

He may preach there as he did before, in the Old Jewry, but he is not fit to be the representative of the United States—especially at this time.

A political revolution has just taken place in England. The Tories have regained power. They have succeeded by an alliance with the Abolitionists on the West India question. This turned the scale in their favor. The new Minister for the colonies will doubtless be Lord Stanley, by whose exertions mainly West India emancipation was carried. These circumstances give a graver aspect to our relations with England. Most of the questions under discussion are connected with that of slavery; for example, the illegal search of our vessels on the coast of Africa; the liberation of our slaves cast upon the Bermuda coasts; the congregation of black troops in the West Indies; the British designs and intrigues upon Cuba, &c. &c. Is it proper, is it fair to the South, to send an avowed Abolitionist, and one, too, who is, by recanting, which John Randolph used to say was the worst sort of canting, to settle these great and delicate questions? This is a great blunder. Mr Webster has doubtless great talent; but he lacks what is more important, in public as well as private conduct, we mean common sense.

The Barings—Webster—State Stocks—Bates' Letter.

Our readers recollect that the house of Baring, Brothers & Co., the great London bankers, issued a circular calling for a national guaranty of State stocks in which they were deeply interested, also at their request, Mr Webster, then in England, wrote a pamphlet giving his opinion as to the responsibility and security of State liabilities. It is also recollect that during the Presidential election certain letters of English bankers were published, in which they manifested uncommon interest in the result, and expressed a confident opinion if Harrison succeeded that State stocks would immediately rise in value. The movement of the federalists in Congress has evidently tended to accomplish this object, but knowing that to propose the assumption of the State debts by the General Government would be resisted more or less by both political parties, they have urged the distribution of the public lands preparatory to the measure desired by the Barings. The appearance of Mr Bates, a partner of the Barings, at Washington, immediately after the circular of his house calling for a national guaranty of State stocks, and this too at the extra session, is an incident which cannot, and ought not to pass unnoticed. It revives the suspicions heretofore entertained of the influence of British bankers over our legislation and the message of the President in answer to a resolution of Mr Woodbury, tends to confirm that suspicion. Mr Bates has communicated to Mr Webster certain papers on the subject of State stocks, and the following is a copy of Mr Bates' note to Mr Webster:

NEW YORK, May 25. Sir: By request of the parties interested, I beg to enclose the copy of a memorial that I have received signed by the proprietors of the Mississippi stock in London, addressed to the Governor of that state. I am requested to desire you will be so kind as to lay the same before the President, and to do all in your power to induce that state to comply with its engagements.

I have the honor to be, sir, Your very obedient servant. JOSUAH BATES.

Secretary of State, &c. Upon this letter we would simply ask, what has the President to do with State stocks, or what power has Mr Webster over the State of Mississippi to induce that State to comply with its engagements to a foreign banker? It is sheer impudence on the part of Mr Bates to send these papers and weakness in Mr Webster to comply with this request.

Definitions for the Year 1841.

"Newspaper Enterprise"—Stealing a farmer's wagon, carrying it to market, selling his vegetables and pocketing the money, before the owner can overtake the rogue.

"Reports from the Departments"—Smokes kindled from the Treasury to keep the people from seeing what the Whigs are doing with the money.

"Finance"—The art of making any number of blunders all in favor of the financier.

"Securing the independence of the States"—Tying them by the neck to the Federal crib, and authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pat them on the head, and distribute to them two cabbage leaves a piece every day.

"Expediting the business of the Nation"—Setting the government a rolling down hill, and giving nine cheers as it pitches with accelerated speed to the d—n!

"An agitated people crying action—action!"—Seven London Bankers writing to their feed counsel in Washington—"for Heaven's sake rob us the exchequer the first thing thou dost."

"Rebellion and civil War"—Presuming to call in question the Divine Right of a corporation to hold a mortgage of the souls and bodies of the people without equity of redemption.

"Fiscal Agent"—A long spoon to feed politicians out of the Treasury window, and save them the trouble of breaking down the door.

"An unfortunate difference"—Striding across the Senate chamber, staring a brother Whig in the face, shaking both fists and telling him he lies. "Making the amende"

—Assuring the same gentleman next day that you are quite astonished that some people should have supposed you meant to hurt his feelings or do him any wrong.

"Retrenchment and Reform"—Words proper to be said or sung before election.

"Action"—Throwing three millions of dollars into the dock. "Fattious opposition"—Trying to keep the said three millions for public use.

"Relieving the People"—Taking money from those that have, to pay the debts of those that have not.

"Encouraging Labor"—Laying such

taxes as to make sure a man will have to work hard for his bread and clothing.

"Tinkering the currency"—Making gold and silver the standard of value. "Restoring the currency"—banishing gold and silver, and making bank notes a legal tender.

"A uniform Currency"—Paper promises undisturbed by any intermixture of coin.

"Concentrating the Money Power"—Giving to the whole people one neck, and appointing a commission to regulate its breathing by a greater or less degree of strangulation.

"Odor of Nationality"—A carcass that can be smelt from Philadelphia to New Orleans.—Charleston Mercury.

DANIEL WEBSTER & Co.—The N. York New Era mentions that the Branch of the U. S. Bank at New York, has assigned sundry unpaid notes for the benefit of the creditors of the Mother Bank in this City. Among them are, one note of Daniel Webster for \$12,750 00 one other of Daniel Webster for \$5,000 75, and one of J. Watson Webb for \$3,090 00. These be it remembered are in addition to the much larger loans made to Webb and Webster at Philadelphia. Here we have a key to the refusal of the Whig members of the Senate to prohibit loans to members of Congress in the new Bank Bill. There are also notes assigned of Jos. Hoxie & Co., for upwards of fourteen thousand seven hundred dollars. This Joseph Hoxie, we understand, was chief singer at the Tip and Ty orgies before the election.

What think ye of this, ye Harrison whigs? Henry Clay, the leader of your party, branded before the world, by another leader of your party in the District, as insincere, inconsistent, and had acted as no honorable man would have acted!

Mr Brent also states what follows: Who has ever trusted Mr Clay that has not been repaid by the same deep and black ingratitude, unless it has chanced that his self interest ordered it otherwise? In making this charge, starting as it may appear, I am ready to furnish the proof that there have been others, more distinguished than I am, who have left the same sting of ingratitude. Yes, I have now in my possession, open to the public examination, the recorded opinion of Mr Clay's ingratitude, as expressed to me by one whose "lightest word" will far outweigh, in public estimation, the most solemn avowal of even Henry Clay. I have the proof that no less a personage than General William H. Harrison considered Mr Clay as false to his best friends, repaying their best exertions in his behalf, when it suited him, with "ungenerous treatment." The expressions of General Harrison, in a letter dated North Bend, 1st March, 1838, in reply to a letter of mine, urging upon him the support of Mr Clay, should be nominated by the Harrisburg Convention, are as follows: "I will do my duty, even if Mr Clay is to be benefited by it, from whom I have experienced only ungenerous treatment, in requital for years of devoted services." I know this was his private, well settled opinion; and I doubt not that there are many of his intimate friends who can bear me out in this assertion. As the leader of a great party, General Harrison was compelled to treat Mr Clay as a political ally, and even, as such, to tender him an high office, and to consult him upon State affairs. But Mr Clay could never satisfy General Harrison, nor can he satisfy any reflecting man, that the support he gave to General Harrison's election, after the Harrisburg nomination, proceeded from magnanimity on his part, as he has been anxious to persuade the world, or that it proceeded from any other motive than that of self aggrandizement. Had he withdrawn from the contest, in favor of his old friend General Harrison, before he was compelled to the act by the nomination made at Harrisburg, he might talk of magnanimity; but after his defeat, what other course could he have pursued to gain strength for the "succession," at which he is still aiming? These recorded feelings of General Harrison towards Mr Clay were not caused by the legitimate rivalry of Mr Clay for the nomination. They originated in occurrences which took place years before, and in feelings which continued down to the date of his letter, and which were known to me, and doubtless to many of General Harrison's intimate friends. General Harrison was too magnanimous to have suffered such feelings to be engendered by a fair and honest competition between public men. Even towards his political antagonist, Mr Van Buren, he never manifested feelings of personal displeasure. Those who knew General Harrison best, will appreciate and fully understand the force which is to be given to his expressed opinions respecting men. They were opinions slowly formed, but unalterably fixed.

After his failure to notice my language, as a man of honor should have noticed it; and considering that he has no ground upon which he could have honorably avoided the last alternative left him, I am constrained to say, publicly, that henceforward I must consider him as out of the pale of honor—first, because he has avowed himself false to his pledge; and, secondly, because he has rested so long under the most injurious imputations. I have said nothing in this publication more offensive than in our private correspondence; and, if goaded by the publicity of the thing, he should seek to retrieve his lost chivalry, I feel constrained, by self-respect, to say, it is too late. I have waited patiently for a summons, which, as an honorable man, I cannot now listen to. I say, emphatically, that I can take no other notice of Henry Clay, Senator from Kentucky, than to correct any misrepresentations he may attempt, in his desperation, to make. Your fellow-citizen,

W. L. BRENT.

Washington City, 23d July, 1841.

This is Henry Clay's character, from the time he entered political life, up to this day, and if the above be not proof enough of his meanness, and pusillanimity, read the following:

CLAY AND RANDOLPH.

We give below the words which produced the challenge between John Randolph and Henry Clay, in 1825. They were uttered in secret session, and we do not know how they got into the newspapers. Verba volant sunt sed scripta manent.

From what we can gather of public opinion in relation to this law, passed at the last session of our Legislature, it would be better to reject it, and let them try again.

The Common School Law.

Capt. G. C. Hutter, and 1st Lt. R. C. Asheton, have been dismissed from the army, in disgrace.

Henry Clay and William L. Brent—black-leg Plays False.

It appears that William L. Brent, was promised by General Harrison, the office of District Attorney, for the District of Columbia, and that after General Harrison's death, it was given to Philip R. Fendall, of Washington, a very good gentleman, as far as we are acquainted, but a man of no more than ordinary talents, and whose only claim, the Globe says, was that he very frequently contributed to the National Intelligencer, and as we further suggest as some little satisfaction for being expelled from office by General Jackson.

This, of course, was mortifying to Mr Brent, who, by some means found out that it was through Clay's interference that Mr Fendall was appointed, and immediately addressed Mr Clay, inquiring if such was the fact, for says he, "considering our past relations, and especially two conversations which I had with you upon this subject," he felt that it could not be true. Mr Clay replied that in consideration of his long and intimate acquaintance with Mr Fendall, [an acquaintance brought about by their connection with the American Colonization Society,] he had addressed a strong letter of recommendation in his favor to President Tyler.

Mr Brent then tells Mr Clay of a former conversation they had together, in which Mr Clay told him if he had the giving of the office, he would give it to Mr B., in preference to any other, if General Jones would not accept it, and positively stated that he would not interfere between him and Mr Fendall. Mr Brent then tells him, that he views his conduct as "insincere, inconsistent with the high estimate I have heretofore placed upon your character, and such as NO HONORABLE MAN ought to have pursued."

What think ye of this, ye Harrison whigs? Henry Clay, the leader of your party, branded before the world, by another leader of your party in the District, as insincere, inconsistent, and had acted as no honorable man would have acted!

Mr Brent also states what follows: Who has ever trusted Mr Clay that has not been repaid by the same deep and black ingratitude, unless it has chanced that his self interest ordered it otherwise? In making this charge, starting as it may appear, I am ready to furnish the proof that there have been others, more distinguished than I am, who have left the same sting of ingratitude. Yes, I have now in my possession, open to the public examination, the recorded opinion of Mr Clay's ingratitude, as expressed to me by one whose "lightest word" will far outweigh, in public estimation, the most solemn avowal of even Henry Clay. I have the proof that no less a personage than General William H. Harrison considered Mr Clay as false to his best friends, repaying their best exertions in his behalf, when it suited him, with "ungenerous treatment." The expressions of General Harrison, in a letter dated North Bend, 1st March, 1838, in reply to a letter of mine, urging upon him the support of Mr Clay, should be nominated by the Harrisburg Convention, are as follows: "I will do my duty, even if Mr Clay is to be benefited by it, from whom I have experienced only ungenerous treatment, in requital for years of devoted services." I know this was his private, well settled opinion; and I doubt not that there are many of his intimate friends who can bear me out in this assertion. As the leader of a great party, General Harrison was compelled to treat Mr Clay as a political ally, and even, as such, to tender him an high office, and to consult him upon State affairs. But Mr Clay could never satisfy General Harrison, nor can he satisfy any reflecting man, that the support he gave to General Harrison's election, after the Harrisburg nomination, proceeded from magnanimity on his part, as he has been anxious to persuade the world, or that it proceeded from any other motive than that of self aggrandizement. Had he withdrawn from the contest, in favor of his old friend General Harrison, before he was compelled to the act by the nomination made at Harrisburg, he might talk of magnanimity; but after his defeat, what other course could he have pursued to gain strength for the "succession," at which he is still aiming? These recorded feelings of General Harrison towards Mr Clay were not caused by the legitimate rivalry of Mr Clay for the nomination. They originated in occurrences which took place years before, and in feelings which continued down to the date of his letter, and which were known to me, and doubtless to many of General Harrison's intimate friends. General Harrison was too magnanimous to have suffered such feelings to be engendered by a fair and honest competition between public men. Even towards his political antagonist, Mr Van Buren, he never manifested feelings of personal displeasure. Those who knew General Harrison best, will appreciate and fully understand the force which is to be given to his expressed opinions respecting men. They were opinions slowly formed, but unalterably fixed.

After his failure to notice my language, as a man of honor should have noticed it; and considering that he has no ground upon which he could have honorably avoided the last alternative left him, I am constrained to say, publicly, that henceforward I must consider him as out of the pale of honor—first, because he has avowed himself false to his pledge; and, secondly, because he has rested so long under the most injurious imputations. I have said nothing in this publication more offensive than in our private correspondence; and, if goaded by the publicity of the thing, he should seek to retrieve his lost chivalry, I feel constrained, by self-respect, to say, it is too late. I have waited patiently for a summons, which, as an honorable man, I cannot now listen to. I say, emphatically, that I can take no other notice of Henry Clay, Senator from Kentucky, than to correct any misrepresentations he may attempt, in his desperation, to make. Your fellow-citizen,

W. L. BRENT.

Washington City, 23d July, 1841.

This is Henry Clay's character, from the time he entered political life, up to this day, and if the above be not proof enough of his meanness, and pusillanimity, read the following:

CLAY AND RANDOLPH.

We give below the words which produced the challenge between John Randolph and Henry Clay, in 1825. They were uttered in secret session, and we do not know how they got into the newspapers. Verba volant sunt sed scripta manent.

From what we can gather of public opinion in relation to this law, passed at the last session of our Legislature, it would be better to reject it, and let them try again.

The Common School Law.

Capt. G. C. Hutter, and 1st Lt. R. C. Asheton, have been dismissed from the army, in disgrace.

Henry Clay and William L. Brent—black-leg Plays False.

It appears that William L. Brent, was promised by General Harrison, the office of District Attorney, for the District of Columbia, and that after General Harrison's death, it was given to Philip R. Fendall, of Washington, a very good gentleman, as far as we are acquainted, but a man of no more than ordinary talents, and whose only claim, the Globe says, was that he very frequently contributed to the National Intelligencer, and as we further suggest as some little satisfaction for being expelled from office by General Jackson.

This, of course, was mortifying to Mr Brent, who, by some means found out that it was through Clay's interference that Mr Fendall was appointed, and immediately addressed Mr Clay, inquiring if such was the fact, for says he, "considering our past relations, and especially two conversations which I had with you upon this subject," he felt that it could not be true. Mr Clay replied that in consideration of his long and intimate acquaintance with Mr Fendall, [an acquaintance brought about by their connection with the American Colonization Society,] he had addressed a strong letter of recommendation in his favor to President Tyler.

Mr Brent then tells Mr Clay of a former conversation they had together, in which Mr Clay told him if he had the giving of the office, he would give it to Mr B., in preference to any other, if General Jones would not accept it, and positively stated that he would not interfere between him and Mr Fendall. Mr Brent then tells him, that he views his conduct as "insincere, inconsistent with the high estimate I have heretofore placed upon your character, and such as NO HONORABLE MAN ought to have pursued."

What think ye of this, ye Harrison whigs? Henry Clay, the leader of your party, branded before the world, by another leader of your party in the District, as insincere, inconsistent, and had acted as no honorable man would have acted!

Mr Brent also states what follows: Who has ever trusted Mr Clay that has not been repaid by the same deep and black ingratitude, unless it has chanced that his self interest ordered it otherwise? In making this charge, starting as it may appear, I am ready to furnish the proof that there have been others, more distinguished than I am, who have left the same sting of ingratitude. Yes, I have now in my possession, open to the public examination, the recorded opinion of Mr Clay's ingratitude, as expressed to me by one whose "lightest word" will far outweigh, in public estimation, the most solemn avowal of even Henry Clay. I have the proof that no less a personage than General William H. Harrison considered Mr Clay as false to his best friends, repaying their best exertions in his behalf, when it suited him, with "ungenerous treatment." The expressions of General Harrison, in a letter dated North Bend, 1st March, 1838, in reply to a letter of mine, urging upon him the support of Mr Clay, should be nominated by the Harrisburg Convention, are as follows: "I will do my duty, even if Mr Clay is to be benefited by it, from whom I have experienced only ungenerous treatment, in requital for years of devoted services." I know this was his private, well settled opinion; and I doubt not that there are many of his intimate friends who can bear me out in this assertion. As the leader of a great party, General Harrison was compelled to treat Mr Clay as a political ally, and even, as such, to tender him an high office, and to consult him upon State affairs. But Mr Clay could never satisfy General Harrison, nor can he satisfy any reflecting man, that the support he gave to General Harrison's election, after the Harrisburg nomination, proceeded from magnanimity on his part, as he has been anxious to persuade the world, or that it proceeded from any other motive than that of self aggrandizement. Had he withdrawn from the contest, in favor of his old friend General Harrison, before he was compelled to the act by the nomination made at Harrisburg, he might talk of magnanimity; but after his defeat, what other course could he have pursued to gain strength for the "succession," at which he is still aiming? These recorded feelings of General Harrison towards Mr Clay were not caused by the legitimate rivalry of Mr Clay for the nomination. They originated in occurrences which took place years before, and in feelings which continued down to the date of his letter, and which were known to me, and doubtless to many of General Harrison's intimate friends. General Harrison was too magnanimous to have suffered such feelings to be engendered by a fair and honest competition between public men. Even towards his political antagonist, Mr Van Buren, he never manifested feelings of personal displeasure. Those who knew General Harrison best, will appreciate and fully understand the force which is to be given to his expressed opinions respecting men. They were opinions slowly formed, but unalterably fixed.

After his failure to notice my language, as a man of honor should have noticed it; and considering that he has no ground upon which he could have honorably avoided the last alternative left him, I am constrained to say, publicly, that henceforward I must consider him as out of the pale of honor—first, because he has avowed himself false to his pledge; and, secondly, because he has rested so long under the most injurious imputations. I have said nothing in this publication more offensive than in our private correspondence; and, if goaded by the publicity of the thing, he should seek to retrieve his lost chivalry, I feel constrained, by self-respect, to say, it is too late. I have waited patiently for a summons, which, as an honorable man, I cannot now listen to. I say, emphatically, that I can take no other notice of Henry Clay, Senator from Kentucky, than to correct any misrepresentations he may attempt, in his desperation, to make. Your fellow-citizen,

W. L. BRENT.

Washington City, 23d July, 1841.

This is Henry Clay's character, from the time he entered political life, up to this day, and if the above be not proof enough of his meanness, and pusillanimity, read the following:

CLAY AND RANDOLPH.

We give below the words which produced the challenge between John Randolph and Henry Clay, in 1825. They were uttered in secret session, and we do not know how they got into the newspapers. Verba volant sunt sed scripta manent.

From what we can gather of public opinion in relation to this law, passed at the last session of our Legislature, it would be better to reject it, and let them try again.

The Common School Law.

Capt. G. C. Hutter, and 1st Lt. R. C. Asheton, have been dismissed from the army, in disgrace.

Henry Clay and William L. Brent—black-leg Plays False.

It appears that William L. Brent, was promised by General Harrison, the office of District Attorney, for the District of Columbia, and that after General Harrison's death, it was given to Philip R. Fendall, of Washington, a very good gentleman, as far as we are acquainted, but a man of no more than ordinary talents, and whose only claim, the Globe says, was that he very frequently contributed to the National Intelligencer, and as we further suggest as some little satisfaction for being expelled from office by General Jackson.

This, of course, was mortifying to Mr Brent, who, by some means found out that it was through Clay's interference that Mr Fendall was appointed, and immediately addressed Mr Clay, inquiring if such was the fact, for says he, "considering our past relations, and especially two conversations which I had with you upon this subject," he felt that it could not be true. Mr Clay replied that in consideration of his long and intimate acquaintance with Mr Fendall, [an acquaintance brought about by their connection with the American Colonization Society,] he had addressed a strong letter of recommendation in his favor to President Tyler.

Mr Brent then tells Mr Clay of a former conversation they had together, in which Mr Clay told him if he had the giving of the office, he would give it to Mr B., in preference to any other, if General Jones would not accept it, and positively stated that he would not interfere between him and Mr Fendall. Mr Brent then tells him, that he views his conduct as "insincere, inconsistent with the high estimate I have heretofore placed upon your character, and such as NO HONORABLE MAN ought to have pursued."

What think ye of this, ye Harrison whigs? Henry Clay, the leader of your party, branded before the world, by another leader of your party in the District, as insincere, inconsistent, and had acted as no honorable man would have acted!

Mr Brent also states what follows: Who has ever trusted Mr Clay that has not been repaid by the same deep and black ingratitude, unless it has chanced that his self interest ordered it otherwise? In making this charge, starting as it may appear, I am ready to furnish the proof that there have been others, more distinguished than I am, who have left the same sting of ingratitude. Yes, I have now in my possession, open to the public examination, the recorded opinion of Mr Clay's ingratitude, as expressed to me by one whose "lightest word" will far outweigh, in public estimation, the most solemn avowal of even Henry Clay. I have the proof that no less a personage than General William H. Harrison considered Mr Clay as false to his best friends, repaying their best exertions in his behalf, when it suited him, with "ungenerous treatment." The expressions of General Harrison, in a letter dated North Bend, 1st March, 1838, in reply to a letter of mine, urging upon him the support of Mr Clay, should be nominated by the Harrisburg Convention, are as follows: "I will do my duty, even if Mr Clay is to be benefited by it, from whom I have experienced only ungenerous treatment, in requital for years of devoted services." I know this was his private, well settled opinion; and I doubt not that there are many of his intimate friends who can bear me out in this assertion. As the leader of a great party, General Harrison was compelled to treat Mr Clay as a political ally, and even, as such, to tender him an high office, and to consult him upon State affairs. But Mr Clay could never satisfy General Harrison, nor can he satisfy any reflecting man, that the support he gave to General Harrison's election, after the Harrisburg nomination, proceeded from magnanimity on his part, as he has been anxious to persuade the world, or that it proceeded from any other motive than that of self aggrandizement. Had he withdrawn from the contest, in favor of his old friend General Harrison, before he was compelled to the act by the nomination made at Harrisburg, he might talk of magnanimity; but after his defeat, what other course could he have pursued to gain strength for the "succession," at which he is still aiming? These recorded feelings of General Harrison towards Mr Clay were not caused by the legitimate rivalry of Mr Clay for the nomination. They originated in occurrences which took place years before, and in feelings which continued down to the date of his letter, and which were known to me, and doubtless to many of General Harrison's intimate friends. General Harrison was too magnanimous to have suffered such feelings to be engendered by a fair and honest competition between public men. Even towards his political antagonist, Mr Van Buren, he never manifested feelings of personal displeasure. Those who knew General Harrison best, will appreciate and fully understand the force which is to be given to his expressed opinions respecting men. They were opinions slowly formed, but unalterably fixed.

After his failure to notice my language, as a man of honor should have noticed it; and considering that he has no ground upon which he could have honorably avoided the last alternative left him, I am constrained to say, publicly, that henceforward I must consider him as out of the pale of honor—first, because he has avowed himself false to his pledge; and, secondly, because he has rested so long under the most injurious imputations. I have said nothing in this publication more offensive than in our private correspondence; and, if goaded by the publicity of the thing, he should seek to retrieve his lost chivalry, I feel constrained, by self-respect, to say, it is too late. I have waited patiently for a summons, which, as an honorable man, I cannot now listen to. I say, emphatically, that I can take no other notice of Henry Clay, Senator from Kentucky, than to correct any misrepresentations he may attempt, in his desperation, to make. Your fellow-citizen,

W. L. BRENT.

Washington City, 23d July, 1841.

This is Henry Clay's character, from the time he entered political life, up to this day, and if the above be not proof enough of his meanness, and pusillanimity, read the following:

CLAY AND RANDOLPH.

We give below the words which produced the challenge between John Randolph and Henry Clay, in 1825. They were uttered in secret session, and we do not know how they got into the newspapers. Verba volant sunt sed scripta manent.

From what we can gather of public opinion in relation to this law, passed at the last session of our Legislature, it would be better to reject it, and let them try again.

The Common School Law.

Capt. G. C. Hutter, and 1st Lt. R. C. Asheton, have been dismissed from the army, in disgrace.

Henry Clay and William L. Brent—black-leg Plays False.

It appears that William L. Brent, was promised by General Harrison, the office of District Attorney, for the District of Columbia, and that after General Harrison's death, it was given to Philip R. Fendall, of Washington, a very good gentleman, as far as we are acquainted, but a man of no more than ordinary talents, and whose only claim, the Globe says, was that he very frequently contributed to the National Intelligencer, and as we further suggest as some little satisfaction for being expelled from office by General Jackson.

This, of course, was mortifying to Mr Brent, who, by some means found out that it was through Clay's interference that Mr Fendall was appointed, and immediately addressed Mr Clay, inquiring if such was the fact, for says he, "considering our past relations, and especially two conversations which I had with you upon this subject," he felt that it could not be true. Mr Clay replied that in consideration of his long and intimate acquaintance with Mr Fendall, [an acquaintance brought about by their connection with the American Colonization Society,] he had addressed a strong letter of recommendation in his favor to President Tyler.

Mr Brent then tells Mr Clay of a former conversation they had together, in which Mr Clay told him if he had the giving of the office, he would give it to Mr B., in preference to any other, if General Jones would not accept it, and positively stated that he would not interfere between him and Mr Fendall. Mr Brent then tells him, that he views his conduct as "insincere, inconsistent with the high estimate I have heretofore placed upon your character, and such as NO HONORABLE MAN ought to have pursued."

What think ye of this, ye Harrison whigs? Henry Clay, the leader of your party, branded before the world, by another leader of your party in the District, as insincere, inconsistent, and had acted as no honorable man would have acted!

Mr Brent also states what follows: Who has ever trusted Mr Clay that has not been repaid by the same deep and black ingratitude, unless it has chanced that his self interest ordered it otherwise? In making this charge, starting as it may appear, I am ready to furnish the proof that there have been others, more distinguished than I am, who have left the same sting of ingratitude. Yes, I have now in my possession, open to the public examination, the recorded opinion of Mr Clay's ingratitude, as expressed to me by one whose "lightest word" will far outweigh, in public estimation, the most solemn avowal of even Henry Clay. I have the proof that no less a personage than General William H. Harrison considered Mr Clay as false to his best friends, repaying their best exertions in his behalf, when it suited him, with "ungenerous treatment." The expressions of General Harrison, in a letter dated North Bend, 1st March, 1838, in reply to a letter of mine, urging upon him the support of Mr Clay, should be nominated by the Harrisburg Convention, are as follows: "I will do my duty, even if Mr Clay is to be benefited by it, from whom I have experienced only ungenerous treatment, in requital for years of devoted services." I know this was his private, well settled opinion; and I doubt not that there are many of his intimate friends who can bear me out in this assertion. As the leader of a great party, General Harrison was compelled to treat Mr Clay as a political ally, and even, as such, to tender him an high office, and to consult him upon State affairs. But Mr Clay could never satisfy General Harrison, nor can he satisfy any reflecting man, that the support he gave to General Harrison's election, after the Harrisburg nomination, proceeded from magnanimity on his part, as he has been anxious to persuade the world, or that it proceeded from any other motive than that of self aggrandizement. Had he withdrawn from the contest, in favor of his old friend General Harrison, before he was compelled to the act by the nomination made at Harrisburg, he might talk of magnanimity; but after his defeat, what other course could he have pursued to gain strength for the "succession," at which he is still aiming? These recorded feelings of General Harrison towards Mr Clay were not caused by the legitimate rivalry of Mr Clay for the nomination. They originated in occurrences which took place years before, and in feelings which continued down to the date of his letter, and which were known to me, and doubtless to many of General Harrison's intimate friends. General Harrison was too magnanimous to have suffered such feelings to be engendered by a fair and honest competition between public men. Even towards his political antagonist, Mr Van Buren, he never manifested feelings of personal displeasure. Those who knew General Harrison best, will appreciate and fully understand the force which is to be given to his expressed opinions respecting men. They were opinions slowly formed, but unalterably fixed.

After his failure to notice my language, as a man of honor should have noticed it; and considering that he has no ground upon which he could have honorably avoided the last alternative left him, I am constrained to say, publicly, that henceforward I must consider him as out of the pale of honor—first, because he has avowed himself false to his pledge; and, secondly, because he has rested so long under the most injurious imputations. I have said nothing in this publication more offensive than in our private correspondence; and, if goaded by the publicity of the thing, he should seek to retrieve his lost chivalry, I feel constrained, by self-respect, to say, it is too late. I have waited patiently for a summons, which, as an honorable man, I cannot now listen to. I say, emphatically, that I can take no other notice of Henry Clay, Senator from Kentucky, than to correct any misrepresentations he may attempt, in his desperation, to make. Your fellow-citizen,

W. L. BRENT.

Washington City, 23d July, 1841.

This is Henry Clay's character, from the time he entered political life, up to this day, and if the above be not proof enough of his meanness, and pusillanimity, read the following:

CLAY AND RANDOLPH.

We give below the words which produced the challenge between John Randolph and Henry Clay, in 1825. They were uttered in secret session, and we do not know how they got into the newspapers. Verba volant sunt sed scripta manent.

From what we can gather of public opinion in relation to this law, passed at the last session of our Legislature, it would be better to reject it, and let them try again.

The Common School Law.

Henry Clay and William L. Brent—black-leg Plays False.

It appears that William L. Brent, was promised by General Harrison, the office of District Attorney, for the District of Columbia, and that after General Harrison's death, it was given to Philip R. Fendall, of Washington, a very good gentleman, as far as we are acquainted, but a man of no more than ordinary talents, and whose only claim, the Globe says, was that he very frequently contributed to the National Intelligencer, and as we further suggest as some little satisfaction for being expelled from office by General Jackson.

This, of course, was mortifying to Mr Brent, who, by some means found out that it was through Clay's interference that Mr Fendall was appointed, and immediately addressed Mr Clay, inquiring if such was the fact, for says he, "considering our past relations, and especially two conversations which I had with you upon this subject," he felt that it could not be true. Mr Clay replied that in consideration of his long and intimate acquaintance with Mr Fendall, [an acquaintance brought about by their connection with the American Colonization Society,] he had addressed a strong letter of recommendation in his favor to President Tyler.

Mr Brent then tells Mr Clay of a former conversation they had together, in which Mr Clay told him if he had the giving of the office, he would give it to Mr B., in preference to any other, if General Jones would not accept it, and positively stated that he would not interfere between him and Mr Fendall. Mr Brent then tells him, that he views his conduct as "insincere, inconsistent with the high estimate I have heretofore placed upon your character, and such as NO HONORABLE MAN ought to have pursued."

What think ye of this, ye Harrison whigs? Henry Clay, the leader of your party, branded before the world, by another leader of your party in the District, as insincere, inconsistent, and had acted as no honorable man would have acted!

Mr Brent also states what follows: Who has ever trusted Mr Clay that has not been repaid by the same deep and black ingratitude, unless it has chanced that his self interest ordered it otherwise? In making this charge, starting as it may appear, I am ready to furnish the proof that there have been others, more distinguished than I am, who have left the same sting