

W. A. GRAHAM'S SPEECH.
Speech of Hon. Wm. A. Graham,
ON THE LOAN BILL.
In the United States Senate, April 23.

On the 13th of April, 1842, the loan bill being under consideration—

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Senate as follows:—
Mr. President: In the division of the labors of this body it has not fallen to my lot to have any special charge of the finances and expenditures of the Government. But, being called upon to vote for an additional loan for the public service, I have felt myself constrained to examine whether it was demanded by necessity; and being now satisfied that such necessity exists, I must bespeak the patience of the Senate while I endeavor to show its existence, and the causes by which it has been produced.

For more than five years past the expenditures of this Government have exceeded, very far exceeded, its revenues. By an official document from the Treasury Department now before me, it is plainly demonstrated that, in four years, from the 1st of January, 1837, to the 1st of January, 1841, the expenditures were above one hundred and twelve millions of dollars, whilst, in the same time, the aggregate income from revenue was but eighty-four millions of dollars, in round numbers, being an average annual expenditure of twenty-eight millions, with an annual revenue of but twenty-one million of dollars. I omit the fractions of millions to simplify the statement. It thus appears that, during that space of time, expenditure exceeded revenue by twenty-eight millions of dollars. (See appendix.)

In the four years from the 4th of March, 1837, to the 4th of March, 1841, the precise period of Mr. Van Buren's administration, the excess of expenditure over revenue is still more surprising. It amounted to more than thirty-one millions of dollars, being an average annual excess of expense over income of near eight millions per year—an expenditure greater in four years than would have been yielded from the average revenue in five years and a half.

Such having been the condition of our monetary affairs during the past Administration, the wonder is, not that we are compelled to borrow now, but how they avoided a greater debt heretofore. Having expended thirty-one millions of dollars beyond their income from revenue, that would naturally be expected to be the amount of debt which they left to their successors on the 4th of March, 1841, instead of five and a half millions, which they admit. Such would have been the amount of debt left by them upon the country, had they, like other Administrations, had no other means to expend but such as they themselves raised. But, sir, it was their good fortune to inherit a full Treasury, in ready money, and to have falling in it, at convenient periods during their term, millions upon millions of capital stock, (not current revenues,) which had been laid up by the Government from the contributions of the people in previous years. The surplus in the Treasury was seventeen millions of dollars, nine of which had been directed to be transferred to the States, as the fourth instalment under the deposit act of 1836. Nine millions more were received by them from debts due to the United States, principally, almost wholly, for the sales of its stock in the late Bank of the United States, at \$115 per share. Adding these together, you have twenty-six millions of dollars of extraordinary means, over and above the revenue, expended by the late Administration. Yet, in addition to this, they borrowed five and a half millions of dollars by the issue of Treasury notes, which were outstanding at the end of their term, making in all more than thirty-one millions of extraordinary means. Recollect, too, that this was during a period when they had a tariff of duties, on all the principal articles yielding revenue, averaging forty per cent. Yet, sir, who feel bound to vote for this loan are taunted by the adherents of the late Administration by being told that we are running the nation in debt. This reproach, if deserved at all, would come with better grace from those who could show a better administration of the finances while in their charge. The distinguished and able Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Buchanan) proclaimed in this discussion the other day that a Whig Administration, in the short space of thirteen months, was, by this bill, about to consummate a debt of seventeen millions of dollars, which he admits was contracted by their predecessors. Sir, this may be very criminal; but, take it without any of the palliation or apology to be found in the deficiency of the revenue and the wants of the public service, did the Senator and his friends do better when they had possession of the Government? The very first act of Congress, at the called session under Mr. Van Buren, was an act to borrow nine millions of dollars which had been given to the States by the bounty of Congress; (I say given, because, although in legal form it was but a deposit for custody, in substance and intention, at least on the part of many, it was a gift;) and in the act of Congress to which I refer, the transfer is merely postponed until the 1st of January, 1839, but a repeal of the gift is avoided. This was the first movement of Congress under that Administration, and the second is like unto it; that is, an act to borrow ten millions of dollars by the issue of Treasury notes. By deductions equally fair with those of the honorable Senator, it is shown that, not in thirteen months, but in seven months after coming into power, the administration of Mr. Van Buren borrowed nineteen millions of dollars. This was allowed at the time to be indispensably necessary, because of the indulgence given to merchants on duty bonds by an act of that session, and the failure of the deposit banks to pay the amounts due from them to Government; and that these measures were to be merely temporary until those means could be realized. But, although

the merchants and the banks paid up what they owed, yet the fourth instalment was never paid to the States, of whom it was borrowed, and Treasury notes were kept Senator that there was yet due \$100,000 or \$200,000 from the banks of Mississippi, and he believed \$80,000 from the Bank of the United States.

Mr. Evans: No, the last has been paid. The Mississippi banks are all who have not paid.
Mr. Graham resumed. This is too trifling an amount to constitute the slightest apology for failing to pay the fourth instalment and redeem all the Treasury notes issued. It bears no proportion to the nine millions of the former, and the five and a half millions of the latter. It now distinctly appears that the States lost the fourth instalment which had been promised them, and a permanent debt of five and a half millions was fixed on the country, not by reason of the defalcations of "the merchants and the banks," which, for some time, were represented as the sources of all the ills which befell the Government, but because the expenditures during the last Administration were raised to an annual average amount of twenty-eight millions of dollars per year. With a revenue admitted to be deficient by their very first acts of legislation, and which, by regulation of the compromise act of 1833, was to decline materially during their continuance in authority, a system of expense was pursued, which not only overran the yearly incomes and exhausted all the earnings of previous years, but superadded a national debt besides. A guardian who should thus manage the estate of his ward, would find no just cause for wonder in his removal from office.

We are now told however, that, although the average rate of expenditure was large, the graduation was downward; and it has been repeatedly a matter of boast, that, in the last year of Mr. Van Buren, the whole amount expended was but twenty-two and a half millions of dollars. And it is vehemently contended, that the experience of that year shows that sum to be the amplest amount for annual expense; and, indeed, that it should fall below it. Sir, I hope it will be found to be enough for the yearly support of Government. If we can avoid war, I hope to see the annual expenses reduced to twenty millions. But a very casual examination of the legislation of 1839-40 will show that the reason why no more than twenty-two and a half millions was expended in the latter year was, that the Administration had no more to expend. The seventeen millions which they found in the Treasury were gone; the nine millions of debts which they had collected were gone, in addition to their current revenues; and a Presidential election being on hand, it was not deemed prudent at the moment to resort to the taxing power to raise new supplies. The perennial fountain of Treasury notes, it is true, was still kept open, but for sufficient reasons it was not expedient to swell the amount of those in the monthly published statement. What, then, was the wise measure of economy and retrenchment which was adopted to bring down expenses to income? Was an useless branch of service cut off? Were all the objects which yearly cost the Government money examined, and those struck off and discontinued which were not supposed to be worth what they would cost in taxes upon the people? No, sir. A new expedient was devised. Appropriations were made as usual in all branches of expenditure; Congress thereby declaring that the objects of appropriation were proper, and were still to receive the patronage of Government. But a proviso was inserted in the appropriation bills, authorizing the President of the United States "to postpone the expenditures" in case of a deficiency of revenue; "such postponement, in each case, to be merely temporary, or until the close of the next session of Congress," manifestly implying that these subjects of appropriation, though suspended momentarily for the want of money, are all, hereafter, to be resumed and finished.

If, by such resorts as these, the public expenditures were reduced in 1840 to twenty-two and a half millions of dollars, it furnishes surely no occasion for the authors of that reduction to boast of their economy, nor to accuse their successors of extravagance in completing the works which they had begun. In the military establishment, the expenditure was nearly a million less in 1840 than in 1839. Why? Because, under the authority of these provisions in the acts of Congress, the President could arrest the operations of the mechanic and laborer on the public works with his hammer or trowel in hand at midday, and whilst his contract was yet unexpired, though the walls of the barracks or quarters in which they labored were but half finished, with an assurance, however, that the works were not abandoned, but only suspended until Congress should provide additional means for carrying them on; meanwhile the Presidential election will be over. In like manner, seven or eight hundred thousand dollars are saved by suspending the works on fortifications and leaving the half finished walls of your fortresses to wind and weather, until the Treasury should be replenished. Mr. President, this course of temporary reduction, to make a fair showing in the arithmetic of expenditure, so far from being economy was neglect of duty. Either the military establishment and the system of fortifications—the number of men in the army, and their barracks and quarters; the armories, arsenals, forts, &c.—should have been permanently lessened, or adequate revenues should have been provided to support and carry them on efficiently. The policy which was adopted necessarily exposed the public property to dilapidation, expressly intended no permanent reduction in expense, and threw over upon the year 1841 many of the pecuniary burdens which properly belonged to 1840.

Mr. President, in tracing the causes of the enormous average expenditure of twenty-eight millions per year during the last administration, I believe it will be found to have been chiefly owing to their having had a redundant Treasury, which they had not

nominal from habit and necessity. In my humble opinion, the first and prolific source of that system of expenditure, as well as of many of the other evils under which the country now labors, was in withholding the fourth instalment from the States. It deprived the States of a boon which they had a just right to expect, under the provisions of the act of 1836—a boon which was held out to them as a sure resource for more than twelve months; upon the reasonable expectation of which, they had commenced public enterprises and incurred debts, and which, though taken from their grasp almost at the very moment when they were about to elude it, was still suspended over their heads, like the bow of promise in the heavens, until the turbid and overflowing waters of public expenditure were raised high enough to absorb it. That many of the States would have become deeply embarrassed, independently of the action of this Government in this particular, I do not doubt; but that the embarrassments of many of them have been hastened and increased by the loss of the fourth instalment, I believe, is equally certain. To them, in their peculiar condition, it was every thing; to us, I fear, it has been worse than nothing. With it, the last Administration expended in their four years one hundred and eleven or one hundred and twelve millions of dollars. Without it, they would still have had one hundred and two, or one hundred and three millions, giving for average annual expenses near twenty-six millions per year—enough for all reasonable purposes—enough, the country will say, nay, has determined, for all the good that was accomplished.

By yielding this to the States, one of two results must have happened, either of which would have had a happy effect, in mitigating the severity of our present embarrassments—either a material reduction of expenditure to correspond in some degree with the rate of income, or a timely provision of means for support, by reason of which the suddenness of our present difficulties would have been avoided. I listened on yesterday with much pleasure to many of the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Calhoun) on the dangers of allowing expenditure to exceed income, and the tendency of an overflowing Treasury to produce extravagance. And I could but regret, that those maxims, so true in themselves, had not been applied in 1837 and the 4th instalment allowed to go to the States instead of being retaken into the Treasury of this Government, thereby affording the means for extravagance.

Mr. Calhoun said the Senator was not here, and of course could not know the reasons which had induced him to vote for withholding the 4th instalment from the States. He was opposed to collecting moneys for distribution, and went for distributing in the first instance only because there was a surplus on hand. When it was needed, he voted to restore it to the Treasury. But he had uniformly voted against extravagant appropriations.
Mr. Graham said he had not been examining the votes of the Senator for purposes of censure, but was calling his attention, and that of the Senate, to what I conceive to have been an unfortunate mistake, in giving to the Government temporary means so far to exceed its regular income in its expenditures, and to carry them to a height from which the present state of our finances would demand so abrupt and hasty a descent. As it is, a service now costing you twenty odd millions of dollars per year is suddenly let down upon means not exceeding thirteen and a half millions; and its weight is accumulated by a public debt of five and a half millions, left by the last administration, bearing an annual interest of 330,000 dollars. To meet this deficiency what have we? Instead of surplus, we have debt; instead of extraordinary means falling in, we have a daily increasing charge of interest; instead of a tariff of 40 per cent, we have one nearly approaching 20 per cent, and that upon little more than half the imports. What then is to be done? If we propose to borrow money to defray the present expenses of Government, we are told that we are running the nation in debt. If we propose to levy duties to furnish a permanent revenue, we are taxing the people. If we suggest retrenchment, and cutting off such parts of the public service as are not most needed, we are told there is imminent danger of war, and that the most vigorous preparations for it should not be omitted. Mr. President, our whole duty in this emergency seems to me to be comprehended in three propositions:

- 1st. Borrow such sum, upon the best terms you can obtain, as will relieve your present necessities, and save the public honor from disgrace.
 - 2d. Reduce your expenditures to the lowest point which is consistent with an efficient public service.
 - 3d. Levy such duties upon imports as are necessary for an economical administration of the Government, and no more.
- But, sir, our opponents have one objection for all the difficulties of the times. Take back the proceeds of the lands, say they.—A direct proposition to that effect was early introduced by the Senator from Missouri, (Mr. Linn.) and no matter what may be the particular subject under consideration, it is perpetually moved by way of amendment. Now, let me ask in all candor, if they are resumed into the Treasury of what avail are they? Last year the net proceeds but little exceeded a million of dollars, and it is exceedingly doubtful what they may be in years to come. To say nothing of the immense quantities in the hands of speculating companies, the very fact that large grants were made to the several new States by the distribution act, embracing in the whole, I think, near two millions of acres, with the liberty of selecting choice qualities—grants already perfect because made by the statute itself, and incapable of repeal, whatever modern democracy may urge to the contrary, will make those States afloat by issuing and redeeming again and again, leaving five and a half millions outstanding when that Administration closed.

Mr. Woodbury would remark to the

millions of dollars, the maximum that has been estimated here, what is this, compared with fourteen millions, the amount by which the Secretary of the Treasury informs us the current revenue of the year will be deficient! With or without the lands, therefore, the necessity for a loan is exigent and unavoidable.

But, Mr. President, were it otherwise, I would ponder long before I could consent to disappoint the just expectations of the States and the people in regard to these lands.—No subject has been more discussed or better understood in this country for the last ten years, than that of the distribution of their proceeds among the States. None occupied a more prominent place in the Presidential canvass of 1840. None was more distinctly or boldly put forth as a leading article of his creed of policy, in his letters, speeches, and addresses to his fellow-citizens, by the illustrious man who was then called to preside over us. And whether we look to the results of elections, the proceedings of popular assemblies, or State Legislatures, no measure on which parties in our country have divided has, so far as I recollect, so many and such unequivocal evidences of public opinion in its favor.

Sir, to my mind, it is clear that the Constitution of the United States does not contemplate the public lands as among the means for the ordinary support of Government. When the venerable men who framed that Constitution breathed into the nostrils of this Government the breath of life, and prescribed the laws by which it should live, and move, and have its being, they declared upon what aliment it should subsist. Aware of the vital importance of the money power, which not only affords the supplies of peace but the sinews of war, they proclaimed, as the very first of the authorities of Congress, the power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises" for the purpose of paying the debts and providing for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; not such "taxes, duties, imposts, and excises" as shall be necessary for the purposes expressed, in addition to, or after applying the proceeds of the public domain, but an absolute power is conferred, limited only by the application to constitutional objects.—As to the public lands, nothing is said of them as a means of supply; they are not mentioned at all in the three first articles of the Constitution, which emphatically create the Government, by constituting a Legislature, Executive, and Judiciary, and are brought forward in the latter part of the fourth article, not as a source of contribution to the Treasury, but a public property, the disposal of which is committed to Congress.

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property of the United States." How Congress shall dispose of it, whether by sale or gift, whether on one object or another, is not defined. The trust is without limitation in the words of the Constitution. And for instruction as to our duty in administering it, we are thrown back upon the directions of the donors in the deeds of the ceding States. These declare them a "common fund for the use and benefit of such of States as have become, or shall become members of the confederation, or federal alliance," &c. And here let me remark, that I recognize no distinction between the disposition of the lands ceded by States, and those acquired by treaty. The great man, (Mr. Jefferson,) by whose negotiation our first great purchase of public land was made entertained strong doubts as to the power to do so, and it was surely a doubtful question. But that difficulty being overcome, and the question settled by practice, the lands thus acquired became "territory of the United States," to be "disposed of by Congress" in like manner with other territory. That that other territory was not looked to, in the Constitution, as a resource to pay current expenses; and that it was intended for the benefit of the States severally I have endeavored to show. To enter no farther into the argument, to me it does appear that the cessions of North Carolina and Georgia, made after this present Government was established and in full operation, granting their territory to the United States, not for revenue, not for the benefit and enjoyment of the United States as a political corporation, but for the use and benefit of "the United States of America, North Carolina and Georgia inclusive, according to their respective and usual proportion in the general charge and expenditure," &c., (the same in substance with the grants of Virginia and other States, which ceded under the old confederation,) afford an early exposition, not only of the designs of those States themselves on this subject, but of the general understanding of the deeds of the other States at that time.

But, sir, the whole legislation of Congress in regard to these lands shows that they have never been considered as standing on the basis of the revenues of the nation. The immense grants which have been made from time to time to States, State corporations, benevolent institutions, and as charities to meritorious foreigners in distress who have come among us, would never have been attempted or allowed out of a fund which had been raised by taxation, direct or indirect. And for a series of years past the leading statesmen of all parties seem to have concurred in the opinion that, within a short period at least, the proceeds of the public lands ought no longer to be relied upon as a source of revenue; the difference between them being that those with whom it is my pride to be associated, adopting the policy of the eminent Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Clay,) who has recently retired from this body, were for an equitable distribution of the land proceeds among all the States, while our honorable opponents, approving the suggestion of General Jackson on this subject, were for ceding the lands themselves to the States in which they are situated. In his message of December 1839, the then President says: "It is deemed obliged to provide for themselves—as the heir of fortune is generally a prodigal, while the son of industrious poverty, who must needs accumulate for himself, is eco-

nomical, however, that in convenient time this machinery (the land offices) be withdrawn from the States, and that the right of soil and the future disposition of it be surrendered to the States respectively in which it lies." I need not refer you to the report of the experienced Senator from Alabama, (Mr. King,) at the head of the land committee of that session, and the speeches of other distinguished gentlemen of that political school, to show that in both parties there has been a general concurrence in the propriety of "looking to the custom-house for revenue," and that the real contest upon the subject of the lands has been between a general and equitable, and a local and partial distribution. The evidences upon this point have been abundantly furnished by the Senator from Indiana, (Mr. Smith) upon a recent occasion. I must therefore be pardoned, Mr. President, if I cannot yield to the eloquent appeals which are almost daily addressed to us against withdrawing the land fund from the exchequer of this Government and giving it to the States. But yesterday we were told that the lands should be considered worthless for revenue; now we are assured, from the same quarter, that they are as the purse of Fortunatus.—You have only to retain them in hand, and wish, to obtain whatever measure you want. While without them, you can neither get money nor credit. These appeals, sir, are but the afterthoughts of the advocate, after a decision against him upon the points made at the hearing. And when the people are persuaded, as they are constantly, that every dollar of land proceeds distributed creates a necessity for new taxation, they will not fail to remember that those who oppose distribution when the Treasury is empty, did it with equal earnestness when it was full: they will reflect that this taxation will be the same whether the land proceeds are taken from the Treasury by the plan of distribution, in which the people of each State get their due share, or those other plans of surrender, cession, or graduation, by which the whole is given to a few States. And in this connection let me remind you that, if there were objections to the passage of the distribution bill, there are objections to the repeal likewise. I have shown already, two millions of acres of land have been granted to certain States by that bill, which are incapable of being recalled. With what propriety can these grants be allowed to remain, as they must remain, in full force, whilst those States to whom the grant was of money only, &c. to be deprived of its benefits?

I have said, Mr. President, that the authors of the Constitution did not rely upon the public lands as a means for ordinary maintenance of Government, and in my humble opinion, to effectuate their design of making this a Government of limited powers, confined to comparatively few objects, it ought to be restricted to those modes of supply pointed out in the Constitution. All history will verify the fact, that those nations have been most remarkable for purity and correctness of administration, for the strictest accountability of public agents, and have longest preserved their liberties, who have kept their ruling powers constantly dependent upon the contributions, direct or indirect, annually levied upon the people.—As a certain writer has remarked, "they who would trample on their rights are restrained by the want of their money." This general truth applies with tenfold force to a Government, like that of the United States, far distant from the great mass of the people whom it affects, and so complicated in its structure and diversified in its operations that, to keep up a minute knowledge of its details of administration, federal politics must be made, to a great extent, an exclusive profession. That period of our history, when speculation and embezzlement were most rife, when the responsibility of public officers was least rigid, when salaries were unregulated, and the gains in many offices were almost what their holders desired, and when appropriations were most extravagant, was the period which I have reviewed in the first part of these remarks, when revenue was not redundant but grossly deficient, but when there were surpluses and extraordinary means in your coffers, which the Administration had nothing to do with but to expend. Think you, sir, that in any other state of the Treasury, a district attorney would have been allowed to receive emoluments greater, by more than one-half than the salary of the President of the U. S.—greater, according to his own declaration, when about to leave office, than "any citizen of a free republic ought to receive: that marshals, collectors of customs and postmasters, would have been permitted like Roman pro-consuls, to enrich themselves to immense fortunes out of the offices created for the public benefit alone, and oftentimes by like instances of official abuses—abuses to which no corrective was applied until the 31st of March, 1841, the very last day of the late Administration, when a clause was inserted in the appropriation bill a kind of bequest to pious uses upon the death bed repentance spoken of by the Senator from South Carolina, (Mr. Preston,) restraining the compensation of these functionaries to six thousand dollars per annum for the future.

Sir, adversity is not without its uses.—Lamentable as is the present condition of the public fisc, it will compel us to at least an earnest endeavor at economy and retrenchment. When the question comes to be determined, as it must now be determined, whether any particular office, institution, or department of service, is worth to the public what will be required in taxes for its support, I have an assured hope, that sinecures will be abolished, a more rigid accountability established, and our system reduced. Without any desire on my part, you, sir, have done me the honor to place my name on a committee on retrenchment, raised during the present session on the motion of my friend from Kentucky, (Mr. Morehead,) and I have felt it my duty, in the intervals allowed by other and prior our competitors in the market, and, apart from the depression of moneyed affairs, must diminish the receipts from that source. But suppose the annual proceeds to be three

engagements of my time, to look somewhat into the public expenditures both past and proposed. The estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury for the present year amount to twenty-four and a half millions; that is—for the civil list, four millions—less, by nearly one million than have been its expenditures for the last six or seven years. By rigorous examination I doubt not but that hundreds, thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands more may be saved in this branch of service; but if you wish to save millions, you must go into the War and Navy Departments. Wars, it has long been known, cost money; and we are learning by experience that rumors of wars are also expensive. For many years past we have been threatened with hostilities, and I rejoice that there is now a prospect that these difficulties with foreign Powers approach a termination—I hope a peaceful termination. In the event of actual war, I shall be willing freely to contribute every thing to the national defence.—But if we are to have peace, I am not for maintaining such a system of armament as would only befit a great military empire. The estimates of the War Department, including Indian Affairs, &c., for this year, amount to about eleven and three-fourths millions of dollars—a sum equal to the whole cost of the Government twenty years ago, though less than has been expended in that Department for the last few years. Those for the Navy Department are near eight and three-fourths millions, being two and three-fourths or three millions more than has been applied to that service annually for several years last past. Bating this excess, the estimates for this year are less than were the expenditures of the boasted fourth year of Mr. Van Buren's administration. And, sir, with the most sincere desire to see an efficient system of defence, and without any pretension to professional knowledge in such matters, I am unable to approve that rapidity and extent of increase contemplated by the Heads of Departments in the reports at the commencement of this session, unless in open prospect immediate war.—We have seen from the repeated declarations of the Senator from New Hampshire, (Mr. Woodbury,) as to the appropriations of Congress exceeding his estimates, when Secretary of the Treasury, that Mars and Neptune prevailed over Mammon when the Treasury was full; and we are obliged to avoid yielding too much to their influences now that it is reduced.

But, sir, I weary your patience.—I rose but to explain the real unhappy condition of our finances and expenditures, the causes which led to it, and my conception of the mode of relief; to show that the question of the passage or rejection of this bill, is a question of affording or withholding the necessary supplies to the Government of our country. Such being our condition, I voted for it as I did for the issue of Treasury notes under the last Administration. I will not stop the action of the Government by denying it the means of going on, no matter who may be in power.

BRITISH TARIFF.—Among the articles exported from the United States to Great Britain, on which a duty is laid by the Government of the latter, are as follows:

- On American corn, per bushel, 38½ cents,
- " wheat, per bushel, 82 cents,
- " tobacco, per pound, 75 cts.,
- " pork, per pound, 3 cents,
- " bacon, per pound, 6 cents,
- " beef, per pound, 3 cents.

With the exception of tobacco, on which the duty is enormous, France has interdicted the other articles above named, from this country. Is it not fair and expedient, then, that the American Government should tax heavily, the silks, laces, jewelry, wines and such like luxuries of France? Surely the objection that a discriminating duty to that effect has been laid by Congress, will have little weight with public intelligence, when the facts are considered.

GENERAL JACKSON.—The \$1,000.—The Judiciary Committee of the U. S. States have reported against refunding to the defender of New Orleans the \$1,000 fine imposed on him by Judge Hall.

WM. M. PRICE.—The jury in this case has returned a verdict against him of \$83,000—this is the amount of the defalcation. It will be remarked that he was U. S. District Attorney for New York.

METHODISTS.—The Methodists of Texas have added twenty-two hundred to their church within the last 18 months.

- The following named gentlemen have been invited by the Secretary of War, to attend the Annual Examination of the Cadets at the Military Academy, to commence on the first Monday in June next:
- Thomas A. Deblois, Esq. of Maine.
 - James J. Austin, Esq. of Massachusetts.
 - Gen. E. P. Walton, of Vermont.
 - Rev. Alonzo Potter, D. D. of New York.
 - Prof. Alexander Dallas Bache, of Pennsylvania.
 - George P. Macculloch, Esq. of New Jersey.
 - Gen. George A. Stewart, of Maryland.
 - Col. Josiah W. Ware, of Virginia.
 - Gen. Alexander McKrae, of North Carolina.
 - Richard W. Habersham, Esq. of Georgia.
 - Dr. Churchill J. Blackburn, of Kentucky.
 - Gen. Robert B. McAfee, of Ohio.
 - W. S. T. Dennison, Esq. of Ohio.
 - John G. Floyd, Esq. of Indiana.
 - Hon. A. S. Brown, of Mississippi.
 - Dr. Benjamin W. Maclin, of Alabama.
 - Frederick W. Curteneus, Esq. of Michigan.
 - Dr. Frederick Hall, District of Columbia.
 - Capt. Beverly Kennon, United States Army.
 - Col. J. J. Albert, U. S. Army.
 - Capt. P. H. Salt, do.
- We will also state, for the information of the public, that the Cadet appointments for this year have been made. The next selections will be made in February or March 1843.—*Madisonian*, 30th ult.