

procured in the market by the agents of the government here, with money drawn out of the treasury. Here is one conversion of the money received from the tax gatherer into the Treasury. The bills are transmitted to the bankers, honored, paid, and the amount credited by them to the United States.

Are the bankers bound to retain the proceeds of the bills in identity? Are they bound to do more than credit the government for an equal amount, for which they stand responsible whenever it is wanted? If they should happen to use any portion of those proceeds of bills transmitted to them in their banking operations, would it be drawing money from the treasury contrary to the provisions of the constitution? The Senator from S. Carolina contends that there is no constitutional power to contract with the twenty-five selected banks, as proposed in the substitute; yet the deposit act of 1836, which obtained the hearty approbation of that Senator, contained a similar provision; and the very bill under consideration, so warmly supported by him, provides, under certain contingencies, for contracts to be made with state banks, to receive deposits of the public money upon compensation. He objects to the substitute, that it converts twenty-five state banks into a system of federal institutions; but the employment of state institutions by the federal authority no more makes them federal, than the employment of federal institutions by the states converts them into state institutions. This mutual aid, and this reciprocal employment of the several institutions of the general and particular governments, is one of the results and beauties of our admirable, though complex system of government. The general government has the use of the courts, court houses, prisons and penitentiaries, in the several states. Do they, therefore, cease to appertain to the states? It is to be borne in mind, that although the state banks may occasionally be used by the federal authority, their legal responsibility to the several states remains unimpaired. They continue to be accountable to them, and their existence can only be terminated or prolonged by the state authority; and being governed, as they are, by corporate authority emanating from and amenable to state jurisdiction, and not under the control of the executive of the United States, constitutes a more a greater security for the public money, and more safety to the public liberty. It has been argued that a separation of the government from the banks, will diminish the Executive power. It must be admitted that the custody of the public money in various banks, subject to the control of state authority, furnishes some check upon the possible abuses of the executive government. But the argument maintains that the Executive has less power when it has most complete possession of the public treasury? The Senator from South Carolina contends that the separation in question being once effected, the relation of the federal government and the state banks will be antagonistic. I believe so, Mr. President. That is the very thing I wish to prevent. I want them to live in peace, harmony and friendship. If they are antagonistic how is it possible that the state banks can maintain their existence against the tremendous influence of this government—especially if this government should be backed by such a vast treasury bank as I verily believe this bill is intended to create? And what becomes of the argument urged by the Senator from South Carolina, and the abolition resolutions offered by him at an early period of the session, asserting that the general government is bound to protect the domestic institutions of the several states?

The substitute is not, I think, what the welfare of the country requires. It may serve the purpose of a good half-way house. Its accommodations appear fair, and with the feelings of a wearied traveler, one may be tempted to stop awhile and refresh himself there. I shall vote for it as an amendment to the bill, because I believe it the least of two evils, if it should indeed inflict any evil; or rather, because I feel myself in the position of a patient to whom the physician presents in one hand a cup of arsenic, and in the other a cup of poison: I reject the first, because of the instant death with which it is charged; I take the latter, as being the most harmless, and depend upon the *vis medicatrix nature*. It would have been a great improvement in my opinion, if the mode of bringing about the resumption of specie payments contained in the substitute were reversed; provided that the notes of a certain number of safe, sound, and unquestionable banks to be selected, should be forthwith received by the general government, in payment of all public dues; and that if the selected banks did not resume, by a future designated day, their notes should cease to be taken. Several immediate effects would follow: 1st. The government would withdraw from the market as a competitor with the banks for specie, and they would be left undisturbed to strengthen themselves. And, 2dly, confidence would be restored by taking off the discredit and discountenance thrown upon all banks by the government. And why should these notes not be so received? They are as good as treasury notes, if not better. They answer all the purposes of the state governments and the people. They now would buy as much as specie could have commanded at the period of suspension. They could be disbursed by the govern-

ment. And, finally, the measure would be temporary.

But the true and only efficacious and permanent remedy, I solemnly believe, is to be found in a Bank of the United States, properly organized and constituted. We are told that such a bank is fraught with indescribable danger, and that the government must, in the sequel, get possession of the bank, or the bank of the government. I oppose to these imaginary terrors, the practical experience of forty years; I oppose to them the issue of the memorable contest, commenced by the late President of the United States, against the late Bank of the United States. The administration of that bank had been without serious fault. It had given no just offence to the government, towards which it had faithfully performed every financial duty. Under its able and enlightened president, it had fulfilled every anticipation which had been formed by those who created it. President Jackson pronounced the edict that it must fall, and it did fall, against the wishes of an immense majority of the people of the United States; against the convictions of its utility, entertained by a large majority of the states; and to the prejudice of the best interests of the whole country. If an innocent, unoffending, and highly beneficial institution, could be thus easily destroyed by the power of one man, where would be the difficulty of crushing it if it had given any real cause for just animadversion? Finally, I oppose to these imaginary terrors the example deducible from English history. There a bank has existed since the year of 1694, and neither has the bank got possession of the government, nor the government of the bank. They have existed in harmony together, both contributing to the prosperity of that great country; and they have so existed, and so contributed, because each has avoided cherishing towards the other that wanton and unnecessary spirit of hostility which was unfortunately engendered in the bosom of the late President of the United States.

I am admonished, sir, by my exhausted strength, and by, I fear, your more exhausted patience, to hasten to a close. Mr. President, a great, novel, and untried measure, is perseveringly urged upon the acceptance of Congress. That it is pregnant with tremendous consequences, for good or evil, is undeniable, and admitted by all. We firmly believe that it will be fatal to the best interests of this country, and ultimately subversive of its liberties. You, who have been greatly disappointed in other measures of equal promise, can only hope, in the doubtful and uncertain future, that its operation may prove salutary. Since it was first proposed at the extra session, the whole people have not had an opportunity of passing in judgment upon it at their elections. As far as they have, they have expressed their unqualified disapprobation. From Maine to the state of Mississippi, its condemnation has been loudly thundered forth. In every intervening election, the administration has been defeated, or its former majorities neutralized. Maine has spoken; New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, Rhode Island, Mississippi and Michigan; all these states, in tones and terms not to be misunderstood, have denounced the measure. The key-stone state (God bless her), has twice proclaimed her rejection of it; once at the polls, and once through her Legislature. Friends and foes of the administration have united in condemning it. And, at the very moment when I am addressing you, a large meeting of the late supporters of the administration, headed by the distinguished gentleman who presided in the electoral college which gave the vote of that patriotic state to President Van Buren, are assembling in Philadelphia to protest solemnly against the passage of this bill. Is it right that, under such circumstances, it should be forced upon a reluctant but free and intelligent people? Is it right that this Senate, constituted as it now is, should give its sanction to the measure? I say it in no disrespectful or taunting sense, but we are entitled, according to the latest expressions of the popular will, and in virtue of manifestations of opinion deliberately expressed by state legislatures, to a vote of thirty-five against the bill; and I am ready to enter, with any Senator friendly to the administration, into details to prove the assertion. Will the Senate, then, bring upon itself the odium of passing this bill? I implore it to forbear, forbear, forbear! I appeal to the instructed Senators. Is this government made for us, or for the people and the states whose agents we are? And are we not bound so to administer it, as to advance their welfare, promote their prosperity, and give general satisfaction? Will that sacred trust be fulfilled, if the known sentiments of large and respectable communities are despised and contemned by those whom they have sent here? I call upon the honorable Senator from Alabama [Mr. King,] with whom I have so long stood in the public councils shoulder to shoulder, bearing up the honor and glory of this great people, to come now to their rescue. I call upon all the Senators; let us bury deep and for ever the character of the partisan, rise up patriots and statesmen, break the vile chains of party, throw the fragments to the winds, and feel the proud satisfaction that we have made but a small sacrifice to the paramount obligations which we owe our common country.

**HILLSBOROUGH.**  
Monday, April 2.

A friend has directed our attention to the following note in a late number of the Raleigh Standard. It had not altogether escaped our observation, but other matters claimed our more immediate attention, and it was permitted to remain undisturbed on our desk. The note being very short, we will insert it here entire:

"COMMUNICATED."

"Mr. Editor—Please inform the Editor of the Hillsborough Recorder, that the friend of Mr. Van Buren, who toasted Mr. Calhoun, at the celebration in the county of Orange, on the eighth of January, is not sick of Mr. Van Buren's administration yet, but hopes he will hold his office for the term of 8 years. Neither was it his design to nominate Mr. Calhoun as a candidate for the Presidency; and the Editor must have known it, because Thomas H. Benton was toasted at the meeting as a candidate for that office. Neither are there two-thirds of that section of the country opposed to Mr. Van Buren's administration, as represented by the Editor of the Recorder. If he had said there was about one in ten who are so opposed, he would have come nearer the fact. I hope the Hillsborough Editor will correct this error, and make no more such mistakes."

"ONE OF THE PEOPLE."

Any person who will take the trouble to compare this note with the few brief remarks to which it alludes, will see that the writer, either through ignorance or a perversity of intellect, has totally misapprehended the whole matter. We had observed in different parts of the country many signs of the waning popularity of Mr. Van Buren, and in some quarters had seen what we thought to be indications of a desire to foist Mr. Calhoun upon the party as a candidate for the next presidency. It was for the purpose of showing the utter futility of any hope of effecting an arrangement of this kind that our remarks were made. We knew that some of the adherents of Mr. Van Buren were well nigh sick of the multiplied evils which his determined adherence to a wild system of "experiments" was heaping upon the country; but we could not for a moment suppose that the number of Mr. Calhoun's friends would be at all increased by the fall of Mr. Van Buren. In proof of this we quoted the toast given at Mount Willing on the 8th of January; and concluded with the expression of a belief that the sentiment contained in the toast was the sentiment of two thirds of the Van Buren party, at least in this section of the country. Now in all this we should like to know what mistake we have fallen into, or what error we have to correct. "One of the People" cannot have read our remarks, or he would not have permitted himself to occupy a position so perfectly ridiculous. He says that it was not his design to nominate Mr. Calhoun for the Presidency, and we must have known it! True; and did we not quote the toast to show that Mr. Calhoun's friends had nothing to hope here? Again he says—"Neither are two thirds of this section of the country opposed to Mr. Van Buren's administration, as represented by the Editor of the Recorder." We made no comparison of the kind; we simply said that the sentiment in the toast expressed the sentiment of two thirds of the party; or in other words, that at least two thirds of the Van Buren party were ready to "spurn" Mr. Calhoun. And is it not so?

Having displayed such an inability or unwillingness to comprehend our few plain remarks, a proper estimate may be placed upon his intimation that not more than one in ten are opposed to Mr. Van Buren. It is well known that at the last election the county was very nigh equally divided; since then can "One of the People" count any additions to his party? We know some who have made the other tack; and we trust that the August elections will show that the number is not small. These blunders of "One of the People," as well as those of an illustrious prototype which we had occasion recently to notice, may not be without effect—thinking men will thereby be induced to open their eyes.

In order to complete the publication of Mr. Clay's speech, we have this week been under the necessity of postponing almost every thing else.

**CONGRESS.**

Since our last, the Senate has been principally engaged in the consideration of the Sub-Treasury bill, and the House of Representatives in the consideration of the General Appropriation bill.

In the Senate, on Saturday the 24th, the Sub-Treasury bill being under consideration, Mr. King moved to amend the 23d section, by beginning the gradual process in 1839, instead of 1838. [This section provides that in payments of all dues to the government, the proportion of bank notes receivable shall be reduced one sixth every year, so that at the end of six years these payments should be made in the legal currency of the country, or in other words, in gold and silver; the effect of the amendment was to postpone the commencement of this process one year.] The amendment was adopted—yeas 42, nays 9.

The question then recurring on Mr. Cuthbert's previous motion to strike out this 23d section altogether, it was carried in the affirmative, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Bayard, Buchanan, Clay of Ky., Clayton, Crittenden, Cuthbert, Davis, Fulton, Grundy, Knight, McKean, Merrick, Morris, Nicholas, Prentiss, Preston, Rives, Robbins, Robinson, Ruggles, Sevier, Smith of La., Southard, Spence, Swift, Tallmadge, Tipton, Wall, Webster, White, Williams—31.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Benton, Brown, Calhoun, Clay of Ala., Hubbard, King, Linn, Lumpkin, Lyon, Mouton, Niles, Norvel, Pierce, Roane, Smith of Conn., Strange, Trotter, Walker, Wright, Young—21.

Mr. Tipton moved to insert a clause, containing a positive requisition that the government shall receive in all public dues the notes of specie-paying banks. After an earnest discussion of some length this amendment was rejected—yeas 22, nays 30.

Mr. Webster, having made a few introductory remarks, moved an amendment, which he afterwards modified so as to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from issuing any general order [as the specie circular] making a discrimination as to the funds or medium in which debts to the United States should be paid. Messrs. Calhoun, Wall, and Benton spoke against the amendment, and Messrs. Webster, Walker and King in its favor. Mr. Benton moved an amendment, which he modified at the suggestion of Mr. Young, requiring that all public dues should be received in cash or otherwise, in the same medium and manner as payments at the time may be required for the public lands. This amendment was rejected—yeas 8, nays 44.

The question then recurring on Mr. Webster's amendment, it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 37, nays 14.

Mr. Calhoun at some length assigned his reasons why he should now vote against the bill.

The bill was then ordered to be engrossed for a third reading—yeas 27, nays 25—and the Senate adjourned after nine o'clock.

On Monday, the bill was again taken up, read a third time, and passed by the following vote:

Yeas—Messrs. Allen, Benton, Brown, Clay of Ala., Cuthbert, Fulton, Hubbard, King, Linn, Lumpkin, Lyon, Morris, Mouton, Niles, Norvel, Pierce, Roane, Robinson, Sevier, Smith of Conn., Strange, Trotter, Walker, Wall, Williams, Wright, Young—27.

Nays—Messrs. Bayard, Buchanan, Calhoun, Clay of Ky., Clayton, Crittenden, Davis, Grundy, Knight, McKean, Merrick, Nicholas, Prentiss, Preston, Rives, Robbins, Ruggles, Smith of Indiana, Southard, Spence, Swift, Tallmadge, Tipton, Webster, White—25.

The bill was then sent down to the other House for concurrence.

In the House of Representatives, on Tuesday, the Sub-Treasury bill was taken up, and after a brief debate, on motion of Mr. Patton, laid the table by a vote of 106 to 98.

It is computed that the cotton crops in Mississippi will turn out fifteen thousand bales more than that of last year. At the present prices, it will be worth 16,500,000 dollars.

**Weekly Almanac.**

APRIL.	Sun rises	Sun sets.	M. H. N.
30 Friday,	5 49	6 11	
31 Saturday,	5 48	6 12	
1 Sunday,	5 57	6 13	
2 Monday,	5 56	6 14	
3 Tuesday,	5 55	6 15	
4 Wednesday,	5 54	6 16	
5 Thursday,	5 53	6 17	

MOON'S PHASES.

D.	H.	M.
First	1	4 15
Full	9	6 40
Last	17	10 12
New	24	1 43

**STATE OF NORTH-CAROLINA.**  
Person County.

In Equity—November Term, 1837.

John G. Wade, and others,  
vs.  
John M. Dick, and others.

IT appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, that James H. Ruffin, one of the defendants in this case, is not an inhabitant of this state: It is therefore ordered, that publication be made in the Hillsborough Recorder for six weeks successively, for the said James H. Ruffin to appear at the next term of this Court, to be held for the county of Person, at the court-house in Roxborough, on the seventh Monday after the fourth Monday in March next, and answer to this petition, otherwise the same will be taken pro confesso, and heard ex parte.

JOHN BRADSHAW, C. M. E.  
Price Adv. \$4 00.

**List of Letters,**  
Remitting in the Post Office at Hillsborough, N. C., on the 1st day of April, 1838. If not taken out in three months, they will be sent to the General Post Office and letters.

A	M
Samuel Andlett	Prigg Moore
James Armstrong	Rev. Alarham Mebane
James H. Arrington	
B	O
Israel Barker	John Neal
Robert Burnside	Jesse O'Daniel
Eliza M. Benton	John O'Leary
Joseph Boothe, sr.	P
Andrew Browning	Wm. N. or L. K. Pratt
William Brown	Thomas Parrish
Clem Biles	Anderson Proctor
C	Mary Patterson
Samuel Cole	Cynthia Pate
John H. Crutchfield	Rev. S. J. Price
Messrs. Collier & Garter.	R
William Cate	Robert Rhodes
James R. Cole or Edward Davis	Willie T. Rhodes
Susan Cheek	Wm. M. Roberts
Thomas Cate, of John	James Rainey
D	Joseph Russell
Willie B. Dilard	Margaret Revell
John Z. Davis	S
Fryson Dockery	State of North Carolina
E	F. C. Smith,
Nancy Esther	William H. Smith
F	Gen. John Smith
Thomas Flint	Joseph Steel
Philip Forebee	Pantleon J. Shaw
William Finley	Herbert Sims
G	J. Sneed
Green B. Gilbert	Samuel Strayhorn
Moens Guess	John Seebert
Elizabeth Garrot	Thos. Stephens
Elizabeth C. Graves	T
H	Hannah Thomson
Right House	Mrs. Jane Thomson
Robert Harris	Dan. W. Thomson
Wm. A. Hanney	Zach. Trice
I	Anna M. Underhill
Charles W. Johnston	V
Benjamin Johnson	Thos. Vernon
John Johnson	W
William S. Johnson	Wm. Wharton
Wm. C. Jackson	Wm. H. Woods
Russell James	John W. Woods
Wm. A. B. Jones	James M. Workman
J	Nelson Whitted
Jesse Lewis	Henry Whitted.

Persons calling for any of the above letters will please say they are advertised.

THOS. CLANCY, P. M.  
April 2. 14-

**To Stock Breeders.**

THE subscriber has an IMPORTED BULL of the Ayrshire breed, now fit for use. He will render service at five dollars per cow; or to any careful man he would farm him until October next. Argyle is an animal of beautiful form, now in fine health and condition. He was selected in England as the best adapted to our country, the whole stock being remarkable for their easy keep, and fine milking qualities.

I have also an IMPORTED RAM I would farm out the coming season; he is of the Leicester breed, so famous for early maturity, usefulness and quantity of their wool, and feeding kindly and profitably to the table.

This stock has been imported at great expense, with the hope of improving the Cattle and Sheep of my native State; and if my fellow citizens do not avail themselves of the opportunity, they must blame themselves, not me.

ALLEN JONES DAVIE.  
March 29. 14-

**STATE OF NORTH-CAROLINA.**  
Person County.

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, March Term, 1838.

The Petition of the minor children (names not known) of John Easley and wife Susannah, who sue by their next friend and father, J. H. Easley, Henry Day and wife Catherine, Alexander Ellerson and wife Mary, against, James T. Jones, Nancy Jones, the children of Joseph Jones who represent their deceased father, William Jones, Parham Brooks and wife Sally, Stephen G. Jones, David Christopher and wife Lucy, Betsy Ann Jones, Leah Jones and Rebecca Jones.

Petition for Settlement.

IT appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, that the defendants, the children and heirs of Joseph Jones, William Jones, the children and heirs of Stephen G. Jones, and David Christopher and Lucy his wife, are not inhabitants of this state, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon them: It is therefore ordered, that publication be made for six successive weeks in the Hillsborough Recorder, that the said defendants appear at the next Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, to be held for the county of Person, at the court-house in Roxborough, on the third Monday of June next, then and there to plead, answer or demur to said petition, otherwise the same will be taken pro confesso, and heard ex parte as to them.

Witness Charles Mason, Clerk of said Court, at office, the third Monday of March, A. D. 1838.

CHARLES MASON, Clerk.  
Price adv. \$6 50.

**STATE OF NORTH-CAROLINA.**  
Person County.

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, March Term, 1838.

Fortius Moore, administrator, &c.  
vs.  
Heirs at law of Judith Oakley, deceased.

Petition to sell Land.

IT appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, that the heirs at law of Susannah M'Vey, deceased, (names unknown,) are not inhabitants of this state, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon them: It is therefore ordered by the Court that publication be made in the Hillsborough Recorder for six weeks successively, requiring the said heirs at law of Susannah M'Vey, deceased, to appear at the next term of this Court, to be held for the county of Person, at the court-house in Roxborough, on the third Monday in June next, and plead, answer or demur to the petition, otherwise the same will be taken pro confesso and heard ex parte as to them.

Witness, Charles Mason, Clerk of said Court, at office, the third Monday in March, A. D. 1838.

CHARLES MASON, Clerk.  
Price of Adv. \$4 75.

**Blanks for sale at this Office.**