—they only carry out a general principle. The honorable member calls for a confession by some friend of the President; and if we make it in the form and to the extent he is pleased to indicate, he graciously says he will not press his resolution. Though not authorized, I will confess that the President wanted "unpractised minds" in the Government; hence some changes. He thought he might proscribe proscription, by letting in his own friends to a fair share of the offices. It did not occur to him that he succeeded as a mere administrator *de bonis non* to Jackson, Van Buren, Tyler, and Polk. If he had "no enemies to punish, and no friends to reward," he surely was not obliged to treat his own friends as if they were enemies. In the place of calling for papers—existing only by hypothesis—let the honorable Senator ask the President to send him this extract from General Jackson's message; that is a reality, and it will relieve his mind vastly. No objection will be made on this side of the chamber.

The question, Mr. President, now arises, what has President Taylor done? Has he made a just, reasonable, and proper use of the removing and appointing powers? We see how he was situated; what light the past and the present throw on his path; what was the course of his predecessors; what the situation of the Government when he came into power, and the conduct of the opposition since. We now come to the issue—Has he abused the confidence of the American people, and betrayed the trust which they placed in his hands? Let the following details, collected with much labor and care, tell the story.

I will begin with the Departments in this city, and show what was their political condition at the commencement and close of the late administration, and what changes have been made since; and if the conclusion does not result from the facts, that the President has not even done justfce to himself and friends, to say nothing of the public service, I shall be greatly mistaken.

State Department.—At the close of the late administration, there were in this department twenty-five employees, (exclusive of the Secretary,) of whom twenty-two were Democrats, and only three Whigs!—the former receiving a compensation of $21,920, and the latter of $5,000. Majority of Democrats 19, and balance of compensation in their favor $16,920!

Now there are in the same department twenty-six employees, of whom fifteen are Whigs, and eleven Democrats; the former receiving a compensation of $13,990, and the latter of $12,940. Majority of Whigs only four, and balance of compensation in their favor only $1,050!

Navy Department.—At the close of the last administration, there was in this department (exclusive of the Secretary and officers of the navy) fifty-one employees, of whom thirty-four were Democrats, fifteen Whigs, and two neutrals—the Democrats receiving a compensation of $42,450, and the Whigs of $17,100. Majority of Democrats nineteen, and balance of compensation in their favor $25,350!

Now there are in that department the same number of employees, of whom twenty-five are Whigs, twenty-three Democrats, and three neutrals—the Whigs receiving a compensation of $29,100, and the Democrats of $27,400. Majority of Whigs only two, and balance of compensation in their favor only $1,700!

War Department.—At the close of the last administration, there were in this department (exclusive of the Secretary and officers of the army, and including the Pension and Indian bureaus, which then belonged to that department,) seventy-four employees, of whom forty-two were Democrats, thirty-two Whigs, and eight neutrals—the Democrats receiving a compensation of $55,350, and the Whigs of $34,600. Majority of Democrats ten, and balance of compensation in their favor $20,750!

Now there are in the same department (excluding the Pension and Indian bureaus, at this time a part of the Department of the Interior) fifty-six employees, of whom thirty are Whigs, nineteen Democrats, and seven neutrals; the Whigs receiving a compensation of $32,600, and the Democrats $23,650. Majority of Whigs eleven, and balance of compensation in their favor $8,950!

Treasury Department.—At the close of the last Administration, there were in this Department (exclusive of the Secretary) three hundred and thirty-five employees, of whom two hundred and fifty-nine were Democrats, and only seventy-six Whigs; the former receiving a compensation of $305,133, and the latter of only $97,500. Majority of Democrats one hundred and eighty-three, and balance of compensation in their favor $207,633!

Now there are in the same Department three hundred and thirty-four employees, of whom two hundred and two are Democrats, and only one hundred and thirty-two Whigs; the former receiving a compensation of $223,108, and the latter of $177,895. Majority of Democrats seventy, and balance of compensation in their favor $45,213!*

Department of the Interior.—There were in the bureaus now composing this Department, at the close of the last Administration, one hundred and twenty-seven employees, of whom ninety-three were Democrats, and only thirty-four Whigs; the former receiving a compensation of $177,137, and the latter of $45,100. Majority of Democrats fifty-nine, and balance of compensation in their favor $72,037!

There are now in the same Department (exclusive of the Secretary and temporary clerks) one hundred and thirty-eight employees, of whom eighty are Whigs and fifty-eight Democrats; the former receiving a compensation of $105,650, and the latter of $68,417. Majority of Whigs twenty-two only, and balance of compensation in their favor $37,233!†

---

* This does not include the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Commissioner of Customs, and one or two clerkships created by law at the close of the last Congress, and since filled by Whigs.

† Several of the Democratic clerks dismissed by Mr. Ewing are temporarily employed in this Department.

Here a brief statement of the case of the policemen of the capitol, removed by the order of Mr. Polk, should be introduced. Mr. P., early in his administration, dismissed Major Noland, the Commissioner of Public Buildings, an old, experienced, and truly excellent officer, and appointed to that place the Hon. Andrew Beaumont, formerly a member of Congress from Pennsylvania. Soon after, Mr. B. dismissed two Whig policemen, Messrs. Wailes and Waller, who had long been in office, and were without blame or fault, which was done, as has ever been understood, by the interference and under the direction of the late President. This excited the utmost indignation in Congress, and the Senate, then Democratic, unhesitatingly rejected the Hon. Mr. Beaumont, and sent him back to Pennsylvania. The President then nominated Dr. Charles Douglas, of Connecticut, and, on his confirmation, a large number of Democratic and Whig Senators and members of the House united in a written application to Dr. Douglas for the restoration of Wailes and Waller, but in vain. They remained out of office and proscribed until the accession of President Taylor, when they were promptly restored! These facts are sufficient to illustrate and prove how groundless the clamor has been against the Hon. Secretary of the Interior, for his dispensation of the patronage of his Department. Every opprobrious epithet has been heaped upon him for no other cause than for firmly and resolutely doing what he believed to be his duty.

Post Office Department.—At the close of the late administration, there were in this Department forty-nine employees, (exclusive of the Postmaster General,) of whom forty-seven were Democrats, and only two Whigs; the former receiving a compensation of $65,000, and the latter of only $2,200. Majority of Democrats forty-five, and balance of compensation in their favor $63,700!

In the same department there are now the same number of employees, of whom thirty-five are Democrats, and fourteen Whigs; the former receiving a compensation of $47,600 and the latter of $18,300. Majority of Democrats twenty-one, and balance of compensation in their favor $29,300!

In all the Departments there were on the 4th of March last, (exclusive of neutrals and others, as above,) six hundred and thirty-two employees, of whom four hundred and seventy-six were Democrats, and only one hundred and fifty-six Whigs; the former receiving a compensation of $578,790, and the latter of $194,300. Majority of Democrats three hundred and twenty, and balance of compensation in their favor $384 490!

In the same Departments there are now (exclusive as above) six hundred and forty-four employees, of whom three hundred and fifty are Democrats, and two hundred and ninety-four are Whigs; the former receiving a compensation of $404,165, and the latter of $376,539. Majority of Democrats fifty-six, and balance of compensation in their favor $27,630!

During Mr. Polk's administration, there were removed in these Departments for other than for some special cause, such as drunkenness, one hundred and nine clerks, having a compensation of $122,340 and under that of President Taylor, one hundred and six, having a compensation of $122,485. But the removals under Mr. Polk were highly exceptionable; not so those under President Taylor, for the reason that the distribution on the fourth of March, 1845, approached much nearer the principle of equalization than on the fourth of March, 1849. At the former date it is believed that the official corps in this city was nearly equally divided between the Whig and Democratic parties; whereas, when President Taylor came into power, the Democracy had possession of more than three-quarters of all the offices in this city. The heads of bureaus were, on the fourth of March, 1845, thus distributed: Whigs nine, with a compensation of $26 500; Democrats eight, with a compensation of $23,500: Whig majority one, and balance of compensation in their favor $3,000! Yet Mr. Polk immediately commenced removals; so that at the close of his administration the account stood thus: Democratic heads of bureaus, fifteen, with a compensation of $46,500; Whigs, only two, with a compensation of only $6,000: majority of Democrats thirteen, and balance of compensation in their favor $40,500! The Whigs were Messrs. Hagner and Pleasanton, who came to this city with the Government, and whose connexion with the Whig party consisted only in sympathy of opinion.

In the Treasury Department there were at the same period two hundred and sixty-seven employees, of whom one hundred and thirty-eight were Whigs and one hundred and twenty-nine Democrats; the former receiving a compensation of $172,600, and the latter $150,847. Majority of Whigs only nine, with a balance of compensation in their favor $21,753.

In the Bureaus now constituting the Department of the Interior, including the office of the Commissioner of the Public Buildings, the balance was the other way on the 4th of March, 1845. The whole number of employees in those Bureaus at that time was one hundred and thirty-one, of whom seventy-one were democrats and sixty Whigs; the former receiving a compensation of $83,637, and the latter of $74,300. Majority of Democrats eleven, and balance of compensation in their favor $9,339.

In the General Post Office the state of the case was, on the 4th of March, 1845, much more in favor of the Democratic party. There were then, as now, forty-nine employees in that Department, of whom thirty-five were Democrats, and only fourteen Whigs; the former receiving a compensation of $65,900, and the latter of $20,000. Majority of Democrats (as now) thirty-five, and balance of compensation in their favor $20,000.

So that it appears that under President Taylor's administration the General Post Office has only been put back to where it was on the 4th of March, 1845!

The State Department is known to have been, on the 4th of March, 1845, largely Democratic, as Mr. Buchanan removed only two Whig clerks, and yet left his Department almost wholly in the hands of his political friends.

The Navy and War Departments at that date were believed to have been about in equipoise: so that the preponderance in all the Departments was decidedly in favor of the Democratic party. There was not the slightest excuse for Mr. Polk and his cabinet resuming the proscriptive system. But they did resume it, and prosecuted it with unexampled rigor; and the spirit with which they were actuated will appear from the following letter from the late honorable Secretary of the Treasury:

[Not official.] "MAY 4, 1846.

"DEAR SIR: On Saturday last I directed your appointment to be made out. Since that period it has been made known to me that you are, and always have been, a Whig. This was very unexpected intelligence to me. You never did represent yourself to me as a Democrat, but I took it for granted that such was the fact. It is impossible for me to make the removal contemplated, for the purpose of appointing a Whig. I have felt constrained, therefore, to revoke the order for your appointment. I regret this occurrence very much. Our short acquaintance had made a strong impression on my mind in your favor; and I still believe that, personally, you are entitled to my respect and esteem; but, under the circumstances, I cannot make the removal and appointment as I intended.

"I take pleasure in saying that your deportment throughout has been correct and honorable.

"Yours, very respectfully, "R. J. WALKER.

"JAMES L. CHILDRESS, Esq."

By removing heads of bureaus and clerks, as already stated, and by uniformly filling vacancies created by deaths and resignations with their own friends, Mr. Polk and his cabinet threw the departments substantially into the hands of the Democratic party, leaving only a few Whigs—such men as Peter Hagner and Stephen Pleasanton—whose services, by reason of great experience and long-tried integrity, were indispensable to the Government.

This course would perhaps be of little importance, had not the public interests been compromitted thereby to the last degree. This will appear from the state of things which President Taylor found existing in the Second and Third Auditor's offices on his accession to power.

Second Auditor's Office.—It appears from a letter from Mr. Clayton, the present auditor, to the honorable Secretary of the Treasury, dated April 18, 1849, (a copy of which I hold in my hand,) that he found, on being appointed, that there were no less than thirteen thousand four hundred and twenty-one items, or matters of business pending in that office that remained unattended to or unfinished. He remarks as follows:

"With regard to the causes of the condition of the office, I have only to report, from the short time I have been in office, the entire want of system, and the great want of capability, as well as willingness on the part of some of the clerks, as apparent reasons for the state of things that I have found. It is true that the business has increased during the Mexican war; but I believe, with proper materials and a new organization in the system, or, in other words, giving system to that that knew no system, a great alteration can be made for the better."

It appears from House Doc., 1st sess., 30th Cong., Reps. of Coms., No. 508, p. 6, that General McCalla, the predecessor of Mr. Clayton, in a letter addressed to the Hon. John A. Rockwell, Chairman of the Committee of Claims, called for the appointment of twenty-four additional clerks, to enable him to bring up the arrearage of business in his office. It appears also, from the act of the 12th of August, 1848, (civil and diplomatic bill,) that Congress granted thirteen additional clerks for the period of twelve months, in conformity with the views of Gen. McCalla. And I now produce here a letter from the Second Auditor to the Secretary of the Treasury, dated 31st of December last, in which that officer observes that—

"The business of this bureau has been so far in arrears that it has required all the time and energy of every clerk employed to bring it up, and they have necessarily been usefully employed.

"In addition, I have the honor to report that, from and after the 1st of July, 1850, the services of the thirteen additional clerks allowed by act of Congress, entitled 'An act making appropriation for the civil and diplomatic expenses of Government for the year ending the 30th day of June, 1849,' passed 12th August, 1848, and continued in the act making appropriation for the civil and diplomatic expenses of Government for the year ending the 30th day of June, 1850, passed 3d March, 1849, will not be required in this office."

So much for reform under the auspices of Z. Taylor.

And here would seem to be the proper place to introduce the case of Mr. B. F. Brown, who was a clerk in the Second Auditor's Office, and dismissed for neglect of duty and brawling at the late Presidential election. Soon after, he addressed to the President, through the public prints, the following insolent letter:

"WASHINGTON, *June* 4, 1849.

"SIR: On the first day of this month I received a letter from your Secretary of the Treasury, notifying me of my removal from office. Having distinctly declared in your inaugural address, with the oath of office fresh upon your lips, that you should make honesty, capacity, and fidelity, the requisites for appointment to office, and the want of them the sole cause for removal; and it being repeatedly stated by your principal organ in this city that all removals are made upon that ground, it would be presumed, in the transactions of honorable men, that I have been removed for dishonesty, incapacity, and unfaithfulness in the discharge of my official duties. It is due to myself, and to those who procured my appointment to office, that I disprove such charges. I was appointed upon the recommendation, among others, of General Thomas L. Hamer, who fought by your side at Monterey, and sacrificed his life in the war which made you President. It is due to his memory that those foul and infamous imputations upon my character be repelled. Upon receiving notice of my removal, I addressed the following letter to your Secretary:

"'WASHINGTON, *June* 1, 1849.

"'SIR: I have this day received from you a dismissal from office. I respectfully request of you a copy of the charges against my honesty, capacity, and fidelity, in the discharge of my official duties, if any exist.

"'Very respectfully, B. F. BROWN.

"'Hon WILLIAM M. MEREDITH, Secretary of the Treasury.'

"To this letter I have received no reply, for the reason that there are no such charges. I was removed for my political opinions alone. Were this given as the reason for my removal, I should submit cheerfully, proud that I am considered worthy to be sacrificed for my political principles. But you have neither the disposition nor the honesty to admit the fact. By so doing you would place yourself before the world self-convicted of the violation of your most solemn pledges, made in the presence of God and the people. You prefer rather to attach the stain of infamy to those whom you displace from office, and to prostitute the Presidential office into an infamous engine by which you may defame the private character and blacken the reputation of your fellow-men, after having deprived them of their means of support—a course of conduct in a Chief Magistrate which will find its parallel only in the atrocity of the bandit, who first seizes the purse, and then drives the dagger to the heart of his victim. But there is a power in this country more potent than the edict of a President, or the decree of an irresponsible cabal, upon whom he may seek to throw the responsibility and odium of acts which he dare not perpetrate in his own name, but for which he is himself alone accountable. That power is public opinion, and to that tribunal the humblest citizen can appeal.

"Your fellow-citizen, B. F. BROWN.

"His Excellency ZACHARY TAYLOR, President of the United States."

The Senate cannot fail to be struck with the coincidence that exists between the reprehensions of this letter and those contained in the speech of my honorable friend. The same premises are assumed, and the same conclusions drawn; so that, by analyzing, they would be reduced substantially to the same elements. I will only add as a sufficient commentary on this letter, that Mr. B. F. Brown, after being nominated (I suppose as a martyr) for doorkeeper of the House by the Democratic party, at the commencement of the present session, found it expedient to leave this city suddenly, and he is now

under several indictments by the grand jury of the county of Washington, for obtaining, after his removal, a considerable sum of money from the Treasury of the United States by fraud, forgery, and false pretences. I hope he will prove himself innocent; otherwise, that he will be brought to condign punishment. So much for this item of Whig persecution!

Third Auditor's Office.—This was in a condition not less deplorable. Mr. Polk had removed the best clerks in that office—nine in all; one appointed in 1811, one in 1813, one in 1816, one in 1818, one in 1833, one in 1834, one in 1835, one in 1837, one in 1846, and one in 1848; theappointees of Madison, Jackson, Van-Buren, and himself. Some of these were invaluable servants of the government, particularly the old clerks, and the consequence was to throw the business of the Third Auditor's Office into the utmost confusion; and this appears from a letter from Peter Hagner, late Third Auditor, dated April, 1849, to the Secretary of the Treasury, in which, after observing that the business of the office was enormously in arrears, he adds that—

"Many of the quartermaster's accounts are exceedingly voluminous, embracing quarter-yearly accounts, rendered since 1846, involving a vast amount of money. The accumulation in that branch has in part arisen from the increase in the number of disbursing officers made necessary by the Mexican war, and greatly by the removal from office of several of the old and most efficient clerks, and appointment of others without experience, requiring instruction and time to make their services useful—instruction only to be obtained through the remaining experienced clerks. In the engineer and topographical engineer branches, there has been but little if any increase of disbursements since 1846. The accumulation in that branch, I think may be mainly imputed to the removal of a most intelligent, efficient clerk, who theretofore had these accounts solely and exclusively for many years committed to his adjustment, and who uniformly kept them up—his successor, promoted to fill the place, being not at all familiar with this, his new duty. After a time it was found that the usual prompt adjustment of these accounts had ceased; it was therefore deemed necessary, in order to prevent further accumulation, to assign two other newly appointed clerks to his assistance. The result has not been such as was hoped for—there remaining a great increase of unsettled accounts in those branches, many of them embracing quarterly disbursements from 1846 to the fourth quarter of 1848. There is no remedy which presents itself to my mind, other than again obtaining the services, as far as practicable, of the old, experienced clerks, and the employment of five or six capable, industrious accountants, in addition to the number now authorized by law.

Mr. DODGE, of Iowa. Who removed Peter Hagner?

Mr. SMITH. Old age! fourscore years! probably fourscore years and ten.

I am now prepared to submit an extract from the honorable Senator's speech. He says that—

"It is worthy of notice, that while officers are removed who are invaluable to the public, some of the departments here are calling upon Congress for additional force. I beg leave to suggest, Mr. President, that it might be wise economy to restore the former efficient public servants."

That is exactly what President Taylor has done. He has restored "the former efficient public servants;" and yet some additional force is necessary to overcome arrearages occasioned by the misconduct of the last administration.

So much for the Departments in this city; and I fearlessly submit the question to the Senate and the country, whether, so far as they are concerned, the President and the cabinet have done more than their duty. Many, perhaps, most, of their political friends will believe they have not done even that.

Diplomatic service—At the time the paper was made out which I hold in my hand, (February last,) there had been recalled, from the 4th of March, 1849, without request, three full ministers, and four chargés, receiving salaries to the amount of $46,500; and recalled by request, three full ministers and four chargés, receiving salaries to the amount of $19,000, and there remained abroad appointees of the last administration, two full ministers, five chargés, and the commissioners at Canton and the Sandwich Islands. The appointees of the present administration (including ministers, chargés, and secretaries of legation) were a that period receiving salaries to the amount of $103,000, and the appointees of the last $59,000. More than one third of the diplomatic appointments have remained, during the first year of President Taylor's administration, in the hands of the Democratic party, and this must be regarded as liberal, in view of the faet, that not a single Whig, during the latter part of Mr. Polk's administration, was permitted to hold a situation in this branch of the public service. The late Henry Wheaton was, I believe, the last of this class. He was recalled from Berlin, for no other than political reasons. A more competent or accomplished man never graced our diplomacy abroad. It must also be regarded as moderate, in view of the further fact that the last Congress made provision (as already stated) in the form of outfits for the recall of the whole corps. I perhaps should refer, as additional evidence of a kindly disposition of the President towards the Democracy, to the tact of his permitting Mr. Hannegan to go abroad, when he obtained a nomination to the Senate, and a confirmation by this body under novel, if not extraordinary circumstances. I am sensible that both Mr. Hannegan and Mr. Eames have recently returned from their respective missions, and perhaps some other changes are contemplated; but I have seen nothing like a purpose on the part of the Executive to appropriate all these appointments, in conformity with the practice and course of his predecessor.

Consular service.—The whole number of consuls appointed by President Taylor is forty-three; of these, to fill vacancies, resignations, and deaths, fourteen; new consulates, two; held by foreign subjects, two; and vacancies on recall, twenty-four; all receiving a compensation of $54,600. The consuls appointed by his predecessors, and remaining undisturbed, receive a compensation of $80,000—balance against the present Administration, $23,400. There is little persecution here!

Naval service.—Soon after the present Secretary of the Navy was inducted into office, he discovered that the affairs of the Department were in some disorder—that there were arrearages in the nature of defalcations standing on the books of the Fourth Auditor, to the enormous amount of $652,844 71. This was due from navy agents, navy pension agents, and pursers, and he immediately directed his attention to the collection of these claims; and by good management and great perseverence he has succeeded in recovering, in all, $109,915 82, which has been paid into the treasury. The residue remains unpaid; most of it will probably be wholly lost to the Government. These defalcations include the celebrated Denby case—the amount due from that personage being $145,819 03, all gone—the Independent

Treasury act to the contrary notwithstanding. There are several other cases of aggravated default by navy agents; but as the particulars are before the public, it is necessary to dwell upon them. In consequence, the honorable Secretary deemed it to be not expedient to make pretty extensive changes in the corps of navy agents and pension agents. He has caused to be appointed on expiration of the terms of predecessors, four; on removal, two, and both defaulters; on resignation, one; and has discontinued two agencies as useless to the public. One Democrat holds over, and another (George Loyall) has been re-appointed, (a great mistake!) Every honest man must say it is all right.

Revenue service.—I have no means of comparing the state of things now, as to collectors of customs and other officers in this branch, appointed either by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the condition of affairs under Mr. Polk's Administration; but one thing I know, in many cases removals have been received with high satisfaction in their respective localities. On occasion of the removal of Governor Morton from the collectorship of Boston, the Democracy of that city assembled on the common and fired a salute of *two hundred guns!* or, if I have put too much powder in this statement, say *one hundred guns!* I hope the honorable Senator will not charge over the ammunition to President Taylor or the Whig party. I have letters from reliable friends, showing that at least two-fifths of the patronage in the custom-houses of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, is in the hands of the Democratic party. Quite too much! More reform is needed in this quarter!

I make the same remark in respect to district attorneys, marshals, Indian agents, surveyors-general, registers of the land offices, and receivers of public moneys, which I have already submitted in respect to collectors and other officers of the customs. I would observe that the district attorney for the southern district of New York, on being dismissed, proved a defaulter to the amount of $20,000; and I have understood the President has not removed some of the other officers named, out of deference to the wishes of Democratic Senators. If this resolution passes, I shall conclude he has been too generous!

General Post Office.—The honorable Senator (Mr. BRADBURY) says that there were removed, during the last fiscal year, 2,103 deputy postmasters; and he concludes that at least 2,000 of them must have been dismissed by President Taylor—thus charging over to the President a large number who were displaced, in New York, Ohio, and other States, for turning free-soilers. He then adds: "If the work has gone on at the same rate, we must have some five thousand (dismissals) in the post offices alone." Now, as I am unwilling to have so worthy a gentleman remain in the dark, I will lay the precise state of the case before him.

State of the case on the 9th of March, 1850:

Whole number of post offices in the United States		17,780
Appointed by the Postmaster General on removals	3,406	
Appointed by the Postmaster General on resignations	2,802	
Appointed by the Postmaster General on deaths	218—	6,426
		11,354

The removals have only been about twenty per cent. on the whole number; and after all the appointments made on deaths, resignations, and removals, almost two-thirds of the appointees of the last and preceding Administrations remain in office.

In Maine, (where, according to the honorable Senator, there has been a pretty general sweep,) I find, on recent inquiry at the General Post Office, the account to stand thus:

Number of post offices in Maine	651
" removals	149
" resignations	81
" deaths	3

So that more than three-fourths of the postmasters appointed for Maine, before the 4th of March, 1849, remain in office; and I venture to say there are few Whigs among them.

It is well known that the Harrison Administration went out of office at the end of seven or eight months after it was organized; and I admit that the then Postmaster General made a considerable number of removals during that period; but President Tyler having separated himself from his political friends, ere long commenced removing the appointees of Mr. Granger; and I now submit the following statement, obtained at the General Post Office, of the number of removals made during the two last years of Mr. Tyler's and the whole of Mr. Polk's administration.

Number of Postmasters removed from the 4th of March, 1843, *to the 4th of March,* 1849, *viz:*

In the year ending 4th March, 1844	588	
Do do do do 1845	672	
		1,260
Do do do do 1846	1,197	
Do do do do 1847	393	
Do do do do 1848	295	
Do do do do 1849	428	
		2,313
		3,573

The effect of these extensive removals was to give the Democratic party again almost the exclusive possession and control of the post offices of the country—certainly so of those in the free States, and it

seems to me that there is nothing unreasonable in the course of the President, or rather of his Postmaster General, under all the circumstances of the case.

Before I close this branch of the subject, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the great number of resignations of postmasters which have occurred since the 4th of March, 1849; and these are now rapidly outrunning the removals. From the 12th of January last to the 9th of March, the resignations increased by two hundred and two, and the removals by only one hundred and fifty-four! Mr. Jefferson said, in his celebrated letter to the New Haven merchants, that vacancies "by death are few, by resignation none." How surprisingly times are altered! I cannot account for it, unless it be the effect of the honorable Senator's speech. If he will only publish one or two more editions, all the Democrats in office will probably resign from a sheer sense of justice to the President.

I now come, Mr. President, to the heroes! They have been sacrificed! The honorable Senator gives a list.

1. He says that Gen. Lane, appointed Governor of Oregon towards the close of the last Administration, has been dismissed. I wish to say nothing derogatory to this gentleman. If he won laurels in the war with Mexico, I shall be the last man to pluck a leaf. He may be a good soldier, but not well qualified to discharge so difficult and responsible a trust in that remote quarter of the world. The President knew Gen. Lane intimately, and it is to be presumed he acted in removing him from a high sense of duty. Besides, he has appointed the gallant and highly accomplished Major John P. Gaines to fill the place—who was also distinguished in the same war—and a better or braver man never lived. Does the honorable Senator claim that only Democratic heroes are to be provided for!

2. Colonel John B. Weller, commissioner to run the Mexican boundary, has been removed, and I beg to assure the Senator for good and sufficient reasons. The papers in the case have been communicated to the Senate. I have examined them carefully, and it appears that he violated in the grossest manner the instructions of the last Executive. In addition, he has squandered the appropriation, and overdrawn the amount by several thousand dollars. I venture to predict, that at least twenty-five thousand dollars will be required to supply deficiencies. In the mean time, he has done very little—only fixed the initial point on the Pacific, traced the line towards the Gila four miles, ascertained the point of departure at the juncture of the Gila with the Colorado, and traced the line from thence towards the Pacific one mile. At this rate, it will take one century to run the line. The President owed it alike to himself and the country to dismiss him.

3. Captain Blythe was dismissed from the office of District Attorney for the northern district of Mississippi; but I will let Captain B. tell his own story as follows:

"COLUMBUS, MISS., *June* 15, 1849.

"*To the Editors of the Union.*

"GENTLEMEN: On observing, a few days since, the official notice of my removal from the office of United States Attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, I immediately addressed a note to the Editor of the Democrat, of this place, requesting him not to indulge in crimination or complaint on account of my ejection. My reasons stated for such a request were these: Viewing the course of the Administration, I anticipated that which has occurred the more certainly, as I had positively refused the assistance of many leading Whigs in the district, voluntarily tendered, to retain me in the place; and I was unwilling to become the object of newspaper notoriety or controversy about a matter of so little personal interest to me. Judge, then, of my regret on observing the very kindly-intended article about myself which appeared in your paper of the 8th instant. To correct the mistakes of that article—based upon incorrect information—is the object of this communication.

"It is true, I commanded a company from this place about nineteen months during the war with Mexico. I was not amongst the first to rush to the rescue, my health at that time preventing. Neither was I a member of the *first* Mississippi regiment, nor at the battle of Monterey and Buena Vista.

"I would further state, that I know of no *unusual* bond of sympathy that ever existed between General Taylor and the regiment to which I was attached. He certainly was under no obligations to me, unless experience shall have taught him that those were his best friends who labored most assiduously to prevent his occupying the seat he now does. I do not censure the Administration for its course towards me, as I conceive I have no personal cause.

"Again expressing my repugnance to this character of notoriety, permit me to add my grateful acknowledgments for your kind intentions. A. K. BLYTHE."

This letter I consider highly creditable to Capt. Blythe. By his own acknowledgment, he had participated actively in the late presidential election, and therefore was a proper subject of removal; but he displays in his letter so much nobleness of soul and generosity of disposition, that I could almost wish the President would give him some signal expression of his approbation.

[Here Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi, made some remarks highly complimentary to Capt. Blythe, in which Mr. S. concurred.]

4. I know nothing of the other cases mentioned by the Senator. He speaks of Mr. Haile, of New York, who he says was dangerously wounded at the battle of Lundy's Lane, and left for dead on the field, has nevertheless been dismissed from some office—what, the Senator does not say. But this, whether right or wrong, is no new thing in the history of the country. I have already said that Mr. Jefferson dismissed Elizur Goodrich from the collectorship of New Haven, and he was bayoneted by the British when they invaded that city during the revolutionary war, and was "left for dead on the field." General Jackson turned out several who had distinguished themselves in defence of the country: among others, I recollect the case of Major Melville, who was one of the celebrated "Boston tea-party."

But General Taylor is the last man to do injustice to those who have suffered for the country. If anything of the sort has occurred since he came into power, it has been without his knowledge, and will be sure to meet with his disapprobation. He who exclaimed in the height of the battle of Buena Vista, "My wounded are behind me—I will not retreat alive," will gladly recognise the just pretensions of his comrades in arms.

Mr. President it now only remains for me to state briefly the grounds on which I suppose an adminisration coming into power, as did the present, may make appointments without laying itself open justly to the charge of being proscriptive. It may appoint its own friends to fill vacancies created by—

1. Deaths.

2. Resignation. These have been more numerous than is generally supposed, since the 4th of March, 1849, in other departments than the General Post Office. I could give many more particulars, but time will not permit.

3. By removal of those unduly appointed by a retiring administration. And here I wish to notice the broad contrast which exists been the course of the Democracy at the 2d session of the 20th Congress, at the close of Mr. Adams's term, and at the 2d session of the last Congress. On both occasions the party had a majority in the Senate; but in the former they took the ground that inasmuch as the administration of Mr. A. had been condemned and overruled by the people, it was not fit that he should dispense the patronage of government any further than was indispensable to the public services. They therefore laid on the table, and refused to act on, it is believed, nine-tenths of his nominations, and among others that of the Hon. John J. Crittenden, nominated as a judge of the Supreme Court. But a very different course was pursued at the last session. The retiring President laid his hands on all appointments within his reach. He made no less than one hundred and forty-six nominations at the last session, of which twenty-four were during the three days in March—ministers, chargés, consuls, collectors, marshals, district attorneys, navy agents, postmasters, and other subordinate officers—and the Senate had no difficulty in confirming them, notwithstanding the rule in the case of Mr. Adams. Mr. Hannegan was nominated and confirmed at the last gasp. This anticipation of the incoming President constituted, in my judgment, a serious grievance, which demanded a more full redress than it has received.

By removal of such as obtained their places by proscribing others; and this will usually involve the restoration of long-tried and faithful public officers, as as in the cases of the Second and Third Auditor's offices. Mr. Grundy, in the extract from his speech already quoted, recognised this as a sufficient ground for removal.

5. By ditto, in cases where there is incapacity, inattention to duty, immorality, or other irregularity of conduct.

6. By ditto, where there has been an open interference with elections, either municipal, State, or national. I deny that any man can be deemed truly competent who is a brawler on such occasions. Capacity, properly considered, is a large word. It comprehends not only intellect, sound morals, sufficient education, and business habits, but also acceptability to the people. What right has any administration to quarter on any community a public officer (deputy postmaster for example) who has made himself odious by political impertinence to a majority of the people, at the locality where he is to exercise his functions? When, therefore, the President said that the want of capacity would be a sufficient cause for dismissal, it necessarily involved the exclusion of all this class.

7. By ditto, where there has been no positive misconduct, official or otherwise, and nothing appears against the officer but inaptitude, in point of temper or habits, to the place which he fills. This is recognised by Mr. Shipley, one of the honorable Senator's Democratic predecessors, as sufficient cause for removal:

"A man may prove a bad public officer from constitutional traits of character. He may be slow in the discharge of duty, where expedition is required. He may have an irritable temper, where great patience is desirable or necessary. These, and a great variety of other causes, may prevent the discharge of his official duties as they ought to be discharged, and yet he may not be chargeable with any intentional misconduct. And must the people suffer under these inconveniences without any effectual remedy? The injury and inconvenience to the individual, by removal, is not at all to be compared to the public injury by his continuance in such cases."—*Vide Gales & Seaton's Debates, vol.* 11, *pt.* 1, *p.* 453.

8. By ditto, where there are good and sufficient reasons to suspect frauds, defalcations, or other misconduct. I can say, in the language of Mr. Shipley, that since General Taylor came into power—

"Many instances of defalcation and corruption, where the incumbents were supposed to be good officers while in office, have been discovered on their retiring by virtue of a law, or on their removal, and their names could be given; but I forbear to do it, as it is not necessary to the argument."—*Vide Gales & Seaton's Cong. Deb., vol.* 11, *pt.* 1, *p.* 452.

9. By ditto, with a view to the general advantage; but this ground must be acted on with great caution, otherwise it will run into abuse. Mr. Shipley says, (Gales & Seaton's Cong. Deb., vol. 11, pt. 1, p. 453:)

"I would not necessarily require any positive fault in an officer, in order to remove him from office." * * * "It is just and proper, and useful, without regard to party or party favors, to change public officers. It is in accordance with our system of government, which holds out equal rights and equal privileges to all."

This Democratic Senator from Maine did not deem these views at all inconsistent with positive pledges of Gen. Jackson and his friends against the proscriptive policy.

If the honorable Senator (Mr. B.) should suggest (and indeed he does so in effect in his resolution) that the parties in interest should, before removal, have notice, and a hearing, or an opportunity to make a defence, then I must call on Mr. Shipley again to correct his errors, and bring him to a proper understanding of this subject.

Mr. Shipley says:

"If the President is required to give satisfactory reasons for a removal, he must first have the proof of misconduct; and if the proof is attempted, as long as parties exist, the testimony will be contradictory, and the people will never be enabled to procure a removal, until a case is made so clear as to authorize and justify an impeachment. The voice of the people is lost. They can no longer be heard, or, if heard, respected.—*Vide Gales & Seaton's Cong. Deb., vol.* 11, *p.* 453.

Or will the Senator (Mr. BRADBURY) insist that it is a grievous wrong to displace a party who have been a quarter of a century in office, and that Democratic office-holders have at least a possessory right to their places, to say nothing of an estate for life or in fee?

In answer, I must ask my honorable friend to hear the sentiments of General Jackson, as expressed in his first annual message to Congress—sentiments which were promulged in face of his assurance that "the patronage of the Government should not be brought in conflict with the freedom of elections:"

"In a country where offices are created solely for the benefit of the people, no one man has any more intrinsic right to official station than another. Offices are not established to give support to particular men at the public expense No individual wrong is done by removal, since neither appointment to nor continuance in office is matter of right. The incumbent became an officer with a view to public benefits; and when these require his removal, they are not to be sacrificed to private interests. It is the people, and they alone, who have a right to complain when a bad officer is substituted for a good one. He who is removed has the same means of obtaining a living that are enjoyed by millions who never held office."

Or will the Senator contend that the President has made some mistakes, and has failed in some instances to observe the rules of moderation and equity by which he has endeavored to regulate his conduct? Very likely; in such vast concerns, mistakes are unavoidable; but I hope he will let the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. BENTON) apologize for the President.

"Doubtless President Jackson has made some unfortunate appointments. I myself have made some unfortunate recommendations, though I have made but few.—*Vide Cong. Deb., vol.* 11, *pt.* 1, *p.* 374.

Hear, also, Mr. Grundy to the same effect:

"It is urged that worthy men have been removed from office without sufficient cause. Of this I have no doubt. The Chief Magistrate has, in some instances, been imposed on by the representations of others. Another fact, however, is equally clear, that others have been retained who should have been dismissed.

Many such, Mr. President—many such! and I hope President Taylor's Cabinet will look them all up ere long.

I will not say that the President and his Cabinet have acted on the principles here developed. I do not speak at their instance or by their authority. I desire it may be distinctly understood that all I have offered on the present occasion is submitted on my sole responsibility. I do not intend that the idea shall be entertained for a moment that the distinguished citizens who now administer the Government, are responsible in the slightest degree for what I have now said, or may hereafter say or do, as a member of this body. On the other hand, it is but just that I should disclaim responsibility for the course of events since the 4th of March, 1849. There are not half a dozen appointments out of my own State that can be traced to any opinions expressed by me to the Executive. The President and Cabinet have not needed the aid of my feeble arm.

I have thus, Mr. President, endeavored to show that the course of President Taylor has been moderate, just, and reasonable—such as to commend itself to patriotic and impartial men every where. My sole object in entering on this exposition (I fear too protracted by far) has been to defend his consistency, honor, and rectitude. I know that any effort of mine cannot stop for a moment the floodgates of calumny and abuse. All that ingenuity can devise, malice suggest, or uncharitableness conceive, has been and will continue to be used to poison public sentiment, and to prevent an impartial judgment by the people on his course. Many adventitious circumstances have occurred to embarrass him and his administration; but these must soon pass away. Justice will be done him by the men of the present day; he will receive it at the hands of posterity. But, whatever may be his fortunes, he is sure to be sustained by conscious rectitude, and by the promptings of a heart which has ever beat in unison with the honor of his country and the true glory of the American people. He may exclaim, in the language of Washington, in a letter to Mr. Lee, of Virginia:

"IN WHAT WILL THIS ABUSE TERMINATE? FOR THE RESULT, AS IT RESPECTS MYSELF, I CARE NOT; FOR I HAVE A CONSOLATION WITHIN THAT NO EARTHLY EFFORTS CAN DEPRIVE ME OF: AND THAT IS, THAT NEITHER AMBITIOUS NOR INTERESTED MOTIVES HAVE INFLUENCED MY CONDUCT. THE ARROWS OF MALEVOLENCE, THEREFORE, HOWEVER BARBED AND WELL POINTED, NEVER CAN REACH THE MOST VULNERABLE PART OF ME, THOUGH, WHILE I AM UP FOR A MARK, THEY WILL BE CONTINUALLY AIMED."