

years ago the Manchester of America, Lowell, was a desert—its forests echoed to no sounds but those of the character; it now re-sounds to a power that produces 40,000 bales of cotton goods in a year. Mr. Gregg detailed the vast increase of America in cotton manufactures and manufactured exportation—but he showed it was not confined to cotton alone. In 1835, America had 17,000,000 sheep and lambs; 1838, 20,000,000, at 3 lbs. of wool each, making 60,000,000 lbs.—the whole of which is manufactured in that country. Mr. Gregg, moreover, informed the meeting that coarse woollen cloths can be purchased as cheaply in New York as in Leeds. In addition to these drawbacks, Mr. Gregg supposed there could not be less than 70,000 English residents on the European continent, leaving their beautiful estates in this country deserts, yet drawing from the soil 8,000,000 pounds a year. Mr. Gregg read a very conclusive letter from Sir Saml. Sterling, British land proprietor, who has been long a resident in the Duchy of Baden in Germany, and has had acuteness and opportunities enough to watch the continental rivalry with England in many of our great articles of manufacture and exportation. From this very sensible letter I give you two brief extracts, one containing facts and the other the writer's opinion. "Those," he says, "who only look at the commercial greatness of England, totally forget that she had 25 years' start of the continent, or at least that amid the ruins of a destructive war, her population protected by her insular situation, worked in peace, while the continent was crushed to the earth by every thing fatal to commerce. The Germans, he says, are a slow people; but they are now fairly roused to the importance of trade and manufactures. They do not indeed possess great individual wealth, and few could or would venture their all on such establishments as we see carried on by a few individuals in England: but it is evident there is great and increasing wealth in the mass; and there is no difficulty in procuring funds for an enterprise that holds out a fair prospect of success." The letter is dated from Karlsruhe, Duchy of Baden, and the writer goes on to say in another paragraph—"In the beautiful valley of the Alps, a few miles from this, new woollen factories have been erected, with all the new improvements in machinery known in England or elsewhere. On this river there are fine waterfalls. On the same river a most splendid cotton factory has just commenced working, although all the buildings are not finished. It has been erected at an expense of probably about 100,000 lbs., and there is a large surplus capital. It will employ 1200 hands. The machinery was made at Malhouse, (thanks to our precious laws respecting the export of machinery,) and the gas lights fitted up by a Manchester or Bolton house, I forget which. Another very large spinning establishment is about being finished at Augsburg, Bavaria, about one day and a half from this; and others are in contemplation in every branch of trade." So much for some of the writer's facts: a single quotation more on the writer's opinions. "It is melancholy," he says, "to think that while leading men on both sides of the house attack each other with the utmost violence, they are united in one common sentiment of hostility to the change of policy, based upon a system, perhaps, the most hostile to national interest that ever yet existed in the world. It was left for modern times to discover, that the high price of bread was necessary to the greatness of a commercial nation, and that the interest of 36,000 landed proprietors was of more importance than the prosperity of 24,000,000 of people."

DEBATE IN CONGRESS.

SPEECH OF MR. ROANE,

OF VIRGINIA,
In Senate, Friday, February 15, 1839.—On the bill to prevent the interference of certain Federal officers with elections.
Mr. ROANE rose and said:
I desire, Mr. President, to address the Senate this evening. I have purposely left my own seat, come round to this side of the chamber, and occupied the vacant chair of the Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. WALKER.] now absent, in order to be near my friend from Michigan, [Mr. NORVELL.] whom I wished to persuade to yield to me his just title to the floor. He had, on one or two previous occasions, yielded it to others, and but for peculiar circumstances, I would not have now appealed to his liberality. I most sincerely thank him for generously yielding to the peculiar considerations I have presented to him. I am aware, sir, that at this late hour of the evening—[Here propositions were made to adjourn if Mr. Roane desired it.] He said, no; he hoped that the Senate would not adjourn, but would permit him to proceed this evening. Yes, sir, this 15th day of February, of all the days in the year, is that on which I desire to be heard. This day emancipates me from those considerations of delicacy which, for some time past, have restrained me from saying what I now consider myself free to say, however painful it may be to say it.
Mr. President, a stern sense of that duty which I owe to myself, to those who sent me here, and to those with whom I am here associated in political feelings and principles so congenial to my own, will not permit me longer to maintain that silence which, at all times, I so anxiously desire to observe in this august assembly. My situation here has been, for a long time past, one of pain and delicacy: of pain, because, on the great momentous questions of national policy which have been agitated in this chamber from the first moment I took my seat in it, I have been constrained, by every dictate of my judgment, every feeling of my heart, and every consideration of patriotism to differ totally from my colleague, with whom I had so fondly and sanguinely, and, I think, justly expected to co-operate on all national, political, and party questions. Finding, to my pain and sorrow, that such co-operation has not existed, I have heretofore, for reasons which will be obvious to the Senate, to the country, and to my colleague, contented myself with giving a silent vote. Those reasons no longer exist. That delicacy, growing out of the peculiar relation which my colleague has for

some time past borne towards our mutual constituents, has been this day removed by the action of the General Assembly of Virginia; and I feel that malignity itself cannot now charge me with an effort to intermeddle in that relation. Besides, sir, my colleague has but very recently, fully "defined his position." The course which he has recently hastened to take, the time which he has selected, and the zeal, to say nothing of the temper, which he has manifested in defining his position, would render a longer silence on my part, obnoxious to the suspicion that I assented to his views, or was incompetent or afraid to utter a dissent. Sir, I differ from him as wide as the poles; and, in expressing that dissent, I take leave, in his own strong language to say that I too am an "unfettered Senator of the unfettered Commonwealth of Virginia," and mean this evening, with the blessing of God, to "define my position" in characters which "no that runs may read." There shall be no doubt about it; no equivocation, no mental reservation, no non-committalism, shall, with my consent, obscure it. I define it, sir, not because I believe that a human being who knows me well can doubt it, but because those who never knew me, and those who are to come after me, when advertising to this memorable chapter in our national history, in which it has been my destiny to bear a part, might, peradventure, draw improper inferences from my total silence. I do not object, sir, to the time my colleague has selected to define his position. The General Assembly of Virginia, my immediate constituents, and whose servant I am, are now in session, and watching with a scrutinizing eye our deliberations in this chamber. To that Legislature—to a Whig Legislature, as it has been reputed to be, I boldly define my position. In these days, when novelty and change are all the rage, I can have no hope that the definition I shall give can carry with it the pleasure which that given by my colleague will convey to those for whom it was intended. Of this I am certain, that it will lack one of the best ingredients of every pleasure—surprise! I dare say that my position will be found to be the same plain, old fashioned, and, I would fain believe, straightforward one which I have held from the first moment that I entered into the service of the people. I have no highland fling to throw off, ground and lofty tumbling with which to amuse, and no brilliant Somerset with which to delight and astonish any person. Mr. President, if I should speak less of the bill, which is the immediate subject of deliberation for the Senate, than of other matters, I find my apology and excuse in the many examples which have been set me in this chamber, and in the comity invariably extended by the Senate to its members. With this introduction, and with a view that I should not seem to have been inattentive to the important, vital bill now on your table, I beg leave to make a few remarks in regard to it.
Sir, I agree with my colleague in regard to that bill, only so far as he represents it to be one of great and pervading importance.—None could be more so. I might well leave the report of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has, in a masterly manner, exposed the dangers of this bill, to the luminous speech of its author, the honorable Senator from New Jersey, [Mr. WALL.] in defence of its positions; and the bill itself, and the arguments in its favor, to the mastery, and, in my opinion, unanswerable speech of the honorable Senator from Pennsylvania, (Mr. BUCHANAN.) Any thing from me now, would be but a vain attempt to "add a perfume to the violet."—But, sir, I differ so totally and entirely from my colleague on this question, that I cannot, and will not, forbear to notice some of his points. And, sir, first and foremost, I beg leave to say, that I utterly differ from him in the doctrine he urges in defence of this bill, and has often pressed on other occasions—of the "duty of the Government to take care of the People." Sir, I repudiate and utterly deny any such doctrine. It is at war with the genius of our institutions—it is at war with the spirit of the Constitution—it is at war with all my observation and understanding of the practical operation of our Government, from the year 1789, to the present moment. It was the intention of those who framed it, to make this, as nearly as possible, a Government of the people, identified with them, and finding its only support in their virtue, affections, intelligence, and wisdom. The doctrine, sir, that it is the duty of the Government to take care of the people, is a doctrine much better suited to that country which has a "king that can do no wrong," and a legislature that is "omnipotent," than to this country, where all the power of the Government is granted by the people; and that power not specifically granted, is specially reserved to them. Sir, England has been glorified in this chamber, and held up as the fountain of our liberty, and the proper model for our imitation. I will, by-and-by, touch upon that view taken by my colleague; for the present I will only remark on this one great essential difference between the liberty of the people of England and this country. It is this: That all the liberty which the people of England enjoy, is by grants forced and extorted from their Government; whilst all the power possessed by the Government of America, has been cautiously and sparingly granted by the people, who retain to themselves all that is not plainly and clearly granted. Sir, I acknowledge not this doctrine the "duty of Government to take care of the people." There is no knowing the dangers and excesses to which it might not lead. I adopt, as my creed, precisely the reverse of such a doctrine, and say that it is the duty of the people to take care of their Government. The Government belonging to them, and not they to the Government. So much, sir, hastily, for this point.
Sir, what is the bill on your table? It proposes to make it highly penal for certain persons holding offices under the General Government to give their opinion, except by a vote at the polls, about any public election whatever, whether for the General or State Governments!! And this bill is advocated by my colleague! Sir, I do most cordially agree with my honorable friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Buchanan] when he calls it a gag law, and pronounces it to be worse than the "edition law." That law went to abridge the freedom of the press, and permitted the truth to be given in evidence, and this goes

directly and openly "to abridge the freedom and liberty of speech," which is so sacredly guarded by the Constitution. "None of these enumerated office holders," say the bill, "shall persuade or dissuade any elector to give, or not to give, a vote!" Persuaded, sir, means to advise, and advice is most frequently the mere expression of opinion. And, sir, we are told that one hundred thousand freemen of America are to be put under the ban of this odious law, and subjected to the surveillance of the million of base informers who, by it, are to be rewarded with money for eavesdropping, and distorting and reporting the generous impulses of the freemen of your States, to whom alone is left the power to legislate on the great right of suffrage. There is not a State in this Union that has not legislated on it; that has not passed laws to protect its freedom, and to punish its abuse.
But, sir, why is it that this bill has not embraced all the officers of the General Government? Why has it omitted the highest, who, from their station, their talent, and frequently their wealth, might be supposed to have influence on their countrymen? It has assailed those who, its advocates say, owe their bread to the Government. Yes, sir, we have heard a great deal about custom-house officers, about weighers and gaugers and tidewaiters as if their "persuasion," or "dissuasion" was to control the destinies of elections. Sir, when we see men filling the second most elevated station in the world interfering in elections—nay, say, endeavoring to promote their own, to the very highest station, it is mockery indeed to pass a law to muzzle, to gag and silence weighers, gaugers, tidewaiters, and quill-drivers! And at last, sir, what is, or has ever been, the power and influence of these "legions," these "Praetorian bands," as my colleague calls them? In the cities, where Government officers are most numerous, the Administration has been defeated. Look to New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Richmond. Indeed, sir, look throughout every village, even where "two or three are gathered together," in their offices, and you will see how impotent are all your public officers against the all-corrupting power and influence of money; and yet, sir, we cannot prevail upon those gentlemen, who are willing to abridge the freedom of speech of these poor impotent public officers, to aid us in any effort to rescue the Government and the people of this country from the foul and cruel dominion of associated wealth—of monopolies, of banks. But what does the experience of bygone times say about the dangerous and omnipotent influence of these public officers—these trainbands, these cohorts, and such names, with which they are designated?—Surely no one will say that it was by their mighty influence that Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, were kept in office for eight years! And how was it, sir, that the elder and the junior Adams each went by the board, and were merged, and drowned, and sunk forever in the ocean of popular indignation? Their "legions" of public officers were impotent to save them. All their patronage was of no avail.
But why, sir, should I be assailing this bill on these details, when it is to the principles I object? Why should I attack it on the facts I have stated, when if they were all untrue and unfounded, I should be opposed to it. I am opposed to it. I am opposed to it, sir, because the Congress of the United States have no right to pass any law "abridging the freedom of speech." Nay, I go further, and say they have no right to pass any law abridging the freedom of election, which great subject is left with the States; and it is of the very essence of that freedom, "right of freely examining public characters and measures, and of free communication among the people thereon." But, sir, this truth is gotten over on the present occasion by a view which, as far as my memory serves me, was not presented by any of the sagacious and bold defenders of the "edition law." That view is taken by my colleague. It is, that the office holders are no portion of the people, embraced by the provisions of the Constitution, or whose rights are defended by the celebrated report of Mr. Madison! He informs the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALL.] that he does not understand that great work; that he has read it to but little advantage if he does not see that public officers are no portion of the people, contemplated in that unequalled defence of constitutional right! I, sir, like my friend from New Jersey, have also read this glorious document, (holding Madison's report in his hand.)—This little book, which I once heard John Randolph call his political Bible—to but little purpose, if one hundred thousand free citizens, (the number mentioned by my colleague,) who have rendered themselves respectable enough in their various callings of life, to become public officers, are at that moment cut off from the great constitutional rights secured, without exception, to all the people! Officers of the Government not a portion of the people! The proposition is startling; it is, to me monstrous! I hardly know how to refute it. But, sir, I turn to this sacred paper, the Constitution. You will there find that the word *people* is mentioned six times, and six times only. I will be as little tedious as possible; but let us look into it. The first time the word occurs, is in the preamble: "We, the PEOPLE," &c. "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity." &c. Now, sir, it is evident that no office holders of the Government could be members of the convention that created it; yet, sir, if my colleague's doctrine is correct, that the office holders are a portion of the people, it would inevitably follow that those men who now hold offices under the General Government, who are the "posterity" of the then people of the U. States, are not entitled to the "blessings of liberty," which that charter intended to secure to "themselves and posterity." The second occurrence of the word is in the 2nd section of the 1st article: "Members, &c. shall be chosen every second year, by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State," &c. Now, sir, in this place the people are mentioned without restriction; and such of them as are electors, by the State laws, are secured in all the qualifications granted by the laws of the State; and there is no law in any State, that I know of—certainly not in Virginia—that deprives Federal officers of any of the rights of other electors. The third instance occurs in the first amendment to the Consti-

tion: "Congress shall make no law abridging the right of the people peaceably to assemble," &c. Now, sir, if the officers of the Federal Government are not a portion of the people, they lose this inestimable privilege.—The fourth occurrence of this word people, in our charter, is in the second amendment: "A well regulated militia, &c. The right of the people to bear arms shall not be questioned." Who does not perceive that under this extraordinary doctrine advanced by my colleague, no public officer embraced in this bill can keep a firelock! The fifth time this word people is written in the Constitution, is found in the fourth amendment: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be questioned."—What security have the poor public officers against search and seizure, if this monstrous doctrine, that they form no portion of the people, is to prevail? The sixth and last time in which the word people is to be found in the Constitution, is in the tenth amendment:—"The powers not delegated to the U. States, etc. are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." I am sorry, Mr. President, to have been thus tedious. Who, sir, does not see from this plain, simple reading of the Constitution, that an officer of this Government, who ought to feel at least that he is a freeman, is cut off from every right which this Constitution meant to secure to freemen, if this new and astounding doctrine be true? But, Mr. President, I must pass to other points, as I have much to say on other matters besides this bill.
My colleague says "he does not look upon the report against this bill as the work of an individual, but as a concerted system to sustain the Executive by the party!" Strange language this from that source. May I ask him what he means by "the party?" What party, sir, does my colleague speak of? It is too early for him to be talking with emphasis about "the party." Such language may evince his feeling towards the "Executive," he is so distressed to see receiving support, but I must be permitted to say that it can have no further effect. It is "ad captandam," and can only be intended to aid in breaking down this Administration. My colleague asks the Senator from New Jersey, [Mr. WALL.] with a flourish, if "we are to understand that Democracy will bear an infusion of Federalism?" I, sir, answer yes. Yes, sir, true Democracy will bear an infusion of that Federalism which, when our country is warring with a foreign or a domestic foe, girds on its armor, and, sword in hand, goes forth to the battle field to encounter its foes, instead of convening at Hartford, or any where else, to sell the country to the invading enemy. Good Democracy will bear an infusion of that Federalism which, in all times, will advocate and sustain the unalienable rights of man, the freedom of conscience, the freedom of the press, and of religion, and of speech. My Democracy will bear an infusion of all that, and if my colleague's will bear an infusion of the principles contained in the bill under discussion, I can only say that his is a very different Democracy from mine, or from any I had ever supposed him to possess. I consider this bill much worse than the memorable sedition law. That assailed the freedom of the press, and permitted the truth to be given in evidence.—But this, sir, is a gag law; it is a direct violation of the Constitution, because it abridges the freedom of speech, and is demoralizing in its tendency, by creating a host of miserable spies and informers. My colleague objects to the able report of the committee, because, he says, it intimates that such a law might be resisted, and asks who would resist a law passed with all the constitutional forms. I say to him, sir, that I would. I say to this Senate, and to the world, that I would not regard constitutional forms when the substance was wanting—the Constitution violated, and my liberty usurped—forms! talk not to me of forms! The alien and sedition laws had all the forms of the Constitution! and had I been on the theatre then, I would have resisted them to any and every length; if reason and truth had not timely prevailed over tyranny and injustice. And, sir, should the odious bill on your table become a law, and I ever become a public officer, there is no torture, no rack which the inventive genius of cruelty could devise, which should compel me to relinquish the rights which it proposes to usurp.
My colleague complains of some comparison which has been made between the officers of the Government and bank officers; he contrasts them, and gives the preference to the latter, as being State officers, inasmuch as banks are "State institutions;" and he asks if it is Democratic to deify them? He further tells us that Mr. Jefferson revered "State institutions," therefore, of course, Mr. Jefferson revered State banks! Sir, I have no hostility to banks; I would do them no violence or injustice, let them go on and trade, and speculate, and shock and convulse the country from time to time, I have nothing to say; but in the sense which my colleague means, I totally deny that they are State institutions. On the contrary, unless they are checked by legislative power, or unless, as has ever been my hope, the evil shall cure itself, they will overshadow, and ultimately overawe, your legitimate, constitutional, State institutions—the departments of the Government.
My colleague has informed the nation that he was the portage of Mr. Jefferson. I stand here to rescue that great Apostle of Liberty from the imputation that he revered these State institutions—these State banks. I undertake to say that not a word that ever escaped his lips, or his pen, warrants the imputation; on the contrary, he thought them inimical to liberty and virtue. In the many volumes which John Taylor of Caroline wrote, there is scarcely a page on which he does not denounce them; and Mr. Jefferson has solemnly said, that that great man had never written a word to which he did not give his assent. He said he had read his writings annually, and recommended to the rising youth of the country to do the same. But my colleague says that "State rights" implies jealousy of Executive power! It is strange to me how any person professing, as he does, to understand and to admire this little volume, (Madison's report,) can have fallen into so gross an error. I have only time to refer him to that report, to prove how utterly erroneous is the position. It intimates on the States a jealousy

of their reserved rights against all and every department of the General Government, and utterly repudiates the idea of special and exclusive danger from the Executive; and who does not know Mr. Jefferson's opinions on this subject? He speaks of danger to State rights from all the departments of the Federal Government, but says: "The judiciary is the suitable corps of sappers and miners, working under ground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric." No, sir; this exclusive jealousy of Executive power is not sustained by the Constitution, or any of its contemporaneous expounders. It is a part of modern machinery, worked on the prejudices of the people by those who want the very power they thus repudiate.
My colleague says, "officers of the Government are not officers of the people." This to me, is a new and strange doctrine! Whose officers, I ask, are they? Whose officer is he at this moment? Whose officer was he when he was Minister to France? Why, surely, the officer of the people of the United States. According to his doctrine, that no man not immediately selected by the people is their officer, they have no other officers of the Federal Government except the members of the House of Representatives; for even the President and Vice President are chosen indirectly by them. We are all officers of the people, chosen indirectly by them, to act for them, and are directly responsible to them at the great and controlling bar of public opinion.
[Conclusion next week.]
Correspondence of the New York Evening Star.
MADLE RACHEL.
Of course, people bring up what Madle Rachel was six years ago. She was a beggar in the streets of Paris. Her father, a rough and coarse man, sent her out every night to beg. She stood at one of the corners of the Place de la Bourse, with four little bits of candle stuck in a piece of wood, and laid on the pavement before her. Here she used to sing popular ballads. One night—it was cold and she was in rags—she warbled on, but her voice faltered. A little circle had gathered around her, and a gentleman came out of it, saying, "Poor child, you sing, and tears are rolling down your cheeks." "Yes," said she, "must I have only 15 sous, and if I do not take home a franc I shall be beaten by my father." He handed her a 5 franc piece, and asked her to take him to that harsh parent. The stranger was the late Mr. Charon, the musician. Rachel's father readily agreed that she should enter his academy. She was not 12 years old. She took lessons on music—but acting charmed her more. At the Boulevard's theatres she imbibed this taste. It is easy to make a debut in Paris, and she acted at the theatres Sevestre and des Jeunes Elevés. But she only got *petite* vaudeville parts. Charon died—she went back to her unhappy home—and her father sent her out street-begging again.
One of the Theatre Francais company, who had known her at Charon's, recognized her in the streets, and undertook to teach her declamation. She was young—though not pretty, and he soon offered to take liberties with her. She spurned the man; and some impulse made her address herself to M. Poisson, director of the Gymnase theatre, whom she had seen at Charon's. He received her kindly, allowed her a small salary to satisfy her father, taught her the mechanical part of acting, and, at last, gave her a leading part at the Gymnase, in a new vaudeville called *La Ventuene*. It was seen, and said that she had made a hit. M. Poisson knew it, and said, "Ma fille, I sign an engagement with you. Let us see if we cannot get you into the Theatre Francais, the proper field for your genius." Rachel, in tears—for she thought he was thus dismissing her—went with him to M. Monrose, director of the Theatre Francais. He took Poisson's commendation and said, "You must study to suppress your emotions—we cannot have so much nature—apply yourself to this, and to learning to read and write correctly, and you shall make your debut here in three months. But nature would have way, and when she did make her debut in Racine's *Andronique*, the world saw a natural and therefore powerful actress. In the Journal des Debats, our best dramatic critic, Jules Janin, at once acknowledged that she had, at one bound, reached a height such as scarcely Talma had gained in a life time. In the classic drama—of Voltaire, Racine, Corneille—she has given new life.
I told you formerly how Louis Philippe had personally complimented her. The next day he sent her an autograph letter expressing his admiration of her genius, and enclosing a bank note for 1000 francs. This she handed to her mother, and, kissing the King's letter, said, "This is enough for me."
At a *soiree*, recently, Chateaubriand was present and she came in. The conversation turned on the difficulty of becoming celebrated, in one's lifetime, in any of the arts. He, of course, spoke eloquently, and said to her—"Is it not hard to die, when fame, so rarely achieved, does at last rest on a living creature?" Rachel bent towards him answered—"You should know that there are men who never die."
And now, you may ask, what sort is the lady, and how does she act? She is just 17, her eyes are dark, she has the Jewish cast of face, but is not handsome. She is as tall as Ellen Tree—perhaps a little taller. She is rather narrow shouldered, and this throws her chest forward, and her head leans a little to the left. She uses very little action,—her arms seldom move—her voice often fails—but so strong is the expression that when others use rant and gesticulation, her quiet delivery draws down tears at will. Why?—because she is deeply natural, even as the elder Kean was.
The New York Cultivator states that fruit trees may be propagated by planting the scions instead of engrafting them. They should be prepared by dipping both ends in melted tallow, grafting wax, or some similar article, and then be planted horizontally, with the bud upward, and covered about three inches deep. They will produce trees that will yield fruit in four years.
We notice that in a public meeting recently held in London, the private debts of G. Britain are set down at \$20,000,000,000!!!

From the U. S. Gazette.
THE CONVENTION.
The Boston Atlas, as we have already stated, has expressed on the part of the whigs, whose opinions its editor may be supposed to speak, a determination to abide the decision of a Whig National Convention, on the subject of a presidential candidate—though until that decision is made, Mr. Webster is to be considered the candidate of the whig party in Massachusetts.
The Cincinnati Republican having been closely pressed upon the subject by the Daily Whig in that city, is supposed to speak the determination of General Harrison himself, when it says:
"We have no hesitation in saying, however, for the purpose of ending, on our part, an unprofitable discussion, that Gen. Harrison and his friends have always determined to abide by the decision of the Convention in case it is fairly constituted."
We don't know that any thing more could be said, unless there is a quibble in the words "fairly constituted." The whig convention, we suppose, is to be composed of whigs—elected by whigs. Gen. Harrison has already been nominated by persons calling themselves (as in some instances—that of Pennsylvania—they were, we believe,) the representatives of a party; of course, neither such persons, nor their constituents, could be considered as proper materials for a constituency, or for representatives for such a body. They have acted, and expressed their determination to abide by the results of their action. The whigs then, properly selected by whigs, will make a convention which will be fairly constituted of such materials.
Great Day's Work.—There is a composition in our office, who on last Friday, from six in the morning until five o'clock in the afternoon, set up 19,000 m's Burgeois type, principally solid matter. Beat this if you can, any of you Baltimore light-fingered gentry.
Somerset (Md.) Herald.
COMMERCE OF PHILADELPHIA.
We learn from the Commercial List, that during the years 1837 and 1838, the imports and value of duties on goods imported from foreign countries, direct into the Port of Philadelphia, have been as follows: viz.
Value of Imports. Amount of Duties.
1837, \$10,130,833 \$1,829,993 91
1838, 10,417,815 2,109,355 30
Showing a considerable increase during the past year. The prospects for the present year are flattering, as the number of arrivals have greatly increased, and many of the cargoes have been large and valuable.
Mineral Riches.—Several Boxes of Silver ore, from Davidson county, in this State, were shipped from Wilmington the other day, for New York.
The North Carolinian.
FAYETTEVILLE:
Saturday Morning, April 6.
SWARTWOUT.
The New York Sunday Morning News says that "Mr. Swartwout, our late collector, invested nearly or quite all the amount of his defalcation to government in Texas lands, and that since his arrival in England he has effected a sale of those lands to a company of capitalists for about six millions three hundred thousand dollars."
If this intelligence be correct, Samuel Swartwout may stand a chance to be re-nominated for the Vice Presidency, by the New Light Whigs.
LAMENTATIONS.
The Whig papers are filled with lamentation for the removal of their faithful adherents from office, the whole of which may be epitomized in the following very sentimental verse:
"I never had a piece of bread,
Particularly long and wide
But it would fall upon the floor,
And always on the buttered side."
Fred. Citizen.
The bread and butter of the New Light is like the knots they tie. Their knots are all slip knots, and their bread always buttered on the wrong side.
POLITICAL DEFINITION.
A correspondent wishes to know how he should class himself, viz. a whig—a democratic whig—a federal whig—a Jefferson whig—a loco loco whig, or a conservative whig—for he says he is bothered. We answer whig, by itself whig is a good name for any party, in any times.—N. Y. Star.
Quero—would not New Light Whig do? There are new light Baptists—or, what say you "Captain Dalgettie," to new school whig? The new school Presbyterians have gained their suit in Pennsylvania, and are likely to be in the ascendant.
TROUBLE IN THE WHIG-WAM.
From the Carolina Watchman.
When the question was first agitated as to the propriety of the whigs of North Carolina sending delegates to the whig national convention to be held at Harrisburg, we thought it incumbent to do so. On reflection, however, we are of opinion that it should be done. The very decided preference manifested in favor of Henry Clay, by our party in this State, enjoins upon us the necessity of so providing, that we may not be called on to give our vote to a less acceptable candidate; especially to one from a non-slave-holding State. Without the whig voice of North Carolina, in the proposed convention, it might be that Mr. Clay would not receive the nomination. We doubt exceedingly, whether any other of those spoken of as the whig candidates can receive the vote of this State. That Mr. Clay can, we are as well assured as we ever were of anything belonging to the future. We can send delegates to this convention with limited powers. We can give them instructions not to give or take—not to bargain or chaffer in the matter, but simply to declare the determination of the whigs of North Carolina to vote for Henry Clay and no one else. We are unwilling to be committed to any one else in any event, and we do not mean to be.
Such a participation in the proposed measure, would have nothing of the offensive aspect of caucusing, and might be the means of preventing the vote of the State from being thrown away.
No wonder that "Observer" referred us to the "man in the moon" for an answer to our questions in the first number of this paper.
The above, from the Watchman, is an answer enough. The New Lights are bogged in the same mire that has held them fast to the earth. They cannot agree among themselves. This shows they have not the bond of union—the oneness of principle which holds democrats to-