

## CONGRESSIONAL.

REMARKS OF MR. RENCHER, of N. C.  
In opposition to the claim of Susan Decatur and others for the destruction of the  
Tripolitan Frigate Philadelphia, in  
1804.

Mr. RENCHER said it was with great reluctance he had consented to embark in this debate. To him the task was an unpleasant one. But the confident tone assumed by the friends of the bill, and particularly by his friend from Louisiana, (Mr. Warr.) who had just resumed his seat, imposed upon him the duty of a reply, from which he could not shrink. I have listened, (said Mr. R.) with the deepest sensibility to the strong and glowing appeals which have been made to the feelings of this House. Such appeals captivate and mislead the judgment. None can feel a more profound and grateful respect for the memory of Decatur than I do. His deeds are associated with the earliest recollections of my childhood. But standing here as the representative of the people, I must apply to this claim the same standard of equal and impartial justice which is administered to the most humble and obscure; and, tried by that standard, it falls to the ground.

The destruction of the frigate Philadelphia was a great and glorious achievement. As an American, I am proud of it. As the friend of Decatur, I rejoice at it. It laid the foundation of his future greatness & glory. It immediately promoted him over the heads of his senior officers equally gallant with himself, and gave him the command of a frigate. His salary was augmented, and public honors bestowed upon him. Whatever, therefore, may have been thought by others, Congress and the nation must certainly believe they had done him ample and entire justice. Decatur's own heart must have felt it, for though he lived nearly twenty years in the full enjoyment of the confidence and patronage of his grateful country, he never once intimated the existence of such a claim. The bill, however, is before us, and the circumstances connected with it, demand at our hands a dispassionate and careful consideration.

The claim is rested mainly on two grounds: as a matter of right, and as one of public policy. With the indulgence of the committee, I will briefly examine both these grounds. In the printed documents are found the legal opinions of two gentlemen distinguished in their profession, in which it is supported as a matter of right, arising under the prize act of 1800. These opinions have been endorsed by several gentlemen on this floor. If I could believe this claim justified by the most liberal and indulgent construction of the prize act, it would afford me pleasure to support it; but the careful examination has resulted in the firmest conviction that it comes not within the letter or spirit of that act; nor is it justified by any one act of legislation under it. The 5th section of that act provides: "That the proceeds of all ships, and the goods taken on board of them, which shall be adjudged good prize, shall, when of equal or superior force to the vessel or vessels making the capture, be the sole property of the captors; and when of inferior force, shall be divided equally between the United States and the officers and men making the capture."

By the law of nations, vessels captured belong to the nation making the capture. The right as between belligerent nations passes and vests *ipso facto* by the capture itself, without any other ceremony. This right enures for the sole and exclusive benefit of the Government. The Government may, however, for wise national purposes, transfer this interest, either wholly or in part, to the individual captors making the capture; but it may, and does attach to that transfer, such conditions and limitations as it may think wise and expedient. Until these conditions are complied with, no interest vests in the officers and men, but remains in the Government. In 1800 Congress, to foster and stimulate our little navy to deeds of enterprise and glory, declared that the proceeds of vessels and the goods taken on board of them, which shall be adjudged good prize, shall belong either wholly or in part to the captors. They grant to them the proceeds only, and that not until after a regular adjudication and condemnation as usually necessary without it, and in this case the vessel was destroyed; and can any one believe that it was the intention of the framers of this law to pay our officers and men for vessels and goods destroyed by them? They could not have intended to incur such an obligation, and therefore they transfer the proceeds only after adjudication.

But we have been told, with apparent triumph, that the Government has repeatedly paid for vessels destroyed, without adjudication. It is admitted; but in every single instance referred to, the destruction took place under circumstances which created the strongest obligations on the Government to make indemnity to the captors. There the vessels were captured under the expectation of making prizes of them; and after capturing the Government, to avoid the difficulty of sending them into port to be adjudged, ordered them to be destroyed. The Government could not, therefore, refuse to make indemnity. The officers and crew might justly complain of the violated faith of the Government. We, they might say, have conquered and captured the vessel as a prize, and the Government has made her so.

But we have been told, with apparent triumph, that the Government has repeatedly paid for vessels destroyed, without adjudication. It is admitted; but in every single instance referred to, the destruction took place under circumstances which created the strongest obligations on the Government to make indemnity to the captors. There the vessels were captured under the expectation of making prizes of them; and after capturing the Government, to avoid the difficulty of sending them into port to be adjudged, ordered them to be destroyed. The Government could not, therefore, refuse to make indemnity. The officers and crew might justly complain of the violated faith of the Government. We, they might say, have conquered and captured the vessel as a prize, and the Government has made her so.

But we have been told, with apparent triumph, that the Government has repeatedly paid for vessels destroyed, without adjudication. It is admitted; but in every single instance referred to, the destruction took place under circumstances which created the strongest obligations on the Government to make indemnity to the captors. There the vessels were captured under the expectation of making prizes of them; and after capturing the Government, to avoid the difficulty of sending them into port to be adjudged, ordered them to be destroyed. The Government could not, therefore, refuse to make indemnity. The officers and crew might justly complain of the violated faith of the Government. We, they might say, have conquered and captured the vessel as a prize, and the Government has made her so.

Guerrero, the Java, and the other vessels referred to in the course of this debate. But the destruction of the Philadelphia is not analogous. It is altogether different. Decatur forms a plan to destroy the frigate, and volunteers for its execution. He did not embark in this enterprise under the hope or expectation of making a prize of her. He could not expect any thing from the proceeds of a vessel which he was determined to destroy. To effect his object, he is directed to board the ship. The boarding is a necessary means of destruction. If sunk or destroyed by means of a fireship or in battle, the case would have been the same; and yet no one has ever been so wild as to imagine that we were bound to pay our officers and crew for vessels and goods thus sunk and destroyed. If, therefore, you are determined to pass this bill, call it by its proper name—a gratuity, or an honorable donation; but do not seek a justification for it by a total perversion, not only of the letter, but also of the spirit and original intention of the prize act.

The distribution of the money proposed by the bill on your table is liable to the strongest objection. For myself, I cannot consent to it. It does injustice to the sailors to increase the distributive share of Mrs. Decatur. And this too in the very face and in violation of the very letter of that statute under which this claim is sought to be established. The prize act distributes to the commander of a ship two twentieths of a prize, and to the sailors as a class, seven twentieths, which in this case would give to Mrs. Decatur \$10,000; and to each of the sailors \$333. Surely this disparity is sufficiently great; much greater than is made in the relative pay of a captain of a ship and the sailor under his command. But, according to the distribution proposed by the bill on your table, the share of Mrs. Decatur is swelled to the sum of \$24,000, while that of the sailor is cut down to the pitiful sum of \$304. Is this just, or is it sound policy? The time will never come when we shall not be able to man our ships with gallant officers. But if you deliberately disregard and sacrifice the rights and interests of our generous tars, the time may come, the hour of danger may arrive, when you will not be able to call into your service men who will bear your flag upon the ocean in triumph and glory. Gentlemen have taxed their ingenuity to justify this gross injustice and inequality, and their illustration is as novel as it is ingenious. They contend that the prize act, in giving seven twentieths of a prize to the sailors as a class, is based upon the supposition that the number is equal to the full complement of a frigate's crew, which is 240. That in this case there were only fifty-two, and therefore they are entitled only to 43 parts, leaving the other 198 parts to be divided among the other classes successively, according to their relative proportions. But this, sir, is mere supposition. It fortunately is not the law. If it were, its injustice would demand a speedy repeal. If the number of sailors on board be small, they have the same amount of duties to perform as if they were more numerous. If they refuse or neglect it, they are punished. When, therefore, they have endured all the hardships, braved all the dangers, and snatched a prize from the enemy by their gallantry, shall they be told that they can receive only a pitiful portion of what the law distributes to them? I hope we shall never act so unjustly towards those who have won respect for your flag upon every sea.

I will now, Mr. Chairman, examine the second branch of this argument. Many gentlemen support this claim, not as a right, but as a gratuity, or honorable donation given for great and patriotic services, and justified, in their estimation, by sound policy and public expediency. I will not question the right of Congress to exercise such a power; it has often been done. It will doubtless be repeated. In the transaction now under review, Congress complimented Decatur with a sword, and voted to him and his crew 7 months extra pay. But this power is constitutional and proper. It is exerted for the sole and single purpose of promoting the public good, and not as a pretext to the public, and individual, remotely conveyed with the achievement, a large amount of the public money. But the policy of such donations, after the lapse of so many years, may well be questioned. It creates an arbitrary and invidious distinction among men equally entitled to our gratitude. Gentlemen in this debate have been warmed into poetry and romance; the pencil of the painter has cast every other picture into the shade, and monopolized for Decatur alone the glory and success of the Tripolitan war. Far be it from me to detract from the splendor of his achievements. I would not remove a single pebble from that proud monument of glory which he has reared to his memory, or extinguish one single spark of that gratitude which glows in the bosom of every American. But the gallant heroes who mingled with him in that bright dawn of Naval chivalry are equally the objects of our gratitude and love. Nor can you select this single achievement as the exclusive object of your bounty, without doing injustice and disparagement to the rest.

Mr. Rencher said, he could not notice the many other brilliant achievements under the Tripolitan war, which covered our little squadron with imperishable glory. Though less successful, they were not less bold and patriotic than those who caused the destruction of the Philadelphia. They struck terror into the proud but timid spirit of the Bashaw, though they could not subvert the empire of his heart. But the gallant Commodore Preble to whom we owe the capture of the Tripolitan, by means of patriotic devotion and love of glory, which were his chief motives, and his comparison. The gallant Commodore Preble to whom we owe the capture of the Tripolitan, by means of patriotic devotion and love of glory, which were his chief motives, and his comparison. The gallant Commodore Preble to whom we owe the capture of the Tripolitan, by means of patriotic devotion and love of glory, which were his chief motives, and his comparison.

by means of a fireship, was an enterprise fraught with the darkest and deepest peril. And who of all our squadron courted this enterprise so full of awe and of peril? Who asked to make this almost self immolation for their country? Captain Somers, and Lieutenant Wadsworth and Israel. The monument west of this Capitol, reared by the sacred hand of friendship, tells the disastrous story of their fate. They had passed the inner harbour, and were near the point of their destination, when at the moment of the consummation of their hopes they were boarded by two Tripolitan frigates. All hope of escape was now cut off, and nothing awaited them but the ignominious captivity and torture. Their proud spirits could not brook such a fate; and Capt. Somers, applying a match with his own hand, resolved to sink into the same common ruin with his barbarous captors and his gallant companions.

If, sir, it is politic at this day to distinguish any one act of patriotic devotion during that war, by bestowing upon it an honorary donation; this is that act. Somers, and his companions in this daring enterprise, thought it sweet to die for their country, and their country was sensible of their merit. Congress expressed "the deep regret which they felt for the loss of these gallant men, whose names ought to live in the recollection and affection of a grateful country, and whose conduct ought to be regarded as an example to future generations." They did not live to receive this testimonial of your kind regard, nor to share in the future rewards and patronage of their grateful country. If, therefore, you have bounty to bestow, go seek the widows and children of these heroic men. Left parentless, and perhaps penniless, no donation can be more just to those who receive, or more honorable to those who give.

I will mention but one circumstance more, which contributed, perhaps more than any other, to humble the haughty spirit of the Bashaw, and extort from him the treaty of 1805. It will be recollected that the Bashaw of Tripoli was an usurper. The legitimate heir, Hamet, had been driven into exile among the Mamelukes of Egypt. Early in the year 1805, General Eaton, with a few followers, was sent by this Government to seek out the exiled Hamet, and to co-operate with him in an attack upon Tripoli by land. This adventurous mission was executed with success. The objects of the alliance were reciprocal—to rescue the American captives, and to restore Hamet to his throne. The dominions of the Bashaw were invaded; his forces elsewhere defeated. The city of Derne had surrendered; and it was not until the Bashaw felt his throne trembling beneath him that he consented to the treaty. The third article of that treaty shows the true source of his alarm. It stipulates that General Eaton shall withdraw from Derne, and shall endeavor to induce Hamet to withdraw, without making any provision whatever for him. In one month more, General Eaton would have planted his standard in the city of Tripoli, and have restored our faithful ally to his former throne. Nothing could have justified such a treaty on our part, under such circumstances, but the benevolent desire of saving from torture and from death the American captives, in whose blood the Bashaw, if driven to despair, would have glutted his merciless revenge.

There, sir, were the more immediate and more powerful causes which humbled the haughty spirit of the Bashaw, and extorted from him that treaty by which our commerce was freed from the infamy of a tribute, and our citizens from captivity and chains. The destruction of the Philadelphia was more remote, and less calculated to operate upon the fears of a barbarian. In that enterprise fortune crowned Decatur with success; but he, more than any other naval officer, entered into the full enjoyment of the rich fruits of that success. I cannot consent to create any further distinction. It would be as unjust, as it would be unjust. I cannot consent to give to his representative a large amount of the public money, and leave the representatives of other brave men, who perished in sustaining the honor of their country, to penury and want. Believing the claim, therefore, not justified by law or by sound policy, I shall feel it my duty, however painful, to vote against it.

From the N. York Journal of Commerce.  
ONE FACT IS WORTH A THOUSAND THEORIES.

In looking over a parcel of London papers, our eyes were arrested for a moment by an advertisement with the following "Extraordinary list of prices." We have calculated the prices at the established par of exchange, with 10 per cent. premium: Good wide Welsh flannel yard 80 1/2 Extra stout do full yard wide 18 Blankets 2 yards long, pair 1 25 Large size counterpanes, colored 37 1/2 Large worsted do 25 White do 2 1/2 yards wide 87 1/2 Good stout Scotch linen, for shirts, yd. 12 1/2 Full yard wide, bleached linen sheet 12 1/2 3 1/2 yards wide, do requiring no seam 25 Stout cotton bedtick, yard 7 Wide and stout linen do 19 All the newest patterns dark chintz 12 1/2 500 pieces blue and other dark prints 6 Superior stout calicoes, full yard wide 7 Ell wide common calicoes, 25 yards, for 1 00 Yard and a half wide damasks, for table cloths, yard 25 500 pieces double width merinoes, all colors 34 The very finest French do. 1 13 Striped furniture glazed 8 Good large cloth cloaks each 2 10 Large camblet and plaid do 2 Men's stout lambs' wool stockings dozen 3

How quick it would ruin this country to buy at such prices! How soon it would bring our laboring classes to the most miserable and degraded condition, to be able to buy a whole suit of clothes for \$5. Tariff, protect us from so shocking a condition!

We beg leave to add: The price of sugar in the West Indies is from \$1 to \$3 25 per hundred weight. Will any one deny this? The freight from thence to Charleston is we suppose about half a cent, so that freight and insurance added, the price of sugar should be from \$2 to \$4 50 per hundred. Why is it more? because the tariff requires the importer to pay \$2 50 per hundred, as a toll before it can land. For what is this toll required? confessedly, that about five hundred of the richest men in the United States may get double price for their sugar.

The price of Sweden Iron is, in Sweden, one dollar per hundred pounds; in England, Bar iron sells from one to two dollars. Why is it increased in price here? because our government will not allow it to land, until it pays a toll of ninety cents the hundred pounds on the lowest quality, and up as high as other kinds of iron, as \$2 50 per cwt. Who is taxed by this? Every man who uses a pound of iron.—Who is benefited? the rich manufacturers of iron. We desire to know if there is a country in the world, but our own, that pays as much as \$2 50 per hundred for iron. The price of salt, in Turks Island, and we believe in other markets, is six cents a bushel. Why is it more here? because the government lays a toll upon it of about 12 cents per bushel, (that is 10 cents for 50 lbs.) Who pays this tax? Every man who uses salt. Who receives it? the rich salt makers, and they are all rich. Is not this carrying the hard earnings of the many poor, into the pockets of the rich few. And has it not already built up an order of nobility, as insolent and arbitrary as ever lorded it over any people.

We say that all pay a tax upon salt who use it; we are wrong. Our northern brethren, who use it in their factories, not only do not pay the tax, but are paid for using it—for every bushel which they use and pay 12 cents for, they receive a draw-back of twenty cents, getting a bounty of 8 cents for every bushel which they use.—Whilst we pay a tax of 12 cts. for all which we use, and the government, that does this, is no tyranny, and must not be complained of!

WE PUBLISH TO-DAY BY REQUEST, THE PROCEEDINGS OF TWO VAN BUREN MEETINGS, ONE IN LINCOLN AND THE OTHER IN SURRY, AT THE LAST OF WHICH, WE HAVE BEEN INFORMED, H. C. JONES, A TRIFITTE & FEDERALIST DREW UP THE RESOLUTIONS, AND DAN. W. COURTS, ESQ. MEMBER ELECT FROM SURRY COUNTY TO THE NEXT LEGISLATURE, AND OF THE SAME POLITICAL STAMP OFFERED THEM. WITH THE FUGGINS OF THE GOOD OLD REPUBLICAN COUNTY OF SURRY BE THUS BLIND-FOLDED, AND LED TO THE SLAUGHTER BY THESE ENEMIES IN DISGUISE, BY THESE WOLVES IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING! IF THEY DO, THEY WILL BUT LITTLE DESERVE THE HIGH REPUTATION, WHICH THEY HAVE HITHERTO HAD FOR THEIR UNCOMPROMISING REPUBLICANISM.—THE GAME WHICH IS NOW GOING ON IS A DEEP ONE: THE FEW REMNANTS OF THE FEDERAL PARTY, SCATTERED HERE AND THERE, HOPE TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE PRESENT SPLIT AMONG THE FRIENDS OF THE ADMINISTRATION, WITH REGARD TO THE VICE-PRESIDENCY, TO DOSE THE PEOPLE WITH THEIR FEDERAL NOTIONS BY SWEETENING THE BITTER DRAUGHT WITH JACKSONISM. BUT WE HOPE THE PEOPLE ARE NOT THUS TO BE DECEIVED BY THESE JAMUS-FACED POLITICIANS. WE HOPE THEY WILL SEE THEIR CLOVEN FEET AND DRIVE THEM FROM OUR CAMP! THEY ARE SPIES AMONG US.

THE NEW YORK COURIER AND ENQUIRER, A VAN BUREN AND UNITED STATES BANK PAPER HAS RECENTLY TURNED TO THE RIGHT ABOUT AND CAME OUT FOR CLAY AND SERGENT. THIS DOES NOT LOOK RIGHT: THE REAL AND TRUE FRIENDS OF THE PRESIDENT HAD BETTER KEEP A GOOD LOOK OUT, THERE ARE MORE ENEMIES IN OUR CAMP.

The Editor of the Tariff Federal paper published in this town, under the name of the "Carolina Watchman" takes it very ill of us because we call him by his right name. He says he is in favor of a reduction of the Tariff. Is he to be believed? Shall we take his words for it, or shall we take his acts? Has he ever published a single article against the Tariff? Did he not make use of every argument, in its favor, in his speech during the week of Court, which was contained in the New York Tariff address? Did he not say he was satisfied with the reduction made at the last session of Congress? But, enough; he is a high Tariff man, and he is a Federalist, and he need not deny either. Every body about here knows that he is both. And every body at a distance will soon find him out: The cloak of Jacksonism, and the coat of Republicanism sit too heavy upon his shoulders, he will be compelled to throw off both, and appear as he really is,—a Clay-Tariff-Federalist of the blackest kind.

The writer of "Spectator" in the last "Journal" is too contemptible to elicit from us any reply to the questions he has proposed, and were he as well known as he is here, we should not even have taken the notice of him we have.

The Questions in Arithmetic. We have received no less than 6 or 8 answers to the questions in Arithmetic, and while all agree in their answers to the first question, scarcely two have agreed on the 2nd and 3rd questions. The reason is this:—The person who proposed the questions did not state the two last with sufficient precision; for example the number of hours to be devoted to counting in each day, were not mentioned. Some calculated 12, some 10, and some the whole 24.

In the last question, the width of the dollar was not given, and the Tariff has left so few hard dollars in the South, that it is no easy matter to find one in a neighborhood to measure by.—We wish that we could give the answers of each, with the accompanying remarks, but we have only room for the answers of one of our correspondents. To the rest we return our thanks, particularly to our Stokes and our Iredell correspondents.

At a meeting of delegates last week, in Wilkesboro' from the counties of Surry, Ashe, Iredell and Wilkes, Genl. Lee Davidson was placed upon the Jackson and Van Buren ticket as elector for that district, and Col. Anderson Mitchell was placed upon the Jackson and Barbour ticket.

THE MAJORITY IS SUPREME. A Canada Editor says that Genl. Jackson is KING of America, because Genl. Jackson "has ventured to oppose what a majority of the nation (of Congress) deemed necessary for their prosperity, viz his veto on the Bank bill!"

Now, this is not so very strange in the loyal subject of a royal king, for he knows nothing about CONSTITUTIONAL restraints; the BRITISH PARLIAMENT is omnipotent, and, so thinks he, should the AMERICAN CONGRESS be.—We may excuse this British editor, but what shall we think of our American editors who contend for the same doctrine.—They say, the Tariff is right and we must not complain because a MAJORITY of Congress has passed it.

In the "Journal" of this place, we find under the editorial head these remarks: "Our government is based on the only just principle of Government, the right of the majority to rule the whole so long as this Union hangs together, &c." If this be not claiming for Congress absolute power, we know not what is. What in the name of common sense was the CONSTITUTION made for? If the MAJORITY of Congress have a right to rule as they please without any regard to the constitution, to set it aside whenever it suits them, then our forefathers might have saved themselves the trouble of establishing it, and, in a dozen words have fixed the whole business. Instead of a little volume they could have written these words—"A majority of Congress shall have the power to rule the whole so long as this Union hangs together."

Jefferson says,—the greatest evil that can befall a people is to have "a government without limitation of powers." If the doctrine against which we are contending shall prevail, we will soon have such a government in full operation.

The elections in Alabama are over and we believe that not a single Tariff man has been elected.

POLITICAL MEETING IN WARREN. A large, and respectable meeting was lately held at Shocco, in Warren County, for the purpose of appointing a committee, to address letters to PHILIP P. BARBOUR, and MARTIN VAN BUREN, to elicit from each of them, their sentiments on the following subjects, viz: 1st, on the PROTECTIVE POLICY; 2nd, on the power of Congress, to carry on works of internal improvements within the limits of the several States; 3rd, on the Bank of the United States; and 4th on the doctrine of nullification.

We feel very solicitous to see the answers, to these questions, and, when we receive them, shall lay them before our readers.

## "The Truth Teller."

We have received a small sheet issued from the "Union Press," at Washington, in this State, entitled "THE TRUTH TELLER." The contents of this sheet are written with great spirit and force. The prospectus says,—"The present Tariff system is daily robbing the people of the South, of their hard earnings, to overflow the coffers of the Northern Manufacturers." &c. &c. The object of the "Truth Teller" will be to exhibit, in their true colors, the odious features of the Tariff policy, and will recognize the pretensions of no man to the second office, with in the gift of the people, who was, in any way, instrumental in fixing this curse upon us; or, who is unwilling to make any effort to rescue the violated constitution of his country, from the brink of ruin, upon which it now stands." It is clear from this, that the "TRUTH TELLER" is against Martin Van Buren,—for we all know that he was instrumental in fixing "this curse upon us,"—his vote passed the Tariff act of 1828; he well knew that his single vote could reject the bill, and yet, he voted for it and passed it. He then, is to blame more than any man in existence, for the passage of the bill of abominations,—he fixed burdens on our backs, and we are called on to fix honors on his! What do these men take the people of North-Carolina to be? We cry out against the measure, but they say, take the man who indicted it on you. The old saying is, "I like the Treason, but I hate the Traitor."—The Van Burens reverse it: They say, we hate the measure, but we like the man for ourselves, we can say, we like neither.

We neglected to mention in our last, that William J. Alexander, Esq. had been placed upon the Jackson and Barbour ticket as elector for the district composed of the counties of Lincoln, Mecklenburg and Cabarrus.

We make the following extract, from a letter from a friend now on a visit to the White Sulphur Springs:

"On my way here, I visited Monticello. It is in a state of melancholy decay, and ruin. Enough, however, remains to convince you that it was once an earthly paradise. While there, I felt as if I was standing on consecrated ground.—The bones of the great Patriarch of Liberty, there deposited, will forever throw around it a hallowed feeling, and make it a spot dear to the friends of Liberty all over the world."

FOR THE WESTERN CAROLINIAN.  
Mr. Craige:

I here send you answers to the questions in Arithmetic submitted in your last paper. 1st. Question:—How many 4 horse waggon will it take to haul from the South to the North, the annual surplus revenue of the government, say 18 millions of dollars, and supposing the same to be in silver dollars, 16 to the pound, and each waggon to carry 3000 lbs?

Answer: It will take precisely 875 waggon; and the surplus for ten years will take 3,750 waggon.

2nd. Question: How long will it take 3 persons to count the same at the rate of 100 per minute, and how long will it take one person?

Answer: This question is rather indefinite, as it does not mention how many hours, in each day, are to be devoted to the counting. If 10 hours per day be so devoted, it will take the three persons 100 days,—and one person 300 days, allowing him two hours per day for resting, eating and taking grog.

3rd. Question: If these 18 millions of dollars were placed in a direct line touching each other how far would they extend?

Answer: This question like the 2nd one is indefinite, as it does not mention the width of a dollar.

According however to my measure the 18 millions will extend over 450 miles 100 yards, & 2 feet, 11 inches. I may be wrong in this last calculation.

JACKSON AND VAN BUREN  
TING, IN LINCOLN.

After previous notice, a large and respectable number of the citizens of Lincoln, friendly to the election of Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren, assembled at the Court House on Thursday evening, the 4th September, Col. John Hoke was called to the chair and Jacob A. Ramsour appointed secretary. After some preliminary remarks, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, a high regard for the patriotism and wisdom of Andrew Jackson has twice elicited our cordial support at the ballot boxes of our country: And, whereas, his administration shows that our most sanguine expectations were well founded and evinces to his friends and foes, that he possesses in an eminent degree the qualifications requisite to the discharge of one of the most important stations known to the world: And, whereas, Martin Van Buren is in sentiment and feeling identified with him, possessing talents of the highest order, and being a republican of the old Jeffersonian school and now a candidate for the Vice Presidency, nominated in all the democratic states and likely to receive in every quarter, the candid support of the friends of the present administration, therefore, Resolved, That we will unite in their support.

Resolved, That the friends of Andrew