



NORTH-CAROLINIAN.

W. M. H. BAYNE, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER. FAYETTEVILLE.

Saturday Morning, July 21, 1841.

Webster-McLeod's Case—War with England.

We publish a synopsis of the decision of the Supreme Court of New York upon this case, taken from the New York American, a high federal whig paper. We are sorry that we cannot publish it entire, because, it is so long, that we cannot publish it entire, because, it is one of the most able, profound and learned opinions, we have ever seen; and we learn, that Judge Cowen, the organ of the Court, who delivered that opinion, is distinguished for his probity of character, and depth of law knowledge; and that the whole court—one of the most eminent in the world—was UNANIMOUS in the opinion, that McLeod ought not to be surrendered up to the British Government, but ought to stand his trial for murder, upon the indictment found against him by the Grand Jury of New York. We cannot conceal our satisfaction, that the highest tribunal (and one of the most enlightened in Christendom,) of the empire State, has been brought, (after an argument of many weeks, and by the ablest lawyers in the Union, particularly those employed by McLeod himself, and by Mr Webster for the United States, and after great research and deliberation on the part of the Judges,) to the unanimous opinion, that we are A FREE AND INDEPENDENT PEOPLE—that our soil and citizens are under the protection of our own laws, and that the lives and property of our citizens are not to be made the sport of BRITISH INSOLENCE AND RAPACITY.

Under all these circumstances, so propitious to right decision—argument and deliberation—so exalted a tribunal, selected to, by McLeod himself, and his adviser, Mr Webster, on the part of the U. States, (for the case was removed by McLeod from the county where the indictment was found, to the Supreme Court, to ensure an honest and enlightened decision and unanimity of opinion.) Mr Webster is forever DAMNED, as a DIPLOMATIST AND STATESMAN. Not because he has made a treacherous surrender of the rights and honor of our country, for that perhaps he is incapable of,—but because he has, like the timid General Hull, treacherously surrendered up to British arrogance, the RIGHTS AND HONOR OF A GREAT NATION, THE PEOPLE OF THESE UNITED STATES.

Every body accords to Mr Webster, great talents and lofty intellectual powers, but very justly deny to him, the indispensable attributes of a Statesman—moral courage, and that natural sensibility, whence springs high souled virtue, ever quick to perceive THE POINT OF HONOR. It is well known that on the 4th of last March, the day this new administration came into power, that Mr Fox the British Minister received despatches from his Government. That a report on the same day, was read in the City of Washington, that England had sent a fleet over with men, to sack and burn our seaport towns and cities, unless McLeod was immediately delivered up, upon Mr Fox's demand. That this report was generally believed, and created a great sensation throughout the city, which the knowing ones say, was particularly visible in the flaccid muscles and pallid complexion of the new Secretary of State. Mr Fox, like a skilful antagonist, took advantage of this circumstance, and made an immediate, insolent, peremptory demand of McLeod, under a threat of serious consequences, which confirmed, no doubt, the report of a fleet, in the fears of the Secretary. General Harrison, borne down by the infirmities of age, and the weight of new duties too great for his age, it is more than probable, trusted wholly to Mr Webster, the right solution of the question of international law, upon which this demand was placed. Webster yielding to the trepidation caused by this threat and report; knowing that the banks, and rich bankers, stockholders and wealthy merchants, (who are his chief and constant clients, and who have supported him for the last twenty years with fat fees) live in those cities, and would be the first to suffer by a war, with hot haste knuckled to the demand, and posted off the Attorney General to New York, to wrest the case from the judicial authorities of that State, who to their everlasting honor, have shown themselves, too pure and independent to submit to dictation from any source.

A Secretary of State ought to be a man of incorruptible integrity and unbending moral courage, because in our intercourse with foreign nations, he is the depository of the rights and sacred honor of the nation; above all, he ought like Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Forsyth, to represent the agricultural—the largest interest of the country, and not be taken from cities, where he has been brought up and nurtured, in the sympathies and interest of speculators and wealthy merchants, bankers and stockholders. On a question of peace or war, where their interests are likely to be the first to be effected, his sympathies from education and habit, will be more sensibly alive to their interests, than to the rights and honor of the country.

By this FATAL BLUNDER OR FOUL MORAL TREASON, on the part of GENERAL HULL WEBSTER, our country has not only been wronged and disgraced, but our relations with Great Britain have been involved in a new difficulty and a nearer approach to WAR. It now seems inevitable, that one or the other must recede, or WAR must come. What makes this case so truly provoking is, that there was no necessity on the part of our Government to make any concession to England's demand. Mr Webster had only to maintain the same position taken by Mr Forsyth, in his answer to Mr Fox last December, which was this, in substance: Sir, if the law is as you say it is, and McLeod ought to be delivered up, that law will be administered to McLeod on his trial before the Judiciary of New York, alike distinguished for learning and probity. But so prudent an example, and obvious a course, was overlooked by Mr Webster in the fright and agitation of his hot haste. We therefore say, no honest and patriotic party can sustain Mr Webster in this country, and that he ought and must be DISMISSED FROM THE CABINET.

BE CAUTIOUS where you sleep. A boat had died at New Orleans, on the 8th inst., and on examination, it was found that a vile little worm known as a "thousand legs," had crawled into his ear, and got into the brain.

Ministry of Republics as well as kings. I go for them now, and declare it as my opinion that the only way to obtain our rights, and to avoid eventual war with England, is to abandon all schemes of distribution, and to convert our public lands and surplus revenue, when we have it, into cannon, ships, and forts.

Hard pressed on the instructions to Mr Crittenden—prostrate and defenceless there—the gentlemen on the other side take refuge under the letter to Mr Fox, and celebrate the harmony of its periods, and the beauty of its composition. I grant its merit in these particulars. I admit the beauty of the style, though attenuated into greater thinness and lilliputian weakness. I agree that the Secretary writes well. I admit his ability even to compose a prettier letter in less than forty days. But what has all this to do with the question of right and wrong—of honor and shame—of war and peace—with a foreign Government? In a contest of rhetoricians, it would indeed be important; but in the contests of nations it dwindles into insignificance. The statesman wants knowledge, firmness, patriotism, and invincible adherence to the rights, honor, and interests of his country. These are the characteristics of the statesman; and tried by these tests, what becomes of this letter, so encomiastically dwelt upon here? Its knowledge is shown by a mistake of the law of nations—its firmness, by yielding to a threat—its patriotism, by taking the part of foreigners—its adherence to the honor, rights and interests of our own country, by surrendering McLeod without receiving, or even demanding, one word of redress or apology for the outrage upon the Caroline!

The letter, besides the fatal concessions, is deficient in many tone—in American feeling—in nerve—in force—in resentment of injurious imputations—and in enforcement of our just claims to redress for blood spilt, territory invaded, and flag insulted.

The whole spirit of the letter is feeble and deprecatory. It does not repel, but begs off. It does not recriminate, but defends. It does not resent insult—not even the audacious threat—which is never once complained of, nor even alluded to.

The faults of the letter are fundamental and radical—such as no beauty of composition, no tropes and figures, no flowers of rhetoric, can balance or gloss over. The objections given to its spirit and substance—to errors of fact and law—to its tameness and timidity—and to its total omission to demand redress from the British Government for the outrage on the Caroline, which that Government has now assumed. She has now assumed that outrage for the first time—assumed it after three years of silence; and, in the assumption, offers not one word of apology or of consolation to our wounded feelings. She claps her arms akimbo, and avows the offence; and our Secretary, in his long and beautiful letter, finds no place to insert a demand for this assumed outrage. He gives up the subject, and demands nothing of the sovereign. He lets go the servant, and does not lay hold of the master. This is a grievous omission. It is tantamount to a surrender of all claim for any redress of any kind. McLeod, the perpetrator, is given up; he is given up without conditions. The English Government assume his offence—demand his release—offer us no satisfaction, and we give him up, and ask no satisfaction! The letter demands nothing—literally nothing; and in that respect degrades us as much as the surrender upon a threat had degraded us.

This is a most material point, and I mean to make it clear. I mean to show that the Secretary, in giving up the alleged instrument, has demanded nothing from the assuming superior; and this I will do him the justice to show, by reading from his own letter. I have examined it carefully, and can find but two places where the slightest approach is made, not even to a demand for redress, but to the suggestion of an intimation of a wish on our side ever to hear the name of the Caroline mentioned again. These two places are on the two concluding pages of the letter. If there are others, let gentlemen point them out, and they shall be read. The two paragraphs I discover are these:

"The undersigned trusts, that when her Britannic Majesty's Government shall present the grounds, at length, on which they justify the local authorities of Canada, in attacking and destroying the 'Caroline,' they will consider that the laws of the United States are such as the undersigned has now represented them, and that the Government of the United States has always manifested a sincere disposition to see those laws effectually and impartially administered. If there have been cases in which individuals, justly obnoxious to punishment, have escaped, this is no more than happens in regard to other laws."

"The President instructs the undersigned to say, in conclusion, that he confidently trusts that this, and all other questions of difference between the two Governments, will be treated by both in full exercise of such a spirit of candor, justice, and mutual respect, as shall give assurance of the long continuance of peace between the two countries."

This is all that I can see that looks to the possible contingency of any future allusion to the case of the Caroline. Certainly nothing could be a more complete abandonment of our claim to redress. The first paragraph goes no further than to "trust" that the grounds may be presented, which "justify"—a strange word in such a case—the local authorities in attacking and destroying this vessel; and the second buries it all up, by deferring it to the general and peaceful settlement of all other questions and differences between the two countries. Certainly this is a farewell salutation of the whole affair. It is the parting word, and is evidently so understood by the British Ministry. They have taken no notice of this beautiful letter; they have returned an answer to it, nor even acknowledged its receipt. The Ministry, the Parliament, and the Press in England, profess themselves satisfied. They cease to speak of the affair; and the miserable Caroline, plunging in flames over the frightful cataract, the living and the dead on board, is treated as a gone-by procession, which has lost its interest forever.

It is vain for gentlemen to point to the pa-

graph, so powerfully drawn, which paints the destruction of this vessel, and the slaughter of the innocent as well as the guilty asleep on board of her. That paragraph aggravates the demerit of the letter; for, after so well showing the enormity of the wrong, and our just title to redress, it abandons the case without requiring the slightest atonement!

But gentlemen point to a phrase in the letter, and quote it with triumph, as showing courage and fight in our Secretary. They point to the phrase "bloody and exasperated war," and consider this phrase as a "cure" for every defect. But how did Mr Fox consider it? as a thing to quicken him, or the British Government? as an inducement or stimulus to hasten an atonement for the outrage which they had assumed? Not at all. Far from it. Mr Fox did not take fright, and answer in two days, nor in forty; nor has he answered yet; nor will he ever answer while such genteel epistles are written to him. This "bloody and exasperated war," which is here shadowed forth, is too feebly and pointlessly exhibited to make any impression on the minds of the English and their master. Besides the capital defect of not stating on what fourth day of July the foresaid "bloody and exasperated war" will chance to begin, it happens, also, to be totally defective in not stating the contingency on which it was to happen. It is not said that, if you do not make redress for the outrage you have assumed—if you do not get satisfaction for this wrong—or, if you ever do so again—then and in that case this war of blood and rage will break out.—Nothing of this, nor any thing pointed or tangible, is said in the letter, but only a vague intimation that such occurrences may lead to this war. The little effect which it had upon the mind of the minister, and his Government, is shown by the silent contempt with which they have treated it. This famous letter was written on the 24th day of April; this is June, and to this day no answer has been given to it! Its receipt has not even been acknowledged!

Sir, the case of McLeod is not isolated; it is not a solitary atom, standing by itself; but it is a feature in a large picture—a link in a long chain. It connects itself with all the aggressive conduct of England towards this country; her encroachments on the State of Maine—her occupation of our territory on the Oregon—her insolence in searching our vessels on the coast of Africa—the confiscation of our slaves, wrecked on her islands, in their transit from one port of our country to another—her hatching in London for our Southern States what was hatched there above forty years ago for San Domingo, the insurrection of our slaves and the destruction of their owners—and the ominous unofficial intimations that the Union is bound for the debts of the States. The McLeod case mixes itself with the whole of these; and the success which has attended British threats in his case may bring us threats in all cases, and blows to back them—such blows as the towns of Syria lately received from the war steamers of Stoford and Napier.

The Americans are among the bravest people of the earth, and there is nothing which mortals dare which they will not attempt when bravely led. Their war history is yet in the womb of time. Peace is their policy; but, if much enforced, they shrink not from war. Defence is their first object; but they know how to return visits as well as to receive them. Of all the nations of the earth, the Americans are the people to land on the coasts of England and Ireland. The visits of kindred have sympathies and affections which books and laws cannot control.

As an American citizen, anxious for the peace and prosperity of my country, I do entreat this administration to retrace its steps—to change its policy—to give up its plans of distribution, and of a paper money currency, to fall in the first year of a war—and to give us ships, forts, and cannon, and the hard money currency which our Constitution guarantees, and which the history of the world shows to be the only safe currency for individuals, or for nations, in peace or in war.

Is it not all coming True?

It was charged during the Presidential election that the whigs, (a portion of them i. e. their leaders) were in cahoot with the abolitionists. The following fact goes to show, at least that since the installation of whiggery into power, abolition has reared its hideous head to trouble its former height; and what else than the countenance it has received from some of the leaders of the whig party, has given it this three-fold strength?

The spirit of Fanaticism is alive and active. It hangs like a dark cloud over our horizon. Witness the infamous conduct of these wretches towards the respected Henry W. Ludlam of this city, at New Bedford. Hurried off from Old Point, with his family, by the illness of his father-in-law, he carried with him a black nurse to take care of his child. Scarcely had he arrived at New Bedford, and his father-in-law, supposed to be in the agonies of death, the House was surrounded by a crowd of Abolitionists, the black girl torn away, notwithstanding her own remonstrances, and she was carried off to Boston, where Judge Wild decided that she was at liberty to do as she pleased—to remain in Massachusetts, or to return to Virginia.—Witness, too, the daring conduct of Barrett, a swaggering and mischievous Englishman at Cincinnati, towards Mr John McCalla of Kentucky—protecting his absconding slave in his own house, resisting the authority of the constables, and with the assistance of his comrades striking and wounding McCalla. Thanks to those citizens of Cincinnati, who subsequently seized Barrett, and threw him into jail!

Witness the case of the slave of Archibald Allen of Norfolk, who lately stole off in the brig Relief from Norfolk, and when detected by the Captain, was landed at Newport, Rhode Island, for the purpose of being sent back to his master in Norfolk—but the slave subsequently escaped, and was carried off by the Abolitionists.

And further, that while the reporter of the Herald has to sit in the Senate gallery, the editor of one of the rankest abolition papers in the country, is provided with a seat in the House!!! How do you like this, Southrons? Eh!!!

A Prophecy.

We have as much right to turn prophet as others. Therefore, we predict, that a gag in the shape of some restriction, is now to be placed upon the circulation of newspapers through the Post Office, by the head of that Department. Coming events cast their shadows before. We have noticed a very ominous complaint, in that cunning, crafty, jesuitical organ of the present administration, (we mean the National Intelligencer,) that the present irregularities of the mails, throughout the United States, is owing to the very sudden growth of newspapers, and hinting that the Post Master General intended to obviate it, by new regulations. All this is but the deceitful pretext and prelude of some new restriction to be placed upon the circulation of political news; the most effectual gag upon the liberty of speech and the press, by preventing the people from seeing and understanding the doings, and motives and schemes of this new and most despicable party in power. This administration was brought forth in DARKNESS, got into power by playing DARK; it therefore loves DARKNESS and hates the LIGHT. The Harrisburgh and Baltimore Conventions played dark, Harrison and Tyler played dark, all the federal whig orators played dark, on the subject of a United States Bank, funded debt and tariff taxes, until they had fairly occupied and secured all the holds of power. As soon as this was completed, by the meeting of the present extraordinary Congress, they for the first time, extruded upon the people, their whole batch of detestable federal measures. They alter the good old rules of Congress, made by their patriotic forefathers to secure the liberty of speech, so as to place a gag upon free discussion and enquiry into their measures, in both the Senate and House, and next we will see some gag placed upon the circulation of political information through the Post Office. The press—liberty of speech or free discussion—and the Post Office Department, constitute the three GRAND MORAL TELESCOPES, through which the people can behold and watch the movements of their Government, and detect the first erratic movement. Dim in the least, the glasses of the telescope, or shut out one ray of light, and then commences the REIGN OF DARKNESS, which conducts to TYRANNY or the end of ALL FREE GOVERNMENT.

As God is our judge! we do believe that the great leaders of the present party in power, are base unscrupulous men, who have no hearty love for republican institutions, who believe the people are a fickle, stupid and vulgar mass, to be gained over by log cabins, gourds, con-skims and hard-core humbugs, and all manner of like clap-traps. We therefore shall watch them closely—cry aloud and spare not, and never until these wretches are driven out, will we give up the DRIVE.

Mr Berrien, of Georgia, in the debate in the Senate upon the amendment offered by Mr Bayard to the amendment of Mr Rives on the Bank Bill reported by Mr Clay, uses the following language:

"There was another question—that of location? He disputed the power of the General Government to locate a bank in the District of Columbia. The powers of Congress over the District were powers of relation and not of degree—power to keep out the exertion of foreign legislative power, but not to assume a monarchical position over it. If the South should admit this power, then the question of power to abolish slavery in the District, would cease to exist, and become at once a question of expediency and caprice."

"If the South should admit this power"—What power? To locate a Bank in the District of Columbia, what are the consequences? That Congress have settled the power to abolish slavery in the D.istrict, and it at once becomes "a question of expediency and caprice."

Mr Berrien is from the South, represents a slave holding State in the Senate, and with these views how can he vote for the Bill as reported by Mr Clay, making Washington City the location of the Principal Bank. WE SHALL SEE.

CANDIDATES for the Presidency.—Commodore Stewart, General Scott, General Cass, all three started in Pennsylvania. Now if each State can find a General or a Commodore to put in the field, Mr Clay will be scoured off, he has such a horror of "military chieftains."

Patriotic New Hampshire.

A select committee of the House of Representatives of this State, has passed resolutions to the effect that the United States and the State of Maine have a just claim to the territory in dispute between them and Great Britain; that it is the duty of the United States Government to have the boundary ascertained and marked distinctly; and that in case of a collision between the Governments, she sends her whole means and resources to the Union in maintaining its rights.

TWENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS. FIRST SESSION.

SENATE. WEDNESDAY, July 14, 1841. Mr Linn occupied the morning hour in talking about the Whig Guillotine. The Bank Bill then came up. Mr Tappan proposed to amend, so that nothing in the bill should be construed as to take away the power of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal it, which was withdrawn at the request of Mr Buchanan.

Mr Clay, of Alabama, moved to amend so that its notes should "no longer" be received after it once suspended. Mr Clay, of Kentucky, would not agree, but amended so that they should be refused only during suspension. Mr Clay, of Alabama, then moved to amend by adding that "a suspension shall be held and adjudged a cause of forfeiture of the charter," which passed unanimously.

Mr Clay, of Alabama, then moved to amend so that if the Bank forfeited its charter, the deposits should be removed from it. Mr Clay argued against it. Mr Linn showed that Mr Clay was the author of a proposition to remove the deposits from the Sub-Treasury, and put them in possession of the Secretary of the Treasury, but now he was too squeamish to trust the Secretary with the same power. Mr Clay was penned up so close that he consented, and the amendment passed.

THURSDAY, July 15, 1841. Mr Clay, of Kentucky, desired to take up the Loan Bill. Mr Calhoun wished to proceed with the Bank Bill. Mr Clay urged that the Treasury was in pressing demand for relief. Mr Calhoun said, if the necessity was so urgent, why had not the loan bill been presented earlier?

Mr King desired to know if Mr Clay intended to introduce the "gag law" into the Senate?

Mr Clay: I will, sir; I will.

Mr King resumed as follows:

Mr King. Did not the Senator, in the beginning of the session, press forward his favorite measure, the Bank bill, by "removing the rubbish," as he called the Sub-Treasury, declaring that it could not be delayed a moment, in order to give to the people this Bank bill? The Sub-Treasury was repealed to make room for this splendid Bank; and now that was to be set aside, all at once, to make room for something else, while the delay was to be charged upon them. The loan bill was now to be forced. It was the Bank bill at the beginning of the session. If there was any real necessity for it then, it existed still. He (Mr King) to test that point, was ready, and he would undertake to make the proposition for his friends, to get through with their amendments to-day and to-morrow, and let the bill go to the vote on Saturday, or Monday at farthest. No, no; that would not do. The Senator did not now want to risk that. Some of his friends were absent, they must be waited for. With whom, then, was the delay? The Senator from Kentucky had forgotten his own course and that of his friends when they were in the minority. Look at the panic session. Did they not consume six months in debating every measure, however trifling in itself, for political effect? And were he and his friends to be restricted from presenting their views on measures so momentous?

The freedom of debate had never yet been abridged in that body since the foundation of this Government. Was it fit or becoming, after fifty years of unrestrained liberty, to threaten it with a gag law? He could tell the Senator that, peaceable as a man as he (Mr King) was, whenever it was attempted to violate that sanctuary, he, for one, would resist that attempt even unto the death.

The debate was carried on with great warmth on the Democratic side. Mr Clay was told to come on with his gag as soon as he thought proper, &c. The Senate spent considerable time in Executive session.

FRIDAY, July 16, 1841.

Mr Clay asked that the Loan Bill might be taken up. Mr Calhoun, for his part, should oppose it. Mr Clay said the Bill must pass that week. Mr Wright thought that the Loan Bill might be postponed, considering the amount stated to be in the Treasury, and the accruing revenue. He was willing to assist the Government by the aid of Treasury notes.

Mr Clay moved to postpone the order of the day, and take up the Loan Bill, and put on the screws by calling for the yeas and nays, which call was, however, after considerable irrelevant discussion, withdrawn.

Messrs Clay, Wright, Calhoun, Benton, Buchanan, and several others, discussed the Bill at some length. Mr Linn said: Mr Linn said, pending the late Presidential elections, it was asserted that the nation was forty millions in debt, and immense numbers of maps, printed in columns similar to geological strata, were circulated throughout the country, in which the expenditures of Mr Van Buren's administration, compared with those that preceded it, towered like the Andes or Himalaya mountains. The debt of forty millions has since been gradually reduced as we have approached it from 40 to 30, then to 25, then to 18, and now finally to 12 millions, six of which are not due till next March, and are a debt contracted by the present Administration. Trickery and humbuggery were very prevalent in modern times, and the Whigs had been practising them on a grand scale; but, thank God, the time was coming, when trickery and humbuggery would not answer.

SATURDAY, July 17, 1841.

Mr Calhoun presented some resolutions passed at a meeting in Buckingham county, Va., declaring that the extra session of Congress was unneeded, for, injudicious, and improperly expends the funds of the nation. Speaking of a National Bank they say:

"That should such an institution be incorporated, regarding it as unconstitutional, and of the most deadly hostility to public liberty, they hold it a right inseparable from their condition as citizens of a community under a free constitutional Government, and also an indispensable duty to wage against it an unceasing war, and to use untiring exertions to secure its REPEAL at the earliest practicable day. They protest and remonstrate against the passage of a bill to distribute the proceeds of the sales of the public lands among the States, because there is no constitutional right in Congress to collect money from any source whatever, in order to distribute it among the States, and because the exercise of such a power would be highly impolitic and dangerous. They earnestly and solemnly protest against an increase of the tariff as a violation of the Constitution, a breach of national faith pledged in the compromise act, and extremely oppressive to the South; and above all, it would revive the source of a contention, which has heretofore endangered and would again endanger the existence of our happy Union.

Mr Calhoun and Mr Clay had some conversational discussion in relation to an editorial in the Intelligencer, in relation to the introduction of the previous question just before the war of 1812. Mr Calhoun showed that the Intelligencer had given a very biased and untrue account of the proceedings.

MONDAY, July 19, 1841. The Loan Bill was the special order to-day. Mr Calhoun made a strong speech against the measure. Mr Nicholson followed. He said that all experience shows that the appropriations of the previous session should be the guide for the expenditures of the succeeding year. He showed that they wanted \$18,000,000 to provide for a deficit of \$6,000,000, according to the Secretary's own showing.

Mr Woodbury showed that Treasury notes were preferable, in every point of view, to a loan. Mr Benton closed the debate with facts and figures.

Mr B. affirmed that the Democratic Administration, if it had continued, would have gone through the year without an additional dollar, and appealed to Mr Woodbury, who confirmed it, and gave him a written statement to that effect.

Mr B. examined the reasons used as a pretext for this call of Congress, and deplored the fate of Mr Ewing, who had to find ex post

facto reasons to justify a pre-ordained rule. He showed the wretched error of Mr Ewing's report, and referred to the pulverizing which it received from Messrs Woodbury, Wright, and Calhoun. He compared their arguments against it to the Paixhan (Paysau) bombs fired in the old walls of San-Juan de Ulloa, or St. Jean d'Acre, or Beyroot, "shivering, shattering, and scattering" all before them. Mr Evans, he said, was the only one in the opposite ranks who could keep his legs under that murderous fire.

Before adjournment the Bill PASSED, yeas 23, nays 20; The Globe says:

From this it will be seen that this first instalment of a great national debt, to be provided for the use of a National Bank, was carried by less than a majority of the Senate. In full Senate it would have required twenty-seven votes to make a majority of the body.

TUESDAY, July 20, 1841. In the Senate, the fiscal bank bill was taken up, and has been under debate during the day. There was a caucus upon the subject last evening, but what the fate of the measure is to be, is not known.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. WEDNESDAY, July 14, 1841.

Mr Young of New York addressed the House on the McLeod case. He thought the affair ought to have been left to the people of New York, and he did not believe they would sustain Webster in his directions to the Attorney General to enter a nolle prosequi.

The bill appropriating \$600,000 for ordnance and ordnance stores for the use of the Navy was passed. The fortification bill was taken up, and after some discussion, the Committee rose without accomplishing any thing.

THURSDAY, July 15, 1841.

The House this morning was occupied in discussing the fortification bill. Many amendments were offered; but few adopted, and much talk to little purpose.

FRIDAY, July 15, 1841.

Mr Davis, of Ky., offered a resolution calling on each of the Secretaries to furnish at the next session of Congress, the number, employments, pay, and time requisite to perform the duties of all persons in the employment of the Government, except soldiers, marines and sailors, and their officers, which was adopted.

The fortification bill was again taken up, but the discussion turned principally on the McLeod case, between Messrs Cushing, Hunt, Pickens, &c. Mr Pickens defended his celebrated report manfully.

Mr Wise observed that the present appropriation, called for \$1,019,100, and he wanted to know how so large a sum could be expended in the present year. Mr Fillmore replied that a portion was to be used in the early part of 1842. Mr Wise was opposed to this course. He was against providing for two years in one appropriation bill. The following are a few of his remarks:

He went into a statement to show that from the year 1829 to 1840 the average amount appropriated for fortifications had been \$702,000 a year, and the average expenditure had been \$866,000. Mr Benton's mammoth fortification bill had been reported in 1836 as a counterblast to the distribution bill, even that, with all its extravagance, did not propose so large an annual average of expenditure as would be created by the passage of the present bill.

The great argument against Mr Benton's bill—an argument, too, which had been again urged by the present Secretary of War, then in the House, was, that the money could not be expended. This was the argument Mr W. insisted on against the present bill; it appropriated more money than could be applied within the year. Besides, when Mr Benton's bill had been proposed, there had been a surplus of forty-two millions in the Treasury, whereas now, instead of a surplus, the Government asked for a loan of twelve millions.

Mr W. complimented Mr McKay on his good sense and vigilance, and attributed it to his explanations, with those of his colleagues Mr Shepperd and Mr Rencher, that he had been enlightened as to the true bearings of the present bill. Had he been called on to vote one hour before they commenced to speak, he should have voted for the bill, but in the present state of the Treasury, economy and prudence required that every dollar here asked for fortification should be refused.

Mr Fillmore was surprised at objections from such a quarter, and entered into some calculations.

SATURDAY, July 17, 1841.

Mr Arnold (a whig) moved the reconsideration of the vote upon the resolution to stop all further debate on the appropriation bill, after 2 p. m. this day. He said since the adjournment last evening:—He had had an interview with a gentleman of great knowledge, and whose position afforded him an opportunity to know, next to a certainty, the fate of the great measures whose passage was demanded and desired by the American people; and that gentleman had informed him that, in all probability, every great measure of the country would fail and come to naught.

Mr Weller here exclaimed, "Thank God, our country is safe." Mr Arnold was proceeding to tell about some bawky horses in the whig team, when Messrs Everett and Linn seemed disposed to draw a fight upon him.

Mr Arnold continued. He was in order, and he was sorry his friends did not agree with him. These measures, if they were defeated, would be defeated by politicians here, against the will of the people. He spoke to the unbought, uncorrupted people, and not to them.

Mr Linn of New York rose to a question of order. He said the gentleman was not only not shooting at the mark, but he was shooting at his friends.

Mr Botts here said that Mr Arnold would sing a different tune in the course of a week. Mr Arnold said he would to God the gentleman from Virginia might prove correct, that he might be the true prophet, and himself the false one; but he doubted his hopes. He (Mr Arnold) had, up to this time, followed as a rank and file man, an humble follower of party leaders, but it sometimes became necessary for the humblest individual to speak out. He believed those measures, the fortification and navy bills, would lead to direct taxation. He made this motion now that it might be known that the star of Virginia abstractions had the ascendancy at this time, and like the deadly Upas, blasted the hopes of the American people. If this country was to be under the ban of this influence of Virginia abstractions, then away with commerce, away with