

prided himself as being) that North Carolina had not been surrendered to the *Goths and Vandals*. He finished off with considerable contortion of body, violent gesticulation, and theatrical striding, which was appropriately received and elicited much admiration, as well as the expression of pity from many that he had mistaken his profession. Col. Manly was called for, but did not appear. Mr. Charles Manly regretted that he was "off his feet" and could not run—for he felt certain, if he were not "lame of a leg," he could run over "Locofocoism rough-shod." Mr. H. W. Guion being called for by a few voices, said "he had broken his ankle two or three years ago, and could not speak." He told, however, a very funny anecdote, which probably the whole convention had not heard before; and made some further remarks, the meaning of which your correspondent could not comprehend, but which he has no doubt very creditable to Mr. Guion. "General" Bryan excused himself, saying he had been very ill—had the mumps and had taken cold; but he would offer a few words—a single remark. He then went on for an hour or so, and at the end of his remarks the house rose very much delighted. Mr. Miller had been called two or three times, but failed to appear. At length he came forward and repeated (with the exception of his abuse of Gen. Saunders) the speech of his congressional canvass, the speech he delivered at Franklinton, and the speech he delivered in Orange. His "coquet argument" on the tariff was well-timed, as the convention were drowsy, and needed repose; not was his "indignant eloquence" less appropriate, as it required some noise to wake them up.

The pigmy orators of the convention have now made their display, and Mr. Badger is loudly called for. He was glad he had been called. He wished to give the convention some lessons on order, decency, and gentility. Your correspondent will not repeat his speech or attempt to do so. With him we have to do in a different way. Between him and those to whom we have alluded the difference is that of the mountain to the mole-hill, in mind as well as in heart. In mind, the difference is in his favor; but in heart it is most woefully against him. His speech was a combination of affected charity, love of peace, and appeals to Divinity on the one hand and malignant personal invective on the other. Malignant, for it was not the effect of excited feeling, but premeditated, designed, prepared. With what regard for modesty, for past history and present truth, does a profession of respect for the feelings of a political adversary, or for polite demeanor towards him, or choice language of him, come from the Hon. George E. Badger—the self-constructed lexicographer of decency to the late Federal Convention—the holograph of taste and refinement to that most polite and respectable body! It well becomes him to comment upon charity in deportment, dignity of speech, decorum in manner and grace in action, who can boast himself so noble an embodiment of each of those desirable attributes—whose conversation is always on subjects of importance and improvement—who would not descend to a vulgar joke at a death-bed, nor a depraved jest at a funeral—whose words are not low and vulgar, but who, always standing on the high ground of dignified and polite conversation, looks upon the low marshes of dirty anecdote with proper scorn and contempt. It well becomes him to hold up to the mirror of public observation what he may consider inelegant or ungainly, who is himself so large a recipient from nature of graceful accomplishments—whose refined taste displayed itself in a very important Naval Ordinance, where it was held enough to take all its officers by the beard—while he, in the courtly costume of his shirt-sleeves, received the Ambassadors of the foreign nations, and charmed them by the neatness of his attire and the dignity of his dress. A homily from such a source is a rare and rich prize from the lottery of these degenerate times.

But really, for Mr. Badger to preach a sermon on genteel behavior, very fully exemplified the fable of the aged crab, who was so excessively mortified at the crooked movements of his unpolished descendants. Does he forget his long, labored, well-digested, and conclusive argument to convict Mr. Clay of "foul and dishonest bargain, corruption and bribery"? Does he forget his unscrupulous attack upon Mr. Van Buren and his party, when personal friendship nor private intimacy were sufficient to evade the scorpion-tail of his denunciations? Does he forget his vindictive assaults upon Mr. Tyler, whom he has stereotyped by every appellation but that of gentleman? Does he forget his late attacks upon Mr. Webster, whom he denounced in coarse and vulgar language, with unseemly epithets, as profligate, dishonest, unprincipled and base? Does he forget his application to Mr. Polk of the term "Fide Dog," in the county of Northampton, in the late canvass? Did he not, even in his lecture on good manners, call Mr. Tyler a traitor, and President Polk the descendant of a Tory? How singular and delicate the modesty which, in the face of recollections so fresh and so true, can exalt itself to be minister of politeness and decency at the altar of charity and peace! Mr. Badger's memory fits him like an easy glove, and can be slipped off to suit his convenience. His "Addisonian English" stands him in good stead, who thinks Milton a humbug and Homer a fool.

Upon the question of Oregon Mr. Badger was a masterly specimen of felicitous thought and flowing declamation—"amounting to a confession of his total ignorance of the whole subject—an affectation which he thought smart. Upon the "horrors of war" he was so truly grand that it would have done Mrs. General Gaines no good to have been there—as women cannot look without envy upon successful rivalry. It will occur to any candid man that the false construction of the Texas Address which called forth Mr. Henry, was a departure from fairness and honesty which a correct and upright mind would have been utterly incapable of. But enough of Mr. Badger. He is known to the people of N. Carolina too well to require any thing further at my hands.

It is a pity the editor of the Register could not tell the truth even about the course of pro-

ceedings in the late Federal Convention. Is it that he is ashamed of Mr. McKesson, that he takes from him the credit of "closing the discussion"—or does he especially desire Mr. Waddell's favor, that he bestows upon him this post of honor? The truth of the matter is, Mr. Waddell did not close the discussion. He did make "one of his own speeches"—and a perfectly harmless one too, as it was altogether of himself and his ancestry. Mr. McKesson closed the discussion, in a speech full of slaughter's pencil and death-dealing blows. What a nice young man is that same! If he lives and is properly attended to, he will make a second modern "Addison." It was universally remarked how much he resembled Mr. Badger in appearance, in action, and in language—especially those "gems of polished wit." Go on young sprig of the West! Thou art as spirited as thine own mountain cascade! Dash on! the Presidency of this great Republic is no more too lofty for thy aspirations than it is too great for thy deserts.

We forgot to mention that Col. Long of Halifax, after having been much called for, went forward and said huzzah! huzzah! huzzah! for Graham! which was received with tremendous applause. So ended this "glorious whig convention."

A new humbug has been started. This Convention adopted the cue of being respectful to the democrats—affected great regard for their feelings—and felt conscious of having wounded one. Let us see. Its organ constantly calls us locofocos, which Mr. Stanley says is the lowest meanness, and a false appellation on the part of the Register. Dr. Hill, their President, denounced us as "rogues and swindlers." Mr. Stanley and Mr. Miller charged us with being in power through "miserable, dishonest frauds."—and Mr. Badger pronounced our President "the descendant of a Tory;" and all this they say is whig politeness and good breeding, and in striking contrast with democratic want of manners. Let the people judge between us. Look at their speeches and their press. When did they ever argue a public question honestly and fairly, when personal invectives could be used? Private misfortune screens not their opponent from their attacks—the grave protects not against their Hyena-like assaults. They scratch up the dust and ashes of the dead, and spread the slime of their calumny upon the naked skeleton! Nay, in this very Convention, while preaching charity, Mr. Badger could not forbear (when his hungry nature cried for its usual suck of slander) to denounce most bitterly the dead grand-father of the President as a "miserable Tory." Yet such men set up pretensions to superior charity and decency. This humbug will not take. The people have not forgotten 1840, with its debauchery, its vice, and its slanders. They are rousing themselves against this party, and this whig leaders see, and it alarms them. They would take a new turn—but the blood-hounds of Truth and Retribution are swift upon their track. Their downfall is inevitable; and when this party sleeps in death, may North Carolina hope to rise and shine, for her light will then be come.

## A LOOKER ON.

FROM THE WASHINGTON WHIG.  
DISTRESSING SHIPWRECK.

On the night of the 6th inst., the schooner Comet, bound from Turks Island to Plymouth N. C., was totally wrecked near Ocracoke Bar, and the crew and two passengers perished. The wife of the Captain, Thos. S. Chase, on hearing of the event, drowned herself and two children, at Plymouth, N. C.

An uncommonly foolish murder was committed at Lexington, Ky., on Saturday evening week, upon the person of a young man named Orrin, by another youth named Fayette Shelby. It is said that Shelby, who had been dissipating, was sitting at the supper table, at the hotel, opposite Orrin. Shelby got up from the table first and went out to the bar-room, where he remarked that there was a looking scoundrel at the table, who had been drinking too hard at him. Soon after Orrin came out, when Shelby told him he had insulted him. Orrin replied, "how could I insult you? I never spoke to you, and do not even know you." Shelby said, "you looked hard at me, my name is Shelby, and I do not allow persons to look at me in that way." To this Orrin replied, "I do not care if your name is Shelby, I shall look at you if I choose." At these words Shelby struck him in the face with his fist, and immediately as Orrin turned with the force of the blow, drew a pistol from his pocket, and applying the muzzle to Orrin's head, shot him dead upon the spot. Shelby was arrested, but failed. If such a murder is bailable in Kentucky, we would not give the snap of a finger for all the protection her laws are to her citizens.—N. Y. True Sun.

**MOST MELANCHOLY ACCIDENT.**—We understand that a little son, some 10 or 12 years of age, of the late Michael Hoke, Esq., of Lincolnton, was shot on Saturday evening last and died instantly. Himself and another boy, about the same age were pointing their guns at each other, in sport, when accidentally the gun of the young Fulewider, which is the name of the other boy was discharged. This accident is more truly deplorable, owing to the fact Mrs. Hoke has been in a very critical state of health since the death of her husband.—Rutherfordton Republican.

**AFRAY AT TALBOTTON.**—We learn by an extract of a letter received in this city from Talbotton, Geo., that an affray occurred in that place on Thursday last between two young men of the names of Chambers and Celly, in the course of which Celly cut Chambers nearly in two with a bowie-knife. Chambers lived about a minute. Celly was immediately arrested and imprisoned. A strong guard was placed around the jail in consequence of an apprehension that an attempt would be made by Celly's friends to rescue him. Celly was confined last summer for 90 days, in consequence of having made an attempt on the life of his uncle with a bowie-knife.—Charleston News.

SPEECH OF MR. DOBBIN,  
OF NORTH CAROLINA,

In the House of Representatives, January 15, 1846.—On the resolution authorizing the President to give the notice for the termination of the joint occupancy of the Oregon territory.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. Dobbin addressed the committee as follows:

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not arise with the design of inflicting an hour's speech upon the committee; and while I have not the vanity to indulge the hope of entertaining the committee with the charms of splendid declamation, or of illustrating this vexed question more elegantly or more clearly than other gentlemen; yet, sir, such is its magnitude, such the solemn responsibility its decision imposes on every representative—such the deep and intense interest with which our countrymen are all watching our deliberations here—that I feel excused and justified in proclaiming with undisguised frankness and candor, and as succinctly as possible, at least a portion of the numerous reasons which animate me in the course I feel constrained to pursue. Sir, I believe the present is an interesting crisis in our national history, when legislation should be the offspring of calm, dispassionate, unexcited, patriotic, and statesmanlike deliberation; when the illiberal and contracted suggestions of sectional prejudice should be sternly discarded; when party animosity should be sacrificed and forgotten, and this grave American question, involving American honor and American rights, be settled by the suggestions only of American patriotism. Mr. Chairman, had a stranger entered this hall, and listened to the thrilling and beautiful dissertations on the loveliness of peace—he might have surely have been impressed with the opinion that we are really discussing the question of declaring war against England! For myself, I avow my determination to vote for the resolution of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to give notice to Great Britain to terminate the joint occupancy of Oregon, in pursuance of the treaty of 1828. I repudiate the charge that this is a war measure. I fling back the war cry. If there be a war party and a peace party, I belong to the peace party. But, sir, this alarm-shout of war, war, war, shall not deter me from voicing to give this notice, when I entertain the sincere conviction that national honor demands it—good policy demands it—fidelity to treaty stipulation demands it—justice to our adventurous pioneers in Oregon demands it; and in my humble opinion the public peace will be more surely promoted by it. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen who have ingeniously sought to make this a war measure, may express surprise at the declaration. But here in my place, before this House and the country, I declare my solemn belief that gentlemen who oppose this measure are openly advocating and proposing a course of policy far, far more calculated to plunge our happy country into an early war with England—more evasive and violative of the spirit of our treaty stipulations—more sure to multiply difficulties in the adjustment of this already too long protracted controversy, and more inconsistent with the candid and honorable bearing of this great and proud republic.

What, sir, is the relative position of parties on this question? All, all believe our country's title to Oregon, if not perfect, is at least the best. All concur in the opinion that the emigration of our citizens and of British subjects to that territory, and the difficulties and confusion necessarily produced by conflicting jurisdiction and laws, loudly call for a termination of the present convention between the two countries. All now reject the formerly avowed policy of "masterly inactivity," and propose action. But, sir, I invoke the attention of the House to the character of the policy of gentlemen who discourse so vehemently against this notice as a war measure. The distinguished gentlemen from Virginia, [Mr. Hunter], whose eloquence and patriotism all admit, proposes, not "inactivity," but the passing of "such measures as may encourage our settlements in the disputed territory without contravening any treaty stipulations. He thinks that thousands of dollars may be judiciously expended for colonizing the territory; and that if our settlements are once firmly planted south of the Columbia, the crack of our American rifles, and the sound of the axe of our western pioneer, will in due time be heard, not only north of that river, but north of the 49th parallel! Another gentleman, opposed to the notice, ventures the hope that soon a hundred thousand American emigrants could be encouraged to settle there, and among them twenty thousand good riflemen! Other gentlemen who concur in this mis-called pacific policy, concur also in the opinion that this is the wisest policy to secure the territory, not only to the 49th degree, but "the whole of Oregon"—some, even, in their ardor, stoutly scouting the idea of ever allowing to Great Britain a pound of its earth, a rock, a tree, or shrub! And this, Mr. Chairman, is gravely urged by gentlemen as the peaceful mode of securing the "whole of Oregon." For what are emigrants to be encouraged to go to Oregon? To seize possession of it? What are the implements they bear with them? The axe, and the rifle too. What is to be heard after they reach there? The sound of the axe, but the crack of the rifle, also. What part are they to occupy? First, they are to settle south of the Columbia, but in due time they are to press on north of the Columbia and north of the 49th parallel! I ask, what means this rush of emigrants, bearing not the olive-branch of peace, but the instruments of war? Does this plan, even at the starting point, wear the aspect of peace? I denounce the scheme while I respect its originators. It doubtless was suggested by a desire for peace; but it is deceptive, and must lead to war. Reject this resolution, and refuse to give the notice in accordance with the treaty, and adopt the other policy, and what will the British government say? What the Hudson Bay Company? What the other powers of the world say? Would not the British Minister here inform his government that, although the Congress had refused to give notice, not to be lulled into apathy; that the American Congress had discussed the

policy of giving the notice, but that some distinguished gentlemen, being alarmed lest it might produce war, had persuaded the adoption of another policy, called the peace policy, by which emigrants, under the guise of settling the country, were to go armed with rifles; that they were first to plant themselves south of the Columbia, but that, "in due season," the crack of the American rifle was to be heard even north of 49 degrees? And that, by this plan, "the whole of Oregon" was to be secured!

Think you, sir, that the British cabinet, ever sensitive to British interests, would hear all this and be idle? Would they not promptly and energetically adopt a counteracting policy, started at the development of this new scheme of ours? Would they not encourage British emigrants, and send British soldiers, too, to settle in Oregon, to save it from falling into the hands of Americans? Would they not feel aroused, even to excitement, on learning that, instead of giving notice, we had resolved on resorting to a scheme professing peace, but ultimately designed for the exclusive seizure of "the whole of Oregon?"

And, Mr. Chairman, when the American emigrants and the British emigrants reached there, what would follow? The cross of St. George, and the stars and stripes, would be seen floating in dangerous proximity. Under one would be seen rallying the Hudson Bay Company, with their savage allies and British soldiers; under the other, the hardy and adventurous Americans, attached to their soil, and bent on its exclusive possession. How long, sir, could such jealous adversaries eye each other as contending rivals for sovereignty in Oregon, and remain unexcited and peaceful? Is it not to be expected, sir, under such circumstances, that soon there would be collisions, skirmishes, and violent outbreaks? Would not the report of the first gun be the signal for general conflict? Would not the bold and daring countrymen in the West, who would rush to the defence and aid of their sons and brothers in Oregon? Would not the news fly to England? And then, sir, would not all the horrors of war be the early fruit of this peaceful mode of saving Oregon?

Much has been said in this debate about the importance of having the sympathies of other powers in the event of war. Would England, in such a war, have the advantage in that particular? Would she not say to the other powers, when asked what produced the war, that Americans refused to give the notice according to treaty, but avowed a determination to seize it by other means, and that she was bound to defend or be recreant? I appeal, sir, to gentlemen to look calmly at these natural consequences of their policy, and tell me if its peaceful character can commend itself to their judgment. Sir, it would begin in an undignified scramble for land, and end in war.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I cannot avoid the conviction, that if we have resolved on terminating this controversy, and exercising sovereignty over Oregon, or of taking possession of it, we are honorably bound by the treaty of 1828 to give twelve months' notice to Great Britain, or hazard our national fidelity to treaty stipulation. It is well known that British statesmen, and eminent statesmen in our own country, deny that it was a treaty for joint occupation, but a commercial convention for the purposes of trade and commerce. If that be the true construction, I ask, can we, with that treaty staring us in the face, decline the giving the notice, and pass measures to colonize Oregon for the avowed purpose of ultimately thereby seizing the "whole of Oregon," even to 54 deg. 40 min.?

The committee will mark the manifest distinction between protecting our adventurous pioneers in Oregon, by throwing the shield of our laws around them, and encouraging them to settle there for the avowed policy of seizing the country, to the ultimate exclusion of the English.

Mr. Chairman, statesmen should ever hesitate and ponder well when national honor and national faith is at stake. And sir, with great deference to the eminent gentlemen who differ with me on this question, I appeal to gentlemen's sense of honor and frank and manly dealing, if the policy of emigration and colonization, for the purpose of taking the territory virtually before giving the notice, comports well with the magnanimous, bold, and manly bearing of a proud and high-minded nation. Will not the nations of the world taunt us with it, as an unmanly piece of management, partaking more of the character of an artificial game than of candid, independent, undisguised action? And, sir, will they not have too much cause to do it? I beseech gentlemen to pause, to pause long, before our nation is made to act a part even bordering on dishonesty.

But, Mr. Chairman, when gentlemen seem convinced of the importance of terminating this dispute with England, and that difficulties are annually accumulating, their imaginations are haunted by the terrific war scenes so ingeniously depicted here, that while they talk with burning patriotism about "the whole of Oregon," they urge the policy of colonization, and say if war must come, time, time, time is to achieve our triumph. Sir, this cry of time—wait—negotiation—has been raised and sounded here for twenty-eight years! Difficulties are constantly multiplying, and still the same cry is made. Gentlemen argue as if giving this notice is declaring war. All admit it is of itself not cause of war; and Mr. Chairman, instead of producing war, and shutting the door of negotiation, I advocate it because I firmly believe it tends to promote and hasten negotiation and to preserve peace. Sir, have we not struggled—yes, struggled—for more than a quarter of a century to negotiate with England without giving this notice? And after the lapse of that time, can it be called rashness, war, madness to give the notice? May we not—confidently relying on the strength of our title and the righteousness of our cause—indulge the hope that, when the notice is given, England will reflect, will appreciate our earnestness, will be aroused by the pressing importance of prompt action to act the part in negotiation of her own proposals, which her own sense of justice will dictate and the public sentiment of the world will admonish her she ought to do? Sir, I applaud the President for his effort to settle

this question in that spirit of liberal concession, so creditable to his heart; but I equally applaud the promptness with which he took an independent and firm position, when the British minister so hastily rejected that liberal offer. With a title which no candid man can hesitate to pronounce better than hers, he still, in the spirit of concession, approached her. She discarded our offer. We have done our part for compromise; if she desires it, let her now act. Sir, let us do our duty, and give the notice. Has not negotiation, without the notice, baffled the efforts of our wisest statesmen? Did not Mr. Clay, with his lofty genius, the admiration of so many of his countrymen, try and fail? Did he not suggest the most liberal offer, while he said that England had no "color of title to any portion of the country?" Did not Mr. Monroe, Rush, and the able Gallatin, also attempt it, and fail? Has not Mr. Calhoun, whose giant intellect can grasp any subject, and who has evinced so much desire to adjust it, attempted and failed? And have we not all perused with pride the masterly correspondence of our present eminent Secretary of State, who has also failed in his efforts at negotiation? When Lord Ashburton came from England as a special minister to adjust our controversies, do not gentlemen remember well that the cry then was to "hush up discussion"—the notice will be considered a threat, and check negotiation? And do not gentlemen know that his lordship returned home content with the laurels and land he acquired in the Northeast? Leaving it to some fortunate successor to acquire laurels and land in the northwest? Was not the same suggestion made when it was announced that Mr. Pakenham was coming? And gentlemen know the result of the effort to negotiate with him. And yet, Mr. Chairman, after all these liberal concessions, these anxious efforts at negotiation without notice, by our most eminent and learned diplomatists, struggling in a spirit of compromise, for a quarter of a century, we are told to wait a while longer, to pause still, and thereby literally allow Britain, by time, to strengthen her pretensions to title, and increase the difficulties in the way of adjustment. Sir, I think our path of duty is clear and plain. Fidelity to our treaty demands that we first give the notice, for we are bound to protect and defend our people, who are daily flocking to that territory, under the belief that it is ours, and that this notice will be given.

Gentlemen say that perhaps war may follow. I trust not, and trust that England will do her duty. But, sir, must we be alarmed, frightened from the discharge of what honor and justice to our people commands us to do, because England may in her folly, without cause, involve us in war? Peace has its charms, and war its horrors. The mind delights to contemplate the holy and benign influence which an honorable peace exerts on nations, science, morals, and religion. The man that would recklessly check it in its progress, promoting happiness and prosperity in our beloved country, has neither the heart of a patriot nor Christian. All—all shrink with abhorrence from contemplating the carnage, and bloodshed, and wretchedness that mark the desolating track of war. But let us "be just and fear not," as has often been said. Think you, sir, if the great and gallant Washington and Lafayette could revisit us, they would not blush at our degeneracy in shrinking from duty at this cry of war? Would they not remind us of our early history, and tell us that the race is not always to the swift, or the battle to the strong? But that a just God controls the destiny of nations and of men? Sir, while I listened with pleasure at the charming eloquence of an honorable gentleman this morning, who vindicated so ably our title to Oregon, I was struck with no little surprise at a part of his argument for delay—for time, and against the notice—quite evincive of the scarcity of more solid reasons. It was that John Bull was getting older every day, and that therefore time would do much for us! An adversary does us much wrong, and keeps from us our own—we must bear it in patience—and, if upon observation we discover a few gray hairs on his head, we are to leave him for the present to persist in his wrongs, calmly consoling ourselves that as our adversary is already a little gray, he will become older and weaker in the decline of years, and then the fight shall be made! And shall an American Congress seriously act upon this principle, in reference to our valuable territory in the northwest, in which we have already suffered so much delay? Surely, surely not, sir. Suppose our ancestors—the glorious sons of '76—when three millions only, writhing under a sense of unjust oppression, and indignant at the unwholy attempts to crush them with still more intolerable burdens, had concluded that "Although Great Britain is rudely pressing us down with the yoke of tyranny, we will wait until she gets older!" Instead of this proud, independent republic, America, in all probability, would now be in a state of colonial vassalage. But, sir, such timid counsels prevailed not in the days of Washington, Adams, and Franklin. No, sir, no; the moment they felt that the principles of true liberty were violated, and their remonstrances despised, they flew to arms, and spilled their blood on many a battle-field. Suppose, sir, in our last, our second war of independence, our patriot and gallant statesmen, in the glorious Congress of that day, had listened to such timid counsels of waiting for John Bull to get older, and had been seduced and frightened by the panic cry of the horrors of war! Who, sir, can now conceive of its influence upon the reputation and destiny of our happy country? Our hardy tars, perhaps, would still be impressed, our flag insulted, and our merchant vessels plundered on every sea. But, instead of this, the American feels a thrill of patriotic delight, as his mind reverts to the noble triumphs of that war, and the laurels won on land and on sea, by promptly daring to maintain our rights.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen have said much of our want of preparation for war. I do not expect war; but if it is inevitable, our best fortifications will be found in the noble hearts of our patriotic countrymen—our best preparation to let the people understand their rights. A large standing army and navy have heretofore been regarded as contrary to the genius of republics. Such are a few of the reasons

that guide me on this question. I yield to other gentlemen who are eager to participate in this debate, and will add but little more.

I believe, in the present state of the controversy, our national honor will be impaired if we now falter or hesitate to give this notice. Firmness and undaunted courage only can win from England respect, and exact from her justice. An unnecessary war-cry has been thrust into this debate. I do not anticipate it; but if it come, let us begin it in honor, and it will end in triumph. England will be the aggressor. And if, sir, for the want of preparation, clouds and darkness obscure our horizon awhile, I believe the same protecting power that bore us successfully through the dark and perilous days of the revolution will sustain us again. And if history informs us that, in the war of 1812, defeat and disaster cast a gloom over our country for a season, history also informs us that soon, with a host of other gallant spirits, we had a Brown, and a Scott, and a Jackson to make it terminate in a blaze of glory on land, and our Hulls, and Perrys, and Lawrences, to break the spell of British invincibility on sea.

Mr. Chairman, I will detain the committee no longer. It is my misfortune to differ on this occasion with many with whom it is my pleasure generally to concur. While I regret it much, I feel animated with a consciousness of the rectitude of my motives. The peculiar crisis, sir, demands firmness as well as prudence, and true patriotism admonishes the statesman, in the glowing language of another

"Be just and fear not; let all the ends thou aim'st at be thy country's glory, God's, and truth's; then, if thou fail'st, Thou fail'st a blessed martyr."

We have nothing new from Mexico. We shall probably hear something of the Revolution by our next issue.

A capital article, from the Standard, taking off the late whig Convention at Raleigh, will be found commencing on the first page.

The friends of our worthy Sheriff, Alexander Johnson, will regret to learn that he has been severely injured by the falling of a male upon which he was riding. He is recovering.

**PRICES IN NEW ORLEANS, Jan. 16.**—Cotton 63 to 67 cts per lb. A crop of sugar sold on the plantation at 5 cents—the molasses with it at 18 cts. Corn 54 cts. Flour \$3 25. The above are wholesale prices.

**CONSUMPTION.**—There is, perhaps, no disease with which our country is afflicted, that sweeps off annually so many victims, as that foul destroyer of the human race—Consumption. Day after day, year after year, the insatiable monster hurries to the portals of the cold and silent tomb fresh-added victims to its conquest. No walk of life is sacred from its blighting influence. No age is exempt from its death-dealing shafts. The old, the middle-aged and the young, all alike are laid for this common enemy of mankind. The white-haired patriarch, whose life of temperance has rendered his system impervious to the attacks of other ills, and whose good deeds prepared him for the enjoyment of life's evening, finds consumption fastening its fingers upon his vital, and tearing him from a world, ever bright to minds which look complacently on days we live upon.

Is there no help for the afflicted? No preventive of the disease which beset us in our changeful and fragile frame? We think there is yet. And if the allegations of those who are at the point of death, may be believed, there is a preventive and a remedy.

Wister's Balsam of Wild Cherry is offered to a suffering world as such. It needs not the "advantages" and "a long string of fictitious certificates" to give it notoriety. Its true value and intrinsic excellence are sufficient to captivate to the confidence of the public, and "Wait on to fame" the name of its inventor, is a benefactor of his species. For sale by S. J. Hinesdale, F. J. Atterley, N. C. and Dr. A. Malloy, chemist.

## JUST RECEIVED,

Six sets Blacksmith's Tools,  
Loz Chains, Fifth Chaining, and Trace chains.  
ON HAND, a good stock of Brandy,  
Whiskey, Rum, and Groceries generally.  
JOHN M. ROSE.  
Jan'y 31, 1846. 363 21.

MAGNIFICENT  
SCHEMES,

J. G. Gregory & Co. Managers.

\$40,000!

ALEXANDRIA LOTTERY,

Class 7, for 1846.

To be drawn at Alexandria, D. C., on Saturday Feb. 4, 1846.

**BRILLIANT SCHEME!**

1 Prize of	\$40,000
1 do	10,000
1 do	5,000
1 do	3,000
1 do	2,357
1 do	2,000
2 Prizes of	1,500
3 do	1,300
5 do	1,250
100 do	500
100 do	400

&c. &c. &c.

75 Number Lottery—12 Drawn Ballots.

Tickets \$10—Halves \$5—Quarters \$2 50.

Certificates of Packages of 25 whole tickets \$130

Do do 25 half do 65

Do do 25 quarter do 32 50

\$50,000!

ON SATURDAY, Feb. 23, 1846.

ALEXANDRIA LOTTERY,

Class 9, for 1846.

Will be drawn at Alexandria, D. C.

**MAGNIFICENT SCHEME!**

1 Grand Prize of	\$50,000
1 Splendid do	20,000
1 do do	10,000
1 Prize of	5,000
1 do	3,000
1 do	2,853
50 Prizes of	1,000
100 do	500
130 do	300

&c. &c. &c.

78 Number Lottery—13 drawn ballots.

Tickets only \$12—Halves \$6—Quarters \$3—Eighths \$1 50.

Certificates of packages of 26 whole tickets \$160

Do do 26 halves do 80

Do do 26 quarters do 40

Do do 26 eighths do 20

Orders for Tickets and Shares and Certificates of Packages in the above Splendid Lotteries will receive the most prompt attention, and an official account of each drawing sent immediately after it is over to all who order from us—Address, J. G. Gregory & Co., Managers, Washington City, D. C.