

have satisfactorily, to my own mind, shown that all government, of any branch of government, always has the right and is therefore bound to use appropriate and vested power for the advancement and protection of the interests of those who granted and vested it. That the power being taken *from* the States and given *to* Congress over import duties, etc., was not to *weaken* but to *strengthen* its use for our benefit, and I have, by the way, reasoned upon the proper use of powers as between the States and general Government. But lest my reasonings might not be deemed orthodox by Governor Giles, of Virginia, by the Southern States generally, who deny the right in question, and by the prominent and influential friends of General Jackson in Kentucky, I then proceed to further show that it was an old doctrine; that it was asserted in the first Congress—received the fatherly care and patronage of Washington to the last moment of his administration. The same doctrine was held by Adams, his successor—more warmly espoused by Jefferson—higher still in the estimation of Madison, and sanctioned and recommended by Monroe. It would be tedious to quote from their various messages on this subject. But it is certainly a circumstance worthy of *particular remark* that our five previous Presidents were all patriots and statesmen of the first order, and *all participated* in the Revolution and the great political steps which ended in the present form of our Government, or, say in the present division and investment of power. The four first were members of the Convention which framed the Constitution, and the last, Monroe, was a member of the Virginia Convention which adopted it. Those men, and *such men too*, had no *doubt* upon the subject. Those who, at the present day, entertain serious doubts of this right and this policy, may consistently enough join the men of the South in order to put down this administration. But they would show more candor if they would enlighten us with their reasons upon which their doubts are founded. In the absence of these reasons, in the absence of an open avowal of the great changes intended to be effected by the election of General Jackson—and when we see, too, such a body of men, *nay States*, openly and avowedly *opposed* to the policy *we approve* (all ranged under the standard of the General) with legislative resolves, threatening *resistance*, if the policy is persisted in, *I say, seeing this*, fellow-citizens, let us pause and *reflect well* what we are about. When a determination is avowed 'to put down this administration, if as pure as the angels at the right hand of God!' 'to take a long pull, a strong pull and a pull all together,' their decided and sudden preference for military over civil attainments *might be guessed at.*"

