

# TARBORO' PRESS.



Whole No. 886.

Tarborough, (Edgecombe County, N. C.) Saturday, February 25, 1843

Vol. XIX—No. 8.

## The Tarborough Press,

BY GEORGE HOWARD.

Is published weekly at Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per year, if paid in advance—or Three Dollars at the expiration of the subscription year. For any period less than a year, Twenty-five Cents per month. Subscribers are at liberty to discontinue at any time, on giving notice thereof and paying arrears—those residing at a distance, must invariably pay in advance, or give a responsible reference in this vicinity.

Advertisements not exceeding a square will be inserted at One Dollar the first insertion, and 25 Cents for every continuance. Longer advertisements in like proportion. Court Orders and Judicial advertisements 25 per cent. higher. Advertisements must be marked the number of insertions required, or they will be continued until otherwise ordered and charged accordingly.

Letters addressed to the Editor must be post paid or they may not be attended to.

## POLITICAL.



From the Raleigh Standard.

### THE CORRESPONDENCE.

We publish the correspondence between the Hon. B. BROWN and Gen. R. M. SAUNDERS, which first appeared in the Raleigh Register. We have not supposed the matter of much importance to the public; but as several presses have taken occasion to assail one or the other of the parties, it is proper the gentlemen should speak for themselves, and the people thus have an opportunity of judging in the case.

### INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE.

Washington, January 18th 1843.

Mr. Gales: Having in an Editorial of your paper of the 23d December, had reference to the subjects embraced in the subjoined Correspondence, I have to request the favor of its publication in the Register. As Mr. Brown says the "conversation between Mr. Van Buren and himself occurred about the time of the termination of the French Commission, in which Mr. V. B. used the offensive remark in regard to me; I deem it due to myself to publish his letter to Gov. Spaight, dated a few days after the Commission closed, having reference to the very "appointment," which according to Mr. Brown's statement, led to the remark. I could also give a copy of Mr. Van Buren's letter to myself, expressing in still stronger terms his friendly feelings, but that the letter is of a character so exclusively personal, as to render it indelicate in me to make it public. Respectfully,

R. M. SAUNDERS.

Washington, December 26, 1842.

Sir: You will recollect on the day before my leaving Raleigh, I met you in the Rotunda, when I remarked, I had heard some of your friends had said, they would vote for Mr. Graham in preference to me—that I informed you whatever your friends might do, no friend of mine, as far as I knew or believed, would, under any contingency, vote for a Whig as Senator—and towards you personally I had no unkind feelings; that you replied by saying—"you reciprocated my feelings of kindness, and if any of your friends had expressed themselves as I had heard, it was wrong and should not be done as far as you could prevent it." You may imagine my surprise, after this, on reading the last Raleigh Register. And as the matter has thus been made public, I desire to know if you used the expressions—"that you had rather see an ultra Federalist elected than Saunders," or "that you would vote for a Federalist sooner than for me." Also, whether you used the expression "that whether you had long known me to be politically dishonest?" and whether you said, what you are reported as having said—"that Mr. Van Buren had told you, he had long known the, and that I thought no man in North Carolina but myself, capable of filling an office."

I have to request an early reply to the foregoing. My friend, Mr. Russell, will hand you this.

I have the honor to be, &c.

R. M. SAUNDERS.

Hon. Bedford Brown. Raleigh.

Raleigh, N. C., January 1, 1843.

Sir: Your letter of the 26th ult. was duly received by Mr. Russell, and in consequence of the absence of my friend, Mr. Bragg, from town, until evening before last, a delay of a day or two has occurred, in writing you an answer.

In regard to the conversation in the Rotunda, which you refer to as having taken place between us, on the subject of the Senatorial election, it is substantially correct as stated by you, tho' my recollection of it is different from yours, as to the time, as I think it occurred some days before you left Raleigh. After the expressions used by

you on that occasion, disclaiming any unkindness, personally, towards me, and also disclaiming on the part of your friends any intention to vote for a Whig, in any contingency, my feelings prompted me to reciprocate the same sentiments.

While I state this, frankness requires that I should also say, that subsequent to that conversation, I learned that your course had in some respects, not been characterized by kindness towards me. In addition to this, an article was published in the Richmond Enquirer, without giving the date or place from which it was written containing many misstatements as to myself, respecting the Senatorial election, and doing me great injustice. Without attributing this communication to any one in particular, it nevertheless had the appearance of having been written by some one in your counsels and confidence.

After these occurrences, and the declaration by some of your friends, that under no circumstances would they vote for me, together with the clear indications given, that the Whig party were relied upon to effect your election, it cannot be a just cause of surprise that my sentiments should have been changed, in regard to the subjects referred to in our conversations.

You ask me to inform you, whether I used the expression attributed to me in an article in a late Raleigh Register—"that I had rather see an ultra Federalist elected than yourself," or "that I would vote for a Federalist sooner than for you." While I deny the right of any one to call in question my privilege of expressing preferences in elections for important stations, I shall not hesitate to answer frankly your interrogatory. I did, in conversation, use substantially the expression attributed to me, under a change of views for the reasons above mentioned, and because I believed that an election of Senator from the Democratic ranks by the Whigs, would prove more injurious to the Democratic party, than the election of one from the ranks of our political opponents.

You ask also, if I had used the expression—"that I had long known you to be politically dishonest." In answer, I will state, that in conversation I used those words of similar import. It is due, however, to a proper understanding of my meaning, that I should say, that I used them in the sense in which they are ordinarily used towards public men who are supposed, on some occasions, to permit individual views to influence them to too great an extent, in their endeavors to attain public promotion.

You further request to be informed, whether I had said "that Mr. Van Buren had told me, he had long known you, and that you thought no man in North Carolina, but yourself, was capable of filling an office." The above remark was, in conversation with Mr. Van Buren before he was elevated to the Presidency, and about the time your appointment as Commissioner under the French Treaty was to terminate, and when your name was presented or was spoken of as intended to be presented to Gen. Jackson for another appointment, I understood him to use in substance, the above remark.

I have authorized my friend, Mr. Bragg, to transmit to you this letter.

Very respectfully, &c.

B. BROWN.

Hon. R. M. Saunders.

Washington, January 4, 1843.

Sir: Your letter of the 1st inst. in answer to mine of the 26th December, under cover of a note from Mr. Bragg, has been received.

To my first enquiry, whether you had said you were willing to vote for an ultra Federalist in preference to me, you answer in the affirmative. You also admit the conversation as stated by me to have passed between us before I left Raleigh. But you say your sentiments were changed in consequence of my course being personally unkind, and of other matters to which you refer. To which I answer, I neither said or did any thing pending the contest, to which you had a right to take exception. And it might have been well had you inquired as to the truth of the facts, before deciding upon a supposed case of injustice. As to your opinion on the effect of an election of a Democrat by Whig votes, I take the liberty of saying, it is the more singular as coming from you; as I learn Dr. Shanklin voted for you in caucus—for Mr. Graham in the House, and finally for you again. And I further learn, when a Whig Senator expressed to a friend of yours his disposition to vote for you—there was no objection to your being elected by a Whig vote.

You also admit the correctness of the expressions as used by Mr. Van Buren, and as repeated by you. I take it for granted, the authority of Mr. Van Buren in regard to me; was invoked by you, in order to influence those to whom the remarks were repeated. The office of Commissioner under the French Treaty, was conferred upon me by President Jackson, without any application or knowledge on my part, but as I

understood at the time from my friend Louis McLane, then Secretary of State, on his recommendation, together with that of Mr. Van Buren. When the commission was about to expire, one of the Commissioners and a personal friend of mine, informed me that Mr. Henderson, the Comptroller, was about to resign, and he thought it a situation that would suit me, and for which I was well qualified. I at first declined having any thing to do with it, but was induced, after my resignation as Attorney General, to allow him to enquire into it. Several letters, at my request, were forwarded to me, and amongst the number one from Mr. Macon to the President, and one from Gov. Spaight to Mr. Van Buren. Having been elected Judge, my name was not further pressed. But on my return home, I received from Mr. Van Buren an open letter to Gov. Spaight, in answer to his, couched in the most friendly and flattering terms towards me, in which he uses language very different from that which you say he used to you. Whilst in Washington, I was on all occasions treated by Mr. Van Buren, with marked respect. I have felt it due to myself to make this statement, and not because I supposed you felt any particular interest about it.

I come now to the only matter in your letter to which I had the right to take exceptions on personal grounds—and that is, the part in which you admit you used the expression, "that (you) had long known (me) to be politically dishonest." You add an explanation of the "meaning" in which you intended the use of these terms. And as I understand by this explanation, you intend to disclaim the offensive sense of the words "politically dishonest," and that you did not intend thereby to impeach my public or private integrity—but that you used the words excepted to, in the sense of ambition and not of knavery. If in this, I have understood you correctly, then am I content, and shall consider the correspondence as closed.

I have the honor to be, &c.

R. M. SAUNDERS.

Hon. B. Brown.

My Dear Sir: I would certainly have acknowledged the receipt of your & our friend Edwards' letter, had it not been my intention to send you a verbal explanation, thro' Mr. Saunders. I entertain a high sense of his public and private merits; have on two successive occasions, taken an active part in promoting his interests; and would with pleasure, have done so again, but for the circumstances in which the partiality of my friends have placed me. When I accepted the nomination of the Baltimore Convention, I determined, in justice to the administration and myself, to put down, as far as opposition calumny can be put down, the imputation of a design, on its part, to use the patronage of the Government, for the promotion of my election, by abstaining from all interference in its dispensation. This resolution, I have faithfully maintained. I am moreover, quite sure, that if the President had been in a situation to gratify Gen. Saunders' friends, it would have required no solicitation of mine; to have induced him to do so. Do me the favor to show this to our friend Edwards, and believe me,

Very truly yours,

MARTIN VAN BUREN.

Gov. Spaight.

Washington, Jan. 4, 1835.

### CONGRESS.

The following interesting proceedings took place in the House of Representatives, on Tuesday, the 7th inst. Mr. G. W. SUMMERS now rose, and addressed the Speaker, who recognised the honorable gentleman as in possession of the floor; and all eyes were at once turned to him, and the whole House was at once hushed into silence. The galleries were densely filled with an anxious and attentive auditory, which had collected in anticipation of the interesting proceedings which were about to be witnessed. Many Senators occupied seats amongst the members in the House, and some of the representatives of foreign powers, accredited to this Government in diplomatic relations, were ranged below the bar; and all listened with profound stillness while the honorable gentleman from Virginia, spoke as follows:

MR. SPEAKER: I rise for the purpose of discharging an office, not connected with the ordinary business of a legislative assembly. Yet, in asking permission to interrupt, for a moment the regular order of parliamentary proceedings, I cannot doubt that the proposition which I have to submit will prove as gratifying as it may be unusual.

Mr. Samuel T. Washington, a citizen of Kanawha county, in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and one of my constituents has honored me with the commission of presenting, in his name, and on his behalf, to the Congress of the United States; and through that body, to the people of the United States, two most interesting and valuable relics, connected with the past histo-

ry of our country, and with men whose achievements, both in the field and in the cabinet, best illustrate and adorn our annals.

One is the sword worn by George Washington, first as a colonel in the colonial service of Virginia, in Ferber's campaign against the French and Indians; and afterwards, during the whole period of the war of Independence, as commander-in-chief of the American army.

It is a plain cut-throat, or hanger, with a green hilt and silver guard. On the upper ward of the scabbard is engraven "J. Bailey, Fishkill." It is accompanied by a buckskin belt, which is secured by a silver buckle and clasp; whereon are engraven the letters "G. W.," and the figures "1757." These are all of the plainest workmanship, but substantial; and in keeping with the man and with the times to which they belonged.

The history of this sword is perfectly authentic, and leaves no shadow of doubt as to its identity.

The last will and testament of General Washington, bearing date on the 9th day of February, 1799, contains, among a great variety of bequests, the following clause: "To each of my nephews, William Augustine Washington, George Lewis, George Stepoee Washington, Bushrod Washington, and Samuel Washington, I give one of the swords or cut-throats of which I may die possessed; and they are to choose in the order they are named. The swords are accompanied with an injunction, not to unsheath them for the purpose of shedding blood, except it be for self-defence, or in defence of their country and its rights; and, in the latter case, to keep them unsheathed, and prefer falling with them in their hands, to the relinquishment thereof."

In the distribution of the swords, here by devised, among the five nephews therein enumerated, the one now presented fell to the share of Samuel Washington, the devisee last named in the clause of the will which I have just read.

This gentleman, who died a few years since, in the county of Kanawha, and who was the father of Samuel T. Washington, the donor, I knew well. I have often seen this sword in his possession, and received from himself the following account of the manner in which it became his property, in the division made among the devisees.

He said that he knew it to have been the side-arms of General Washington during the revolutionary war—not that used on occasions of parade and review, but the constant service sword of the great chief; that he had himself seen General Washington wear this identical sword, (he presumed for the last time,) when, in 1794, he reviewed the Virginia and Maryland forces, then concentrated at Cumberland, under command of General Lee, and destined to co-operate with the Pennsylvania and New Jersey troops, then assembled at Bedford, in suppressing what has been called "the whisky insurrection."

General Washington was at that time President of the United States, and, as such, was commander-in-chief of the army. It is known that it was his intention to lead the army in person on that occasion, had he found it necessary; and he went to Bedford and Cumberland prepared for that event. The condition of things did not require it, and he returned to his civil duties at Philadelphia.

Mr. Samuel Washington held the commission of a captain at that time himself, and served in that campaign, many of the incidents of which he has related to me.

He was anxious to obtain this particular sword, and preferred it to all the others, among which was the ornamented and costly present from the great Frederick.

At the time of the division among the nephews, without intimating what his preference was, he jocosely remarked, "that, inasmuch as he was the only one of them who had participated in military service, they ought to permit him to take choice." This suggestion was met in the same spirit in which it was made; and the choice being awarded him, he chose this, the plainest and intrinsically the least valuable of any, simply because it was "the battle sword."

I am also in possession of the most satisfactory evidence, furnished by Col. George Washington, of Georgetown, the nearest male relative of General Washington now living; as to the identity of this sword. His information was derived from his father, William Augustine Washington, the devisee first named in the clause of the will which I have read, from his uncle, the late Judge Bushrod Washington, of the Supreme Court, and Major Lawrence Lewis, the acting Executor of Gen. Washington's will; all of whom concurred in the statement, that the true service sword was that selected by Capt. Samuel Washington. It remained in this gentleman's possession until his death, esteemed by him the most precious memento of his illustrious kinsman. It then became the property of his son, who, animated by that patriotism which so characterized the "father of his

country," has consented that such a relic ought not to be appropriated by an individual citizen, and has instructed me, his representative, to offer it to the nation, to be preserved in its public depositories, as the common property of all; since its office has been to achieve and defend the common liberty of all.

He has, in like manner, requested me to present this case to the Congress of the United States, deeming it not unworthy the public acceptance.

This was once the property of the philosopher and patriot, Benjamin Franklin.

By a codicil to his last will and testament, we find it thus disposed of:

My fine crab tree walking stick, with a gold head, curiously wrought in the form of the cap of liberty; I give to my friend, and the friend of mankind, General Washington. If it were a sceptre, he has merited it, and would become it."

Gen. Washington, in his will, devised this case as follows:

"Item. To my brother Charles Washington, I give and bequeath the gold-headed case left me by Dr. Franklin, in his will."

Captain Samuel Washington was the only son of Charles Washington, the devisee, from whom he derived, by inheritance, this interesting memorial; and having transmitted it to his son, Samuel T. Washington, the latter thus seeks to bestow it worthily, by associating it with the battle-sword, in a gift to his countrymen.

I cordially concur with Mr. Washington in the opinion that they each merit public preservation; and I obey, with pleasure, his wishes in here presenting them, in his name, to the nation.

Let the sword of the hero and the staff of the philosopher go together. Let them have place among the proudest trophies and most honored memorials of our national achievements.

Upon that staff once leaned the sage of whom it has been said "He snatched the lightning from heaven, and the sceptre from tyrants."

A mighty arm once wielded this sword in a righteous cause, even unto the dismemberment of empire. In the hand of Washington, this was "the sword of the Lord and of Gideon." It was never drawn, except in defence of the public liberty. It was never sheathed until a glorious and triumphant success returned it to the scabbard, without a stain of cruelty or dishonor upon its blade. It was never surrendered, except to that country which bestowed it.

[Loud and long-continued plaudits followed the delivery of this address.]

The Sergeant-at-Arms advanced to the seat of the honorable gentleman, and received into his custody the interesting relics."

**Animal Magnetism.**—We learn from the "Boston Daily Mail," that a young woman was thrown into the Mesmeric state at the City Hall, at Lowell, Mass., by Dr. W. P. Shattuck, and submitted to the operation of extracting a tumor on the shoulder, without manifesting the slightest pain. An incision round the tumor was made to the depth of nearly 2 inches, & the operation was one which, under ordinary circumstances, would have caused acute pain, fainting, &c. On being brought to the natural state, the lady was entirely free from pain, and was not aware that any operation had been performed. This experiment was performed under the personal examination of Drs. Holbrook, Pillsbury, and Horn, of Lowell, and in presence of a very large and respectable audience. A full and scientific report of the case will soon be published.

**Special mission to England.**—It seems now pretty well settled, says the Philadelphia Mercury, that a special mission will be sent to Great Britain to settle subjects of importance, among which the Oregon question is the most prominent. Mr. Webster is mentioned as most likely to receive the appointment.

**Another Defaulter.**—The amount of the defalcation of Jesse Hoyt, as Collector of the Port of New York, has been at length ascertained. It amounts to the neat little sum of \$226,295 31 cents.

**The Mermaid.**—John Bachman, D. D., Professor of Anatomy in the Medical College of the State of S. Carolina, E. Geddes, M. D., Professor of Surgery in the Medical College of the State of South Carolina, Lewis R. Gibbs, M. D., Professor of Mathematics and Chemistry, Charleston College, have pronounced "the so-called Mermaid" which was recently exhibited in Charleston, to be an imposition; being nothing more than an African ape, and a fish, put together by cutting off the lower extremities of the ape at the hips, and inserting it into the skin of the fish 8 or 10 inches! They denounce the exhibitor as an impostor. We find it published in the Charleston Mercury.—Fay, Jones.