

Political.

FROM THE UNITED STATES TELEGRAPH.
MR. M. VAN BUREN.

The treacherous attempt of Mr. Van Buren to sell the suffrages of his native State in 1827, yet lives and rankles in the memory of every honest freeman of New York. Through his agents in the Senate, he practised upon the Legislature of that State to defeat the alteration of the electoral law, desired by the people; and vainly hoped, by this device, to fulfil the condition of his contract, which required the vote for William H. Crawford. The decision of that Legislature frowned upon his presumption, and the day dream of his ambition lost its beauty for a season! Now, if your readers will indulge me, for a moment, with their attention to a train of other circumstances, well authenticated by the public journals, I am confident they will impart much light to the subject of the prevailing controversy; and confirm the well founded suspicion of the Vice President that an insidious movement, as early as April, 1827, was warily contrived for the destruction of his political character.

The crafty manager, for a time, stood alone. Even the walls of St. Tammany echoed not his name! The subordinates of the "Regency" hesitated to accord to him their fealty; and he cast around him for a rescue from total defeat; He very soon noted the "Signs of the Times," and thought he saw no doubtful issue of the next campaign: Himself, and a few ambitious partisans of the caucus party of 1824, perceiving the harmonious relations that subsisted between General Jackson and Mr. Calhoun, and well believing that the Hero of New Orleans would triumph in the contest of '28, now cautiously conferred about the means to be devised, first, to defeat the election of the Vice President, and then to alienate from him the friendship of General Jackson. Preparatory to more decided operations, Messrs. Van Buren and Chamberlain, immediately after the session of Congress of 1826-27, visited Mr. Crawford in Georgia, and, as is seen in Mr. C.'s letter to Mr. Balch, of Tennessee, the nature and object of their visit involved important arrangements for the then approaching election; and they were fully commissioned "on all proper occasions" to disclose the opinions of Mr. Crawford on the subject. It may be well here to observe, that Mr. Crawford's missiles against Mr. Calhoun were all discharged upon Kentucky, Tennessee, Louisiana, New York, and other States, subsequently to Mr. Van Buren's visit; and that the evidence of an existing plot against the Vice President, is sufficiently indicated in the successive nominations of Maryland, Georgia, and New York.

Mr. Van Buren took leave of Mr. Crawford some time in May 1827, and, after tarrying a while at Baltimore, arrived at Albany in the month of June: In July following the State of Maryland, by convention assembled in the city of Baltimore, nominated Andrew Jackson as a candidate for the office of President of the United States; and, after much tumultuous discussion, expunged from the resolution the name of John C. Calhoun for Vice President. The motion to strike out the name of Mr. Calhoun, was submitted and advocated by Crawford men exclusively. On the 19th of December, the Legislature of Georgia nominated Wm. H. Crawford as a candidate for the office of Vice President;—only five days after his extraordinary despatch to A. Balch, Esq., wherein he says: "The only difficulty that this State has upon that subject is, that if Jackson should be elected Calhoun will come into power. I confess I am not apprehensive of such a result: for— writes me," &c. Again: "If you can ascertain that Calhoun will not be benefited by Jackson's election, you will do him (Jackson) a benefit by communicating the information to me." About this period the Albany Argus first opened its columns to a touch of kindness for the General, and proposed an armistice under a white flag, to the New York Enquirer, then conducted by M. M. Noah. The editor of the "Argus" was forthwith instructed to marshal the forces of the "Regency" for the approaching legislative caucus; and, accordingly, on the 1st of Feb. 1828, a caucus of the New York Legislature nominated Andrew Jackson for President and excluded the name of John C. Calhoun from the nomination as Vice President.

Now what would we ask, can an honest mind infer from this extraordinary succession of events? Mr. Van Buren, at this time, entirely uncommitted on the subject of the election of General Jackson, in April, 1827, visits Mr. Crawford, the avowed enemy of Mr. Calhoun, and confers freely with him on the much agitated question of the Presidency and Vice Presidency; and receives a commission, "on all proper occasions," to express Mr. Crawford's sentiments on that subject. Returning homeward, he tarries at Baltimore, and entertains sundry friends of Mr. Crawford, with a private interchange of sentiment on the congru-

ing topic of the day. At the State Convention, which soon after met in that city, and nominated General Jackson, the name of Calhoun was stricken from the resolution, and no Vice President was named. Then the letter of Crawford to Balch of the 14th December, 1827, extracts of which we have quoted above. On the 19th followed the nomination, by the Legislature of Georgia, of William H. Crawford, as Vice President of the United States; and, on the 1st February, 1828, at a legislative caucus of New York, we have the nomination of Andrew Jackson for President, the manager carefully reserving the nomination of a Vice President for further advancement. Does not this look like conspiracy? Has it not the aspect of a concerted intrigue? We are not disposed to reflect unjustly on Mr. Van Buren; but we must be permitted to say, that circumstances so peculiar in themselves can hardly fail to produce an unfavorable impression of the Secretary's "motives."

He boldly disclaims all participation in the conspiracy, and sneeringly asks, "what motive" he could have for impairing the political prospects of Mr. Calhoun? As if he would exult in his proud ascendancy in the councils of the nation! Mr. Van Buren, it seems, is yet to learn, that nothing so becomes a man in lofty station, like humility. It is the earnest of great promise in the officer, and the pledge of merit in the man. Without it, genius and attainments are always disgusting—with it, dulness and ignorance are sometimes sufferable.

The humble instruments in this affair will be attended to tomorrow. LEO.
Old Dominion, March 21, 1831.

BANK ROBBERY.

As the all absorbing topic of the day is in relation to the late robbery of the City Bank, and as I have heard it frequently remarked, that no robbery of equal extent had ever been committed in this country, I send you the following account of two Bank robberies under similar circumstances.

In the year 1798 the Bank of Pennsylvania, then kept in the Carpenters' Hall in Philadelphia was entered, and about one hundred and sixty thousand dollars taken away. As no force appeared to have been committed, the natural conclusion was, that the bank locks had been opened by means of false keys. The directors attached suspicion to Mr. Patrick Lyon, a very ingenious blacksmith, who made the original keys for the iron doors, which he had also manufactured. On inquiry being made for Lyon, it was found that he had, just after the robbery, left the city in a shallop for Cape May, to which place he was pursued, apprehended, and brought back a prisoner to the city, and committed to jail, on suspicion of being concerned in the robbery. The yellow fever was then prevailing in Philadelphia; most of the inhabitants had removed to the country, and the poor honest fellow remained in confinement a considerable time. An upright jury awarded him \$12,000 damages against the directors of the bank. During the following winter a journeyman carpenter, I believe his name was Davis, began to move in a considerable style, made deposits in different banks, and endeavored to make his way into company other than that he had been accustomed to. This excited the suspicion of the Mayor, who I believe was Mr. Robert Wharton. He laid his plans, apprehended Davis, and obtained from him within a few thousand dollars of the amount abstracted from the bank. I do not recollect if he was punished; but I believe he was not. It appeared that he had acted in conjunction with the man having charge of the keys to take to the cashier's house. This man died of the yellow fever the same season, being taken ill immediately after the robbery.

The other case was that of the old branch bank at Charleston, S. C. which was also entered by means of false keys, and one hundred and sixty or seventy thousand dollars taken off, all in gold and silver. The directors offered a reward of ten thousand dollars, which set to work almost the whole city; every suspicious person, conversation, and observation, were reported to the directors, when the following circumstances brought the matter to light:—A man by the name of Gray, went into a Grocery store, and paid a small debt in specie. As he was a man known to be very short of cash, the grocer observed to him, that if he was not a person of good character, they would suppose he had robbed the bank. On which observation he was observed to change color, could hardly speak, and appeared to be choked; took up a bottle, and drank off near half a pint of rum. Some persons present began to joke with him, and elicited sufficient to induce the bank to apprehend him; yet nothing could be brought against him. A slave of his was taken up and put in confinement, was coaxed and threatened, but nothing could be elicited from him, and he was discharged. Another slave of Gray's was apprehended, and on a promise of his freedom developed the whole of the robbery, pointed out the place where the money was concealed—which was in a hole near his

master's barn covered with manure, about one and a quarter miles out of the city—to which place the captain of the guard with his men repaired and found the whole of the money taken from the bank, and with the exception of a few hundred dollars, the whole amount was returned to the place from whence it had been robbed exactly one week from the time it had been taken away. Gray was convicted and branded in the hand. He afterwards confessed the whole, and the manner he had pursued to effect the robbery. The bank paid the reward, purchased the freedom of the black man, and sent him to Philadelphia with directions to change his name.

N. Y. Courier & Enquirer.

BANK BOBBERY.

We are indebted to the polite attention of the Editors of the Mercantile Advertiser for the following information: ROBBER OF THE CITY BANK TAKEN.

The mystery which has hung over the robbery of the City Bank for a week past, and excited so much of the public attention is at last solved.

On Saturday night about 12 o'clock, Justice Hopson, High Constable Hays, assisted by some Police officers, arrested a man named Edward Smith, at a Boarding House corner of Broome and Elm streets, in whose possession was discovered a small travelling trunk filled with Bank Notes, which, on examination, was found to contain \$185,738, and proved to be the identical money stolen from the City Bank. The balance \$63,208 (including the doubloons) is yet missing.

Smith is the very man, who was suspected by the Police Officers from the very first, and they were actually on the look out for him. Some of this man's previous acts have rendered his character notorious. He is said to be the individual, who some years ago committed the great robbery of 127,000 sterling from a mail coach in England, and compromised with the Bank for 10,000, with which ill gotten gain, he arrived in this country some 6 or 8 years ago. He is believed to be the same person who took the money from the iron chest of the steam boat Chancellor Livingston, last fall on her passage hence for Providence, which money was afterwards discovered secreted amongst the baggage—and this same man was one of those who recently robbed the store of Mr. Schenck in Brooklyn.

By way of a cover to his crimes, Smith has for some time kept a small shoe store in Division street—a few days ago he changed his lodgings, and took up his residence in the house above alluded to, under the assumed name of Jones. We understand that his strange conduct in relation to his trunk, first excited the suspicions of the landlord and induced him to communicate his suspicions to the police, which resulted in his apprehension.

Smith was taken to the police office this morning, where he underwent an examination—but he refused to give any satisfactory answers—the money was safely deposited in the bank.

Among the money found, is the whole amount belonging to the Morris Canal Company, and the principal part of Messrs. S. & M. Allen's.

U. S. Telegraph.

Cotton is down to 5 a 71-2 cents. The news from England which we give below, has produced this effect. The letter which we have seen from Charleston, and the prevailing opinion here, assign this unexpected step in the English policy to a retaliatory spirit against us. That England should at last have grown resentful of the legislative war which we have been so long waging against her, is but natural. Woe to the cotton planter. [From the Charleston Mercury.]

LATEST FROM ENGLAND. DUTY ON COTTON, &c.

By the Br. ship Mary Catharine, Capt. Holt, arrived last evening from Liverpool, we have our files of English papers to the 15th February. We have also been favored with letters from Liverpool of the 13th and 14th, which communicate the important intelligence that "the British government is going to put a duty of 1d. per lb. extra on the import of Cotton from all parts of the world." The Chancellor of the Exchequer opened the ministerial budget on the 12th. In his speech upon that occasion, in which he details his plan for the reduction of old and the imposition of new taxes, he says, amongst other things, "I intend however, to propose that a tax of 1d. per lb. shall be laid upon raw cotton imported into this country, and a drawback also of 1d on all cotton goods exported." Our readers are referred to our commercial head for additional information on this interesting subject. Telescope.

The Opposition To Government.

There is no use in disguising the fact that Ministers, in accomplishing their task (Parliamentary Reform) will need all the support of the people. There is already, it is said, an opposition party formed, very powerful in numerical force, in the House of Commons. The plan of operations of this opposition is to place at the

head of a Ministry Sir Robert Peel, or some other Minister who will limit his reform to the extension of the franchise to a few large towns—to do something in the name, but as little as possible in reality. Whether such an opposition shall be successful, depends in part on the courage and sagacity of the Ministers themselves, but chiefly on the feeling manifested by the people. If the people are indifferent, it absurdly will succeed. It is not enough for the people to be friendly to Reform—if they are lukewarm friends, for its opponents will not be lukewarm enemies. Wherever there is a feeling in favor of Reform, that feeling should be expressed by a petition. Let all points of difference, which are not essential, be kept out of sight, if it possible; but at any rate let us not, for the sake of concealing these differences, conceal the existence of the opinions in which we all agree. London Globe



Salisbury:

APRIL 11, 1831.

A rebuff has been given to the high and confident hopes of the National Republican party in the recent decision of the Supreme Court upon the Georgia and Indian question, and the Presses in its service are exerting all their ingenuity to conceal this blow from a quarter in which all their hopes and prospects were concentrated. They feel its force and are unable to disguise the alarm which it has spread in their ranks. They begin to render up excuses for the decision of the Supreme Court, and deny for the Court the absence of all jurisdiction in the case, whilst they declare that it was only in the manner required that they had no right to interfere. Is it possible then that the combined wisdom and learning of Wirt and Seaboard was inadequate to track out the proper course which should be pursued in bringing this important question before the Supreme Court? If the Court had not original jurisdiction of the case in the manner in which it was brought in its notice, will the humanity, the philanthropy, which have been excited in the bosoms of those gentlemen who so generously volunteered in defence of the violated rights of the Indians, not prompt them to adopt the proper manner to secure a favorable decision for them? Surely they will not relax their efforts for mistaking the manner in which the question should be brought before the August Tribunal. But let us examine the grounds of the decision of the Supreme Court and see whether the judgment as pronounced was bottomed upon any error as to the mode of prosecuting the rights of the Indians before the Supreme Court. If we have rightly comprehended its decision a disclaimer is made of all jurisdiction on its part to interfere in the dispute between Georgia and the Indians. The Court does not hint that it was any error in form which prevented a decision for the Indians. The Court took a higher ground, that of the Constitutional power to interpose its authority. The Court reasoned thus—that the judicial power under the Constitution only extended to cases or controversies "between a State, or the citizens thereof, and foreign States, citizens or subjects," wherefore the Indian Nation not being an independent or foreign State in the sense contemplated in the Constitution the Supreme Court had no jurisdiction whatever. This reasoning does not imply (if we have given the substance of it correctly as we found it in a condensed report of the decision) that the Court made any equivocal decision of the case. The Court denies that the Indian Nation in its relation to our government is an independent or foreign State, but that it is dependent for protection upon the United States, and stands in the same relation to them that a ward does to his guardian, and therefore the Court can not entertain jurisdiction of the case. This is a positive declaration disclaiming the right to decide the question in any shape. To illustrate the position assumed by the Court that the Indian Nation is not an independent or foreign State, it refers to the language of the Constitution which lays down the rule for the apportionment of representatives and direct taxes among the several States of the Union, "according to their respective numbers," wherein it is said, "it shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other persons." This is the clearest indication of the light in which the framers of the constitution viewed the relation of the Indians to the United States. It is a complete recognition of the right of the States to extend their laws over the Indians. If the States taxed them, which they would have no right to do if the idea of sovereignty had been annexed to their condition by the Constitution, then they can be computed in the calculation of "the numbers of the respective States." True it is, that a State within whose limits the Indians reside is not constrained to extend its laws over them. It is entirely optional with them—the right to do so is conceded by the Supreme Court without reservation. But there is additional evidence afforded in the Constitution of the United States of their true condition and exact relation

to our government. In the provision made in the Constitution for "the regulation of commerce," it is declared, that "Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes. Here are three separate divisions of the powers with whom Congress is authorized to regulate commerce, which would have been entirely unnecessary if a distinction had not been made between the three enumerated classes. The Indians in that clause of the Constitution are not regarded as a "foreign Nation" nor as a "State," but unlike each, wherefore it was argued by the Judges, very correctly, that they could not entertain jurisdiction of the case. Disguise it as they will this is a palpable hit at the constructive doctrine of the National Republicans. It is a triumph of State Rights over consolidation from a source from which we little expected any countenance. We congratulate our friends upon the auspicious appearance of things in the political horizon. The Oracle and Sibylline books have been consulted, and the prophecies are favorable to our cause. With unity and concert success must attend it.

It is with sincere regret that we acknowledge the necessity, imposed upon us by our duties to the community, which we feel under obligations to fulfil in all cases, to speak to the management of so august a body as the United States Senate. We would much prefer in this instance to make our remarks personal, but justice to the most prominent actors in the scene, inasmuch as the resolution which is to be made the subject of our remarks was adopted by the Senate, impels us to speak collectively and not individually. A committee was appointed during the late session of Congress by the Senate, to enquire into and report whether any legislation was necessary to give greater effect to the Post Office Department—whether any obstacles existed in its present management which might be removed with advantage to the country, and whether some new regulations might not be adopted which would secure the greater safety and more speedy transportation of the mail. These were the objects, we presume, contemplated in the Resolution under which a committee was appointed to examine into the Post Office Department. But to do those justice whom we are about to censure, we will admit the resolution in question conferred upon them all the authority over the Post Office Department which the Senate can constitutionally exercise. Under this Resolution of the Senate which we have mentioned, what did the committee do? They went into an examination of the conduct of the Post-Master General from the time the Post-Office Department was entrusted to his management to the then present moment, and undertook to accuse the Post-Master General of Fraud, Misversation and Corruption. Was this not transcending the limits of their authority as well as that of the body whose committee they were? Has the Senate any authority to enquire into the conduct of the Post-Master General and pronounce upon accusations against him until he is regularly impeached by the House of Representatives? Was not this a most reckless and unjustifiable invasion of the rights of a co-ordinate branch of the national Legislature, whose duty it is to impeachments against the officers of the government when they have been guilty of impeachable offences, as either of the charges made against Mr. Barry were? The Senate of the United States undertook to accuse Mr. Barry and to sit in judgment upon his case. How liberal, how unguarded, does this look in us against a body, admitting that the power assumed does strictly belong to it! None but tyrants and oppressors prefer accusations and sit in judgment upon them. The Post-Master General is an officer of the government and his duties are prescribed and defined by law, if he departs from his authority and violates the law which regulates his conduct he incurs the penalty of the law, and is liable to impeachment. Did we ever know before the constitutional judges of an officer to descend from the judgement seat and seek for materials whereon to found an accusation against him? The annals of no civilized country furnish another instance. What a disgrace to the country is this unexampled departure from the honor and dignity of the highest tribunal known to the laws of this Nation! The enquiry is made by the committee into the charges preferred against the Post-Master General—they examine evidence, documentary and oral—they are forced to come to some conclusion in order to report the result of their investigation—a charge of Fraud and Corruption is deliberately preferred in the Senate of the United States against the Post-Master General by the same persons who will be his judges if impeached! How can this be reconciled with the supposed attributes of a Senate, Justice, Honor and Dignity? Political rancour has drowned the voices of these noble qualities in man, and their contraries have usurped their places in the human bosom. That the Post-Office Department has not been as well conducted as it might have been, from some cause or other, we will readily admit. But where is the room for all this tirade of abuse which was heaped upon the Post-Master General in the United States Senate? Where is the necessity of accusing a man in this denigratory manner without affording him an opportunity to be heard in his defence? If Mr. Barry is found guilty of any of the charges made against him upon a regular and constitutional trial, let him be dismissed. None will murmur at the