

THE NORTH CAROLINIAN

News by Mail.

TARIFF.—We have copied from the Petersburg (Va.) Statesman an article giving what there is of dubious twilight probability that President Tyler will veto any bill avowedly designed as a protective tariff. Why has he not vetoed Mr Secretary Forward for proposing such a scheme? In the mean time where are the people of the South? The Clay party have adopted for their motto a protective tariff—they have filled Congress with their petitions to check foreign importation—they boast that while there have been thousands of memorials in favor of protection there has not been one against it, and they assert that the South has changed its principle and is no longer in favor of Free Trade. What says Charleston to this? We should like to take the vote. We should rejoice to know the men that would have us export cotton only to Boston, and import sugar only from New Orleans.

The Southern States have borne the rumor of an effort to establish a high tariff, with a calm aspect, for a number of reasons. 1. They had trusted something to the honor of Mr Clay. 2. They have trusted also much to the common sense of Congress, enlightened by the experience of the last twenty years. 3. They had trusted not a little to the solemn pledges of the whole public life of President Tyler, that if Congress should be mad and faithless enough to enact a protective tariff, he would remember it in cath, and arrest it. 4. They have trusted to the sense of the manufacturers themselves. They cannot but know that a tariff warring upon commerce, will be itself warring upon stability. Whatever advantage they may gain by stability, will be lost by crossing the fatal bands of the Compromise act. Beyond that, there is no peace—no rest—no footing solid ground to stand upon. If they cross it, we hold them as outlaws and traitors—fit to be selfish, blind and incurable. These are the reasons why remonstrance in its most formidable shape has not gone to Washington from the South. But these reasons may all fail—where are we then? People of the South wake to your danger!—Charleston Mercury

Pointexter's Report on the abuses of the N. Y. Custom House.

We are indebted to the Hon. Garret Davis of Kentucky, for a copy of this big document, purporting to give a disclosure of all the enormous enormities of the New York Custom House. We cannot but much value upon this exposure until it is better established. It professes to have detected a wide system of fraud and collusion between the late Collector Hunt and the woolen manufacturers of New England, to harass and exclude importation that came in contact with them. This is no means improbable, but they deny the charge peremptorily, defy him to the proof and towards Pointexter himself pretty rough language, which in a "card" he has promised to "notice in a proper manner" as soon as he gets time; as well as to establish the exact truth of his charges. Another part of the Report is a long tabular statement of alleged overcharges for all manner of stationery to the Custom House, in which the alleged true market prices of articles is contrasted with the prices paid by the Government Officers. These tables are made out on the sole testimony of Mr Felt, and the Washington correspondent of the Herald states that the said Mr Felt has written a letter to the Speaker of the House to be laid before that body, in which he roundly denies that he ever gave the testimony attributed to him in the Report! He says he was examined before the Investigating Committee, but that they, contrary to the promise, never allowed him to see, and that he never did see nor sign the written statements! The Herald also contains another equally curious comment on this part of the Report from the Messrs. Wait, printers, who furnish much of the stationery paraded in these tables. In return they present a table comparing Pointexter's scale of market prices, with the actual prices paid for stationery for the use of the Investigating Committee itself, which were approved by Pointexter and paid by the Government. One of his items is "and—50 cts. a bushel"—for which the Committee paid at the rate of \$27 21 a bushel. On the whole it appears that "Old Point" has as well resign the office of public reformer, and labor in that field where it is said charity begins.—Charleston Mercury.

Mr Clay's Organ.

The Independent, the paper established at Washington by Mr Hays and others, to sustain Mr Clay, out-runs most of its colleagues on the Whig side, in its undisguised aristocracy of principles.

A correspondent in that paper of May 31st, proposes the entire abrogation of our naturalization laws, and an editorial article in the same number, opposes most energetically the enjoyment of the right of suffrage by the poor man.

The editorial article is headed "Difference of Rights between those who have property to protect and those who have only their persons."

After censuring the doctrines of Mr Jefferson, it introduces a high commendation, an article from the New Haven Herald, a Whig print, in which it is said, that the "argument for allowing men of no property an equal vote with those who own property certainly fails;—that "it is not true that men of no property have equal rights to manage or defend with men of property," and that universal suffrage is a violation of equal rights, and a government recognizing such suffrage is founded on injustice.

It is easy to refute these anti-democratic dogmas.

The right to vote is founded upon the fact that the government may dispose of the life, liberty, property or earnings of the voter. Its action in this respect certainly affects the poor man as well as the rich. The poor have therefore a similar, if not an equal interest in the government. For the Independent will have it that the interest of the rich man in the good administration of the government, as affected by voting, is greater than that of the poor man.

We hold on the contrary, that the poor man's interest is greater than the rich man's. The reason is simply this: the poor man is more affected than the rich in the different varieties in the administration of the different kinds of government, from those where there is no voting at all, to those where universal suffrage prevails.

The rights of property are protected, nearly equally, under every species of government;—but the rights of those who are without property are constantly crushed where they do not participate in the sovereignty. The rich man is rarely oppressed any where; the poor are generally oppressed, almost every where. The rich can overleap or evade oppressive laws: the poor are obliged to suffer under them. There is, perhaps, not a country on earth, where the poor man does not directly or indirectly pay at least his full share of taxes, and wherever he does not vote he pays much more. If the government deprives the rich man of half his income, and the poor man of his, then the independent would have it that the rich man's sufferings are the greater. We hold, however, that the poor man's sufferings are the greatest in that case; for the rich man can still be comfortable, under the loss of half his income, but the like loss to the poor man and his family may reduce him and his family to the extreme of misery. The rich man never needs to go forth to aid in the wars of the government, but the poor man is compelled to leave his family, encounter hardships, and expose his life.

Suppose, however, that we admit that the rich man has a far greater interest in the good management of public affairs than the poor, and ought therefore to have a far greater influence over the government, even then we hold that the former possesses all this preponderating influence, although he lives under a system of universal suffrage.

He has, first, an extraordinary influence over the public prints, which affect public opinion; he has next an extraordinary influence in preparing the nominations of the respective parties; then he has a greater influence in affecting the opinions and actions of the voters; and finally, after the election is over, he has an immense advantage over the poor man, in his superior ability to visit, and influence the executive and legislative officers.

There is no government on earth under which the rich are pre-eminently the wronged or oppressed class, and of course, there is none in which they do not enjoy their full and just proportion of power and influence.

From the Globe. Aft Illustration.

We see in an exchange paper an extract from the "Florence (Ala.) Gazette"—a Whig, tariff paper—containing the following remark, viz: "Well, give us a gold and silver currency, and with it give us the bane of national wealth—free trade, as it is popularly styled; and how long could this currency remain with us? As certain as the jaws of nature drain the waters of the Mississippi to the sea, so certain would this currency, by the laws of commerce, find its way to the great marts of Europe."

Well, did it ever occur to this enemy of free trade to inquire what can be the reason why the Mississippi does not run dry, and leave the vast regions which drain on arid desert? There goes the water—and a mighty flood it is—jumbling, boiling, foaming, pouring into the Gulf of Mexico, water enough to make a sea every year. There is no counter-current—no river carrying the water back again; it is always running one way; and yet, wonderful to tell, there is as much water in the Western country now, as when the white people first found it! What can be the reason? Why, by the operation of the laws of nature, the water which runs out by this mighty stream is brought back by the currents of the atmosphere, and returned to the earth in raindrops and dewdrops, in snow and hail. The flakes of snow, descending with scarce a feather's weight, melted by the presence of the sun on his return from the South, and combined together from numberless mountains and prairies, hills and dales, form those overwhelming floods which defy human strength, and form one of the most majestic illustrations of Almighty power.

Now, the operation of the laws of trade is very analogous to those of nature's laws. Specie, and specie funds, are constantly leaving the Western country and the United States, in a mighty stream, like that of the Mississippi; yet they are never drained. That which goes out in a flood, comes back in drops; and these drops are numerous enough to keep the flood always running.

We illustrate our reasoning by a dialogue between Mr Tariff and Mr Freetrade. Scene—Florence, Alabama.

Tariff. Neighbor Freetrade, I am surprised at your opposition to a tariff. Don't you see how free trade is taking all our specie from us, and carrying it off to the East, and thence to Europe?

Freetrade. "Our specie!" you call it. Now, our section of country does not produce specie; and how did we get any?

T. By selling our produce for it.

F. Ay, by trade. It began to come before it began to go, did it not?

T. Certainly. The first emigrants brought some; and our planters, drovers, boat hands, &c. bring more.

F. Well, there was none here when the first emigrants came here, was there?

T. No.

F. And the quantity has been increasing ever since, has it not?

T. I suppose it has.

F. And yet it has been running East in a torrent like that of the Mississippi, all the time; has it not?

T. That is what I was complaining about. F. Considering the facts just admitted, is there any good reason for complaint? Is it reasonable to charge trade with carrying off all our specie, when it brings us all we have, and the quantity is constantly increasing?

T. But it would increase faster if it were not carried away.

F. Well, suppose some one, to save the water of the Western country, were to dam up the Mississippi—what would be the conse-

T. It would drown us all. F. If specie kept coming, and none went away, we should soon have more than we should know what to do with. It is not much better to let it go, and get something useful for it? T. I don't know. I must think about it.

TWENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS. SECOND SESSION.

SENATE, Thursday, June 2, 1842. Mr Benton, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which had been referred the bill to provide for the armed occupation and settlement of the Territory of Florida, reported the same back without amendment.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration, as in committee of the whole, of the apportionment bill.

The question pending, when the Senate adjourned on yesterday, was the motion of Mr Wright to amend the following section of the bill: Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That, in every case when a State is entitled to more than one Representative, the number to which each State shall be entitled under this apportionment shall be elected by districts, composed of contiguous territory, equal in number to the number of Representatives to which said State may be entitled—no one district electing more than one Representative.

Mr Wright moved to strike from the above section the words "no one district electing more than one Representative," and to insert the words "as far as that can be done in conformity with the established election systems of the States; but no State shall, by virtue of the provisions of this section, consider itself called upon to divide counties, or other election districts, for the purpose of furnishing single districts."

Mr Woodbury observed, that in taking the ground he did, that the law now intended was unconstitutional, he asserted nothing which he did not mean to maintain before the Senate and the country. What he contended was, that after passing a law such as this, imperfect and inoperative, it would prove a law of no force; and Congress could not—dared not—send a military force into New Hampshire to carry it out. If you pass a law to have the force of a law, you must carry it out yourselves by making the districts. But you cannot force a State to obey such a mere order as this. This was no temporary construction of the Constitution; it was the construction which had been given to it for half a century. The alteration must be perfected by Congress, and must be for extraordinary reasons, or it is not within the spirit of the Constitution. All that he said was, that Congress dared not send a force into that State—a sovereign State of this Union—to make her obey a mandate of this Congress. And your inability to enforce the law you pass in this form, shows its unconstitutionality. He did not hold the doctrine which the Senator from Kentucky imputed to him—that after a law had been constitutionally passed by Congress, it was to be resisted by force.

Mr Crittenden asked, if Congress passed this law, would the Legislature of New Hampshire use force to frustrate it?

Mr Woodbury said, no, she would not; but she would do what Kentucky did in 1798, and what Virginia and South Carolina did. She would go to work with determination, and peacefully bring about a corrective.

The doctrine held by the Kentucky Legislature was the following: "That the several States who formed that instrument, (the Constitution,) being sovereign and independent, have the unquestionable right to judge of the infraction; and that a nullification, by those sovereignties, of all unauthorized acts done under color of that instrument, is the rightful remedy."

He desired that the attention of Congress should be directed to the four or five instances of alarming encroachments upon the States which had recently been attempted on the part of this Government. One of these was the law in relation to the bankrupt system, in which the force of Congress was brought to bear upon the debtors and courts throughout the several States. Next, was the measure by which all the States were brought here to be fed out of the public crib, whilst they were taxed, in return, to the full extent of all they received. Next, was the attempt to take from the States their criminal jurisdiction in cases like McLeod's, and bring the causes within the cognizance of your tribunals. And what was it they had next seen at the other end of the avenue, the propriety of which was yet to be decided here? The citizens of a State had been denominated insurgents, and were about to be put down by an armed force; and last of all these encroachments, they had the bill now under consideration—a bill of an unprecedented character—dictating to the States how they should elect their districts, and how they should elect their members to Congress.

HOUSE, Thursday, June 2, 1842. Mr Underwood called up a bill incorporating the "National Institution for the Promotion of Science." Was passed by a majority of 105 to 66.

SENATE, Friday, June 3, 1842. On motion of Mr Walker, the Senate proceeded to the consideration, as in committee of the whole, of the apportionment bill.

The question pending, when the Senate adjourned on yesterday, was the motion of Mr Wright to amend the following section of the bill: Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That, in every case when a State is entitled to more than one Representative, the number to which each State shall be entitled under this apportionment shall be elected by districts, composed of contiguous territory, equal in number to the number of Representatives to which said State may be entitled—no one district electing more than one Representative.

Mr Wright had moved to strike from the above section the words "no one district electing more than one Representative," and to insert the words "as far as that can be done in conformity with the established election systems of the States; but no State shall, by virtue of the provisions of this section, consider itself called upon to divide counties, or other election districts, for the purpose of fur-

The bill and amendment were debated till adjournment without taking the question.

HOUSE, Friday, June 3, 1842. Mr Fillmore reported a bill for the raising of revenue for the year, 1842.

The bill was read a first and second time. Mr Fillmore then moved that it be committed to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and that it be printed; also, that 5,000 extra copies be printed.

The motion was agreed to. Mr Fillmore then submitted a resolution to fix Monday next, at 1 o'clock, to terminate debate in Committee of the Whole on the military appropriation bill; which was adopted, after some objection, by the yeas and noes—yeas 93, noes 85.

On motion of Mr Roosevelt, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and resumed the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the support of the army for the year 1842.

SENATE, Saturday, June 4, 1842. The Senate proceeded to consider, as in Committee of the whole, the apportionment bill.

The same amendment as above, being under consideration, which was debated, without action till adjournment.

HOUSE, Saturday, June 4, 1842. The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and resumed the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the support of the army and of the military academy for the year 1842. Reduction of the military establishment of the United States being urged by many on account of the empty Treasury.

SENATE, Monday, June 6, 1842. The Senate proceeded to consider, as in committee of the whole, the Apportionment bill, the question pending being on the above amendment of Mr Wright, which was again debated till adjournment. The debates, we believe, would not interest many readers.

HOUSE, Monday, June 6, 1842. Mr Fillmore obtained the floor, and observed that, as the army bill had to be taken from the Committee at 1 o'clock, and as so short a time would elapse before that hour, he hoped the House would immediately resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr Levy, who held the floor from Saturday, resumed his remarks.

He referred to an item in the present bill for arrangements due for the Florida war; and the proviso he had offered was, that no part of the appropriation should be applied to the support of the militia, or to forces not authorized by existing laws.

In spite of the fact that the Government had been so lenient—a fact which could be proved beyond the possibility of a doubt—the sympathies of gentlemen had been excited and led astray by the supposition that we were making an attempt to drive those savages from their native homes—the land of their forefathers. This was not the fact. They were called Florida Indians, only because they were there at the time. But they were intruders and trespassers upon the Territory. Its aborigines were Yemassee; and they were driven out long ago, by South Carolinians and Georgians, who went there, aided by 1,000 Creek Indians. He read from Williams' History of Florida an account of the extermination of these aborigines long ago—about the year 1704—under Governor Maule. By whom were they succeeded? By runaways and refugees from the Upper Creek nation, who resided not in Florida, but between Georgia and the Mississippi. He read from an official report in 1822, by Captain Bell, describing the people who resided in Florida at the time of hiscession. When the country was ceded, General Jackson, with that wisdom and foresight for which he was so remarkable, recommended and pressed the removal of these Indians from Florida, and the enforcement of their retreat back to the Creeks. But his recommendations were disregarded; and ever since, the Government had been criminally moderate towards them.

The committee proceeded to vote on the pending and proposed amendments.

The committee proceeded to line 90, "For arsenals, \$120,000."

Mr Deberry moved to amend, by increasing the sum to \$150,000.

The amendment was lost.

The Committee then rose and reported the bills to the House; when the amendments to the navy pension-fund bill were concurred in, and it was read the third time, and passed.

SENATE, Tuesday, June 7, 1842. On motion of Mr Woodbury, the Senate proceeded to consider, as in committee of the whole, the Apportionment Bill.

Mr Walker considered the second section of the clause of the bill under discussion nothing but a direction of the Governors of the States, in which the general-ticket system prevails, to assemble their Legislatures in extra session, to repeal their own acts providing for the election of their Representatives in Congress.

But in some of those states the old apportionment gave them the same number of Representatives that this bill will give—whether under the ratio chosen by the House or that substituted by the Senate. Those States may not have any extra sessions of their Legislatures before the election of Representatives; and if they elect the members of Congress, it must be under the old law of their Legislatures; yet this bill says the law must be altered. Would not this present a new and irreconcilable difficulty? In his own State, the meeting of the Legislature is biennial, and the people are opposed to yearly sessions. At the last session they provided for the election of their Representatives by the general-ticket system. Before they can again convene, the election must take place; but this bill says that the Governor must convene the Legislature, to repeal the law. It was his conviction that the Governor would not convene the Legislature for the purpose. If he do not, will that law be repealed? Can an order from Congress to alter a law have the effect of altering it? Is the law altered by a mere order to alter it? No; it can only be altered by a law of Congress, actually districting the States. A mere mandate to alter a law, does not alter the law; and the law being

elect its Representatives under its existing law, and Congress cannot refuse to recognise them.

Mr Berrien stated that the people of Georgia had exercised the right of choosing their Representatives by the general-ticket system since the beginning of the Government. It was a system to which they gave the preference by unanimous assent; and, therefore, he felt it to be his duty to advocate their right to preserve that system as long as they conceive they can be best represented by it.

The question was called for on Mr Wright's amendment, as above, which resulted as follows—yeas 19, noes 29.

Mr Linn suggested the following as a substitute for an amendment of Mr Walker's; Provided, That the provisions of this law shall not affect the election of members to the 25th Congress.

Mr L. said this would cover the whole ground. He would say to the friends of this bill, that if this provision was adopted, it would strip it of all party complexion. They could not then be accused of getting up this bill for the purpose of accomplishing party motives. The Senate seemed to be so closely divided on the question of this second section, that it was hard to tell what would be the result for one side or another.

Mr Walker said he would accept the substitute.

Mr Linn had some observations to make, and would wish to proceed with them now, provided the vote on the bill could be taken this evening; but if it could not, he would rather defer his remarks till to-morrow.

HOUSE, Tuesday, June 7, 1842. The House took up the bill making appropriations for the support of the army and of the military academy for the year 1842; the question being on concurring with the amendments made yesterday in Committee of the Whole.

Mr McKay wished to offer an amendment, to which he begged the attention of the House. It was within the recollection of the members that, by the act of 1838, the pay several of the officers of the army was increased. By the law as it now stood, the pay of the officers of the staff, of the dragoons, of the ordnance, and of the engineer corps was greater than that of the artillery and infantry.

Mr McK. after a few more observations, concluded by saying that he was aware that the House was impatient, and he would therefore occupy their attention no longer; contenting himself with submitting for their consideration the amendment, that he proposed to offer with the accompanying table that he had just read. Mr McK. then read an amendment providing that officers of the staff, whose duties required of them to be mounted, should receive a proportionate allowance for forage.

Amongst other abuses of the West Point academy Mr Reynolds called the attention of the House to the fact that forty cadets graduated every year, not half of whom entered, or were required for the army. Was it right, then, to educate eighteen or twenty gentlemen at the public expense, when they were not required for the public service?

Mr Reynolds said that he did not intend to vote for the bill if the West Point academy was retained in it. And in reference to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, he said he believed the academy was perverted from its original intention, when it educated bishops instead of soldiers. As well might this Government establish a church, or create a religion. He objected to the West Point academy, also, that it was a monopoly, and confined to the sons of gentlemen, without reference to talent.

The amendment, providing that hereafter no additional rations shall be allowed to the commanding officers of separate posts, was concurred in—yeas 105, noes 89.

All the amendments were then concurred in, except the amendment to the 21st item, which provided that no ordnance storekeeper shall receive for his services a greater compensation than is allowed by the act of 5th April, 1832, which was not concurred in.

The question was then taken on the passage of the bill, and resulted—yeas 163, noes 22.

Letter from the Hon. William R. King to the Salisbury Convention.

WASHINGTON CITY, May 10th, 1842. GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your polite invitation, to meet my Democratic friends at Salisbury, on the 20th of this month, to consult together on the measures proper to be adopted, to sustain the principles of the Constitution—to protect popular rights—and I regret most sincerely, that my legislative duties will deprive me of the pleasure of uniting with them on so important and interesting an occasion. The system of measures which have characterized the Whig party since it came into power, as well calculated to alarm the friends of State Rights, calls loudly upon every advocate of a strict construction of the Constitution, and an economical administration of the Government, to exert themselves to arrest a course of policy, which, if persevered in, cannot fail to be destructive of the sovereignty of the States, and greatly burthensome to the people.

As a North Carolinian by birth and education, I trust I shall be pardoned for saying, that I have felt deep mortification, at seeing my native State array herself on the side of those who would fasten on the country a heavy funded debt—a National Bank—a distribution of the proceeds of the sales of Public Lands—and a consequent high Tariff of duties. I trust in God your efforts may prove successful—and that the virtuous old State of my birth, convinced of the evils which Whig rule is likely to bring upon the country, will be found in future, with her sister States of the South, marching under the Republican Banner. For the flattering terms in which you gentlemen have been pleased to make known the wishes of those you represent, accept my heart-felt thanks.

With the highest respect, I am your obedient servant, WILLIAM R. KING. J. L. Henderson, and others.

They have a man in Philadelphia astonishing the natives by his immense strength. A day or two ago he raised an anchor, weighing about 1,100 pounds, several inches clear of the ground. Afterwards he raised 12 fifty-

THE CROPS.—Planted on the Cape Fear inform us that the Rice in their fields is at this time remarkably forward and thrifty in appearance—promising a great harvest. The Corn in the regions hereabouts also looks well.—Wil. Chronicle.

CROPS.—We feel gratified that the present prospect of the Crops in this part of the State, is so promising. So far our observation and enquiries have enabled us to ascertain, the wheat crop will turn out more than an average. Corn is also promising. The Oats crop is not so fair as it was last year. Cotton is rather behind hand, owing to the cold nights and morning which set in about the time it was coming out.—Salisbury Watchman.

It is said that the crop in Kentucky, of Tobacco, hemp, corn and grain, were never more promising than at this time.

Loss of the C. L. brig Ashley. The C. L. brig "Ashley" Capt. Sherwood, which sailed hence on Monday morning last, with a cargo of Cotton and Rice, for N. York, was struck by a heavy sea about sixty miles off shore and sprung a leak, which could not be stopped—bore away for the land about midnight on Wednesday and was beached about a mile north of Dover Inlet, nine miles across the country from Wilmington. On Thursday, about 3 o'clock, P. M., passengers and crew saved; vessel and cargo will be lost, as there was a heavy sea and strong N. E. wind setting on shore. The ladies were safely landed on the beach, (which is separated from the beach by a narrow sound.) At 6 o'clock, Thursday morning, eight of the passengers coming on shore in the second boat, were swamped in the surf, but reached the beach in safety.

There were 12 cabin and 9 steerage passengers. The following is a list: E. H. Williams and lady, Mr Harris and lady, Miss Bigelow, Miss Tryon, Miss Richards, Miss Wells, Messrs. North, Sanders, Gardner, and Root.

No language can express the courage, fortitude and kindness of Capt. Sherwood—his untiring efforts to save the vessel. He stood at the helm, hour after hour, encouraging and cheering his men and the passengers to hold on at the pumps. When they seemed to lag, he would say "Ladies go forward and encourage the men; tell them that in twenty minutes or half an hour help may come."—Charleston Mercury.

A DREADFUL STORY.—The Mount Holly Herald of Thursday state, that a man and his wife lately living in Chester Township, Pennsylvania, were last week detected of having thrown three of their children into the fire, and there let them remain till they were burnt to ashes. This was done directly after each child was born for the third successive year.

BOUNDARY COMMISSIONERS.—On Saturday, the Governor of Massachusetts, by and with the advice and consent of the Council, appointed the Hon. Charles Allen, of Worcester; Hon. John Mills, of Hampden; and Hon. Abbott Lawrence, of Boston, Commissioners on the part of this State, to proceed to Washington, and unite in the N. E. Boundary negotiations.

MR DICKENS IN CANADA.—A most delightful entertainment was furnished to the fashionable community of Montreal on Wednesday evening by a party of ladies and gentlemen, who, for that evening, took possession of the theatre, and inviting a large circle of their friends, turned actors and actresses. Private theatres were probably never got up under better auspices, for when we state that Mr Charles Dickens was stage manager, and that both he and Mrs Dickens sustained the leading parts in the pieces selected, we think that we have said quite enough to excite the curiosity of the public. The house was crowded with a delightful audience, and from the moment the curtain drew up to the moment it dropped finally, nothing like fatigue was felt. The pieces selected were a Roland for an Oliver, Keely and Charles Matthews' famous scene of Part Two of a Post. In all these characters were sustained by lady and gentleman amateurs, and one and all acquitted themselves admirably.

Refreshments were liberally provided during the evening, and nothing was left undone by the Committee which could contribute to the comfort and amusement of the visitors.—Montreal Courier.

HONOR TO OHIO!—THE PENITENTIARY CLAIMING ITS OWN.—Mr Farrington, late president of the Gallipolis Bank, has been twice convicted of fraud, and has been sentenced to the penitentiary for ten years. Honor to the State of Ohio! She is the only State, we believe, in which the "colbeck of law" has been found strong enough to hold one of the bank big-bugs. In Pennsylvania, the king-bugs of the big-bank break the fillet threads as readily as the lion walks through a bird-net.—Globe.

RESUMPTION IN TENNESSEE.—Resumption by the Banks in Tennessee, is, by law, to take place in twenty days after the Banks of Louisiana and Kentucky shall have resumed. The Banks of Louisiana, our readers are aware, have recently resumed; those of Kentucky will resume on the fifteenth of the present month; and, therefore, if the law of Tennessee is complied with, the banks must resume on the 4th of July next.—Hall Sun.

CONGRESS—THE ARMY BILL. In the House, there seems to be a disposition to retrench in those quarters where the Administration has shown a desire to be most prodigal. The navy appropriation was lopped considerably some days since. The army bill—if the votes taken in Committee of the Whole be a test—will be cut down still more. This is the consequence of the bad management and want of economy of those who promised so much, and as to make thirteen millions per annum, and who have already pushed the expenditures above thirty millions, and run up a debt of twenty-