

From the *Supporter*.
Chillicothe, Feb. 2.

Mr. Massey.—In my judgment, the speech of Gen. Harrison, published in the last *Supporter*, is in many points of view, a very exceptionable document. I sincerely regret that the General should have delivered such sentiments as the speech contains, and I regret most deeply, that he should have deliberately prepared it for the press, and that so much pains should be taken to extend its circulation.

I am the more grieved, because the matter in debate did not call for the expression of a single opinion contained in the speech. In supporting the propriety of striking out a part of the report of the committee, it was wholly unnecessary, and, in my opinion, quite out of order, to take any notice of the controversy between the state and the Bank. General legislation ought to be conducted without reference to particular cases. For this reason, I commend the motion to amend the report, and disapprove the argument in support of it.

Beside the objection, that it was not decorous for the legislature of Ohio to denounce the decision of the Supreme Court, while the state was litigating a similar question in the federal court, a wide field of discussion was opened, as to the relative portions of sovereignty, and the relative rights and duties of the general and state governments—the respect due from each to the other; the comity of language & deportment which they should each observe to the other; and the absolute impropriety of holding a language, which gentlemen, in their intercourse with one another, would regard as offensive and insulting. These were the proper topics of debate; the origin, character and conduct of the Bank ought not to have been introduced, much less should the character of our tax, the influence that produced it, or the probable result of the dispute have been drawn into discussion. Had a direct proposition been submitted, that the state should abandon the ground she has taken; submit herself to the Bank; make restitution; and ask pardon for the offence of attempting to legislate upon a subject so sacred as corporation privileges, Gen. Harrison's speech would have had some pertinency. Even then I should have deemed it very unwise and injudicious. But as it stands, it seems like travelling out of the way to cast reproach upon the legislation of the state; to weaken her counsels, to humble her in the eyes of others, and all this for no visible object but that of making a speech.

The first objection to this speech is, that it states very incorrectly the proposition for debate—“*Shall we oppose the execution of a law of the United States, which comes to us clothed with all the forms, and after having passed the only ordeal presented by the constitution for testing its validity?*” Nothing could be more unfair and more improper, than thus stating the question. Unfair, because expressing an opinion upon an abstract proposition, does not in the most remote manner, imply a determination to maintain that opinion by any illegal proceeding. Improper, because this was the shape in which the Bank advocates had laboured to place their controversy with the state, and nothing could better subvert their views, than that a statesman of Gen. Harrison's standing, should concede them their ground. They had sounded the tocsin of rebellion, of “*danger imminent and certain*,” they had compared Ohio to Massachusetts, the Bank tax to the Hartford convention. Their tools and agents had rung these charges upon almost every change. Did it become the most able and prominent of the legislators of Ohio, to perform the humble task of reiterating this stuff on the floor of the senate? It is my humble opinion that it did not. I am mortified that such was the fact—I am more mortified, to observe the industry with which the degradation is proclaimed from our own house tops; and this feeling of humble pride, is not lessened by the reflection, that the charges are wholly untrue and unjust.

Having assumed that the question for debate, was whether Ohio should oppose the execution of a law of the United States, Gen. Harrison proceeds to treat the subject as if an hostile opposition was actually contemplated. His arguments are all directed to such a state of things. Surely this ought not to have been done! Is it a fact that Ohio contemplates any act of hostility against the law of congress? Is it a fact that she presents any hostile opposition to the execution of the laws? It is well known that she does not, and an argument addressed to such a proposition is greatly mischievous and unbecoming.

What is the fact? In 1816, Congress incorporated a Banking Company with power to establish Branches wherever they pleased in the United States. Their act of incorporation contained no stipulation, on the part of the United States, that the states should not tax them. Before their charter was granted, the states had claimed and exercised the power of taxing a similar institution. They established Branches in Ohio—the state claimed a right to tax them, and enacted a law for this purpose. When the law passed it was in collision with no express provision of the charter. Afterwards comes a decision of the Supreme Court in a made case, declaring the exemption from state taxation, though stipulated by Congress, is notwithstanding, a necessary incident of their other privileges. The law of the state is nevertheless

executed in a peaceable manner; and this is an act of hostility against government, which draws us into the consideration of fields of blood, and armies in hostile array. When such is the language of our own legislators, may not people at a distance well believe, that hostility, that resistance, even resistance to blood, is contemplated by the state? Does not every statesman of Ohio know this is not the fact?

According to Gen. Harrison's own views of the subject, the controversy is between right and power. In his opinion the act of incorporation originated in an erroneous interpretation of the constitution, and he also expresses an opinion, that the decision of the court, denying the power of taxation to the states, is founded in error. Gen. Harrison must therefore believe, that a very serious encroachment upon state sovereignty is attempted; and yet, being one of the first and most veteran politicians of the state, he is the first to condemn the struggle she is engaged in for the maintenance of her rights. Is this the conduct of a patriot or of a republican? Was this the conduct of republicans in 1793 and in 1799? Let the patriots of Virginia and Kentucky answer for themselves. Let them say what would have been the language of republicans, if Brackenridge, in Kentucky, or John Taylor, in Virginia, had stood up in their respective legislatures, and proclaimed, that the alien and sedition laws were enacted by Congress, and had been pronounced constitutional by the judiciary, and that to express an opinion, or to remonstrate against them, was to rise in rebellion and act the part of the evil genius of Brutus. I am much mistaken if one universal hiss of scorn would not have driven them from the ranks of republicanism forever.

In the estimation of Gen. Harrison, the Bank is not only unconstitutional, but is also calculated to produce great evil in the nation, and has acted towards his own immediate constituents with oppression and injustice. The committee proposed to declare their opinion, that congress have no right to authorise such an evil to establish itself in the state, without its consent, and that the right of the state to tax it, ought never to be surrendered. This declaration Gen. Harrison is unwilling should go to the world, “without raising his voice against it,”—because he deems it “a most unfortunate measure, calculated to produce the most awful consequences.” Gen. Harrison is the last man in the legislature from whom I should have expected to hear such language. A legislature of freemen afraid to declare their opinion because of the “*awful consequences*!” This partakes nothing of high minded republicanism, it much more resembles the conduct of the unfortunate sons of Issachar, “*couching down between two burdens*.” I would by no means make the application to Gen. Harrison; but had the speech been made by some men, I should say “he saw the rest was good and the land it was pleasant, and he bowed his shoulders to bear and become a servant unto tribute.” *Consequences*, in the mind of an independent freeman, are secondary considerations. Had Hampden or Patrick Henry weighed consequences, instead of principles, it may well be questioned whether their names would have been known at this day. The consequences which they encountered were serious, not imaginary. They put themselves forward in a struggle for constitutional principles. They did not say to themselves, much less in the face of the public, the government in all its departments, have disregarded the constitution.—To oppose their encroachments involves most “*awful consequences*,” therefore will I raise my voice against it.

Pretensions upon the part of the Bank of the United States, admitted by Gen. Harrison, have drawn the state into a collision with that institution. Those pretensions vitally affect the state sovereignty. Ought the state to surrender without a constitutional effort to preserve her rights? What would Gen. Harrison say of a military commander, who, when his advance was attacked, without attempting to ascertain the number or character of his enemy, should burn his provisions and retreat? The public functionary, who with right and justice to back him, proposes to surrender the sovereignty entrusted to him, upon the first summons, acts very much in the same character. Is it not in both cases, all the difference in the world between a tame surrender, and a gallant effort to preserve our rights?

From the light in which Gen. Harrison views the pretensions of the Bank, I should suppose that he would rejoice, if by any effort of the state, its march to mischief and injustice could be arrested. If his language can be understood, his heart should be with the majority of his fellow citizens upon this question. Is he more wise, or more timid than his brother members? Does he save the general cause by denouncing his fellow labourers? Does it become a good officer, who disapproves the councils of the army, to expose and reprobate them, while in action? Most persons, I believe, will answer these questions in the negative. Gen. Harrison should well consider them. To make & publish a speech is a very puerile ambition at best. But if momentous questions are misrepresented, and vital principles abandoned, the folly is almost unpardonable.

I have heard it suggested by some, that the General was biased by having been a director of the Branch at Cincinnati; by others

that the Gen. had a son holding a pro tem appointment under the national government, which he wished confirmed during the present session of Congress, and that reprobating the conduct of Ohio, might be palatable at Washington. I give no credit to these suggestions, and I mention them only, that he may be advised of the imputations to which extraordinary conduct inevitably subjects a man even of the highest standing.

The speech embraces such a variety of matter, that a detail review of it is out of the question. It is evidence, but of that no evidence is wanted, that the General is a man of reading and reflection. Some of his allusions are more classical than appropriate, and some of his illustrations are not very happily chosen. Of the first description, that of comparing the frequent elections of Congress to the Giant *Autons* is a striking instance. This fabled monster of antiquity undertook to build a temple of men's skulls, and slew all he met for that purpose, and when weary, by touching his mother earth, he refreshed himself. There is certainly no similarity between Congress and this homicide, and as little between our elections and his mode of recruiting strength. Between the Bank of the United States and this unnatural monster, there may be some affinity, but in that sense he is not introduced.

The application of the doctrine of Lord Chatham, to the Bank of the U. States, is certainly very unfortunately introduced.—That stern & virtuous friend of liberty would smile with pity, could he hear the doctrines which constituted a man's dwelling house his castle, set up to claim a like sanctity for the counting room of an association of money changers. Transported with a just and generous indignation, against national and individual oppression, the sentiments of that great man rushed warm from his heart. Violations of personal liberty; outrages upon the sanctity of home, and the sacred safeguards of domestic peace, were well calculated to excite enthusiasm. But how cold and vapour does the same language sound, when applied to cashiers, clerks and tellers; to vaults and shaving shops; to Bank notes and dollars! I am surprised that the General should fall into so great an error. Had he checked his feelings one moment, to give room for reflection, he must have felt the distinction.—Could justice ever be administered or taxes even collected, if every counting-house, shop, and stable were as inviolable as the family mansion?

But I can indulge no further remark, I do not write to wound the General's feelings. I know how sensitive he is, and with what volubility he deals out “*damned rascal*,” and “*federal scoundrel*,” when he is noticed in a newspaper in other than the language of panegyric. I respect him & mean him well. The public conduct of a public man is at all times a proper subject of investigation; it is more emphatically so, when he himself takes pains to disseminate his opinions far and wide.

CAMILLUS.

“Why did not Gen. Harrison, in his universal speech, mention about his having been Governor of the Territory of Indiana, Indian Agent, and at the same time a Merchant of Vincennes, and Contractor for supplying the Rations for the Indian Department? Such a relation would have added more diversity to his harangue, and exposed some of the causes of his present wealth and late extraordinary elevation.”

From a *London Paper*.

TO A FRIEND ABOUT TO MARRY A SECOND TIME.

Oh, keep the ring one little year;
Keep poor ELIZA's ring,
And shed on it the silent tear,
In secret sorrowing.

Thy lips, on which her last, last kiss,
Yet fingers moist and warm,
Oh, wipe them not for newer bliss,
Oh, keep it as a charm.

These haunts are sacred to her love,
Here still her presence dwells;
Of her the grove, of her the grove,
Of her the garden tells.

Beneath those elms you set and talk'd,
Beside that river's brink,
At evening, arm in arm you walk'd,
Here stop to gaze and think.

Thou'll meet her when thy blood beats high,
In converse with thy bride,
Meet the mild beaming of an eye,
That never learnt to chide.

Oh no, by heaven, another here
Thou canst not, must not, bring;
No keep it—but one little year,
Keep poor ELIZA's ring.

A gentleman was complaining that he had three fine daughters, to whom he should give 10,000 dollars each, and yet he could find no body to marry them. “With your leave,” said an Irishman present, making a very respectful bow, “I will take two of them.”

Oswego, Oct. 2.

A few days ago, an Irishman deserted from the British garrison at Fort George, and swam across the Niagara river.—Having divested himself of those articles which would impede his swimming, he exclaimed

on reaching the shore, “by J—s I'm an American born—I've just come stark naked.”

Recreation.—“Beware of too much recreation.—Gaming, taverns and plays, are pernicious, and corrupt youth. If they had no other fault, they are justly to be declined, in respect to their excessive expence of time, and habituating men to idleness, vain thoughts, and disturbing passions, when they are past, as well as while they are used.”

[Chief Justice Hale.

CINCINNATUS, the Roman Patriot, weeding in his turnip garden; BURKE, the British Cicero, dining upon a mutton chop; and FRANKLIN, one of the patrons of America, feasting upon bread and water in a printing-office!—What illustrious examples for modern patriots, for modern philosophers and modern plough boys!

(*Albany Plough Boy.*

DEATH, (N. Y.) DEC. 23.

Systems of old fashioned times reviving.
A farmer of German extraction, came into our village the other day with honey to sell—he fixed his price at 12½ cents per pound, and made several sales at that price; but finding the market rather dull, he sold off the remainder at 10 cents per pound. Turning to the last purchaser he enquired “who lives in that house, & that,” (pointing to the house of the first buyers.)—“I sold Mr.—— 8 lbs. I must now return him 20 cents,” to Mr.——10 lbs. he must have 25 cents.” Why must you return this money? “Because,” replied the honest yeoman, “it would do to make fish of one and flesh of another.”

Treaty with the Kickapoo Indians.—By the terms of this treaty, which was made in August last, at Edwardsville, the United States gave to the Kickapoos, land upon the *Pomme de Terre* fork of the Osage river for their claim upon the Sangamond river in the state of Illinois, and in execution of the treaty the Kickapoos have already been conducted into the Missouri Territory.

The *Pomme de Terre* is a southern fork of the Osage river, entering it some miles above the mouth of the *Tungar*, and not more than thirty miles below the Great Osage villages. The treaty cannot yet have been ratified by the senate of the United States, although it has already been carried partly into execution.

There are several good reasons why it should not be ratified.

First, the country ceded to the Kickapoos, is the hunting ground of the Osages, and in the immediate neighborhood of their towns, and cannot be occupied by the Kickapoos under the authority of the United States, without impressing the Osages with an unfavorable opinion of the justice of our government, and laying the foundation of certain hostilities between the Indians and themselves.

Second, it is equally desirable to the Missouri people to keep the Kickapoos off the Osage river, as it was to the people of Illinois to remove them from the Sangamond.

Third, they will have to be moved again in very short time, as their new position in the neighborhood of the whites and Osages will neither be desirable nor tenable by them many years.

St. Louis Enquirer.

The following paragraph is from a late *London paper*.

“Accession of his majesty.—On the 25th ultimo, our venerable and afflicted Sovereign entered into the 60th year of his reign, a period longer than any of his majesty's predecessors in England and Scotland occupied the throne. Henry III. reigned in England fifty-six years, and James VI. in Scotland fifty-eight years; but the former was only nine years of age when he succeeded to the monarchy, and the latter was an infant, when in consequence of the extorted resignation of his mother he became King; while George the III. was of a legitimate age, on his accession to the sovereignty of Great Britain and Ireland. Of the Peers of Scotland at his Majesty's accession, only the Duke of Gordon, born 1743, who inherited the title in 1732, is alive.—The twenty Judges of the Court of Session and Exchequer in Scotland have been exactly three times renewed during this reign; the appointments to the bench being sixty in number, exclusive of two promotions of Peers to the President's Chair. Of the members of the faculty of Advocates at the accession, four are alive, viz. Robert Craig, of Riccarton, and Robert Berry, both admitted in 1754, and Sir Hay Campbell, and James Ferguson of Pitfour, the present member of Parliament for Aberdeenshire, both admitted in 1750. Of the society of Writers to the Signet at the accession, only one, Cornelius Elliot of Woollee, is in existence. Of the Peers of England and Ireland at the commencement of his reign, five are alive, viz. the Earl, now Marquis Drogheda, the Earl of Carlisle, Earls Fitzwilliam, Viscount Nettleville, and Viscount Bulky, all of whom were under age at the accession, with the exception of the Marquis of Drogheda, now in his 90th year, and at the head of the Generals of the army.”

It is stated that a band of robbers, apparently organised, infest the city of New-Orleans.