

that bill in so hasty a manner ; but it was not slanders contained in newspaper paragraphs which I regarded...they have no more effect on my mind than the passing wind. It was the manner in which that bill was treated by the House of Representatives, that wounded my feelings...I felt for the honor of the Senate. I voted with the gentleman from Virginia for that bill, though I did not at the time feel all the apprehensions which seemed to be impressed on his mind. I did not apprehend that a rebellion excited by an individual not clothed with any official consequence or power, without resources, and almost without friends, could ultimately endanger the safety of the Union. But from the communications made to Congress by the President, I was led to believe there was some treasonable proceeding and rebellion which ought to be speedily and promptly resisted and put down. Though I did not see the necessity of passing the bill with so much haste as to subject the Senate to the charge of precipitation...yet being satisfied of the propriety of passing such a bill, I felt a reluctance, as I always do, at interposing my vote in a manner that may have even the appearance of throwing difficulties in the way of measures which regard the public safety. But no motives of delicacy, or any other cause, will prevent my opposing measures I think wrong in principle. The loss of the bill to suspend the Habeas Corpus was in no respect attributable to the Court or the Judges. There was no interference on their part, nor any conduct of theirs that could warrant the gentleman from Virginia in making the heavy charge "that the hostile propensities of a court against its own country and its own government, were the reasons why treason escaped punishment." In what instance have the judges interposed a shield between guilt and punishment? The principal leader in that rebellion was apprehended and taken to Virginia; and I rejoiced, at the time, that Virginia was to be the place of his trial;...so that no suspicion might exist of a disposition to favor his escape from conviction and punishment. Aaron Burr was acquitted...whether from a defect in the law or testimony, I am not sufficiently informed to decide. But I have no hesitation in declaring it as my opinion, that it was not owing to any indisposition in the judge to do his duty; on the contrary, I think he manifested great integrity and firmness in adhering to the established rules of proceeding in criminal trials, which are the great shield of innocence against oppression; and in giving a fair trial to a political opponent, against whom the popular current ran high, and whose prosecution was aided by executive influence and power. The opinions of the judge are in print, so that every one can examine for himself, and form his own. Thus much I may venture to say, that the gentleman from Virginia would find it no easy task to point out errors.

It is cause of regret when an individual, and much to be lamented when a public body become so zealously engaged in the pursuit of an object, as not to examine with candour the propriety or expediency of the measures by which such object is to be attained. In the present case, I fear that a zeal to enforce the embargo has blinded the eyes of some to the consequences likely to follow from the course of mea-