

POLITICAL.

From the Norfolk Herald. TO THE HON. JOHN C. CALHOUN. No. 6.

I pursue the examination of your argument in favor of the Bank charter of 1816. The only questions (said you) were, under what modifications Banks were most useful, and whether the United States ought or ought not to exercise the power to establish a Bank. After a survey of the whole question, you came to the deliberate conclusion, that Banks were not to be dispensed with, and then you seized the position, that a National Bank was the best possible modification of the banking policy, and maintained, with an ability never before or since surpassed, that the Government had, and ought to exercise, the power to establish such an institution. It is in vain to seek, elsewhere, a more unequivocal commitment to the U. S. Bank than is here presented.

But let us see what were your opinions of the expediency of a Bank? As to the question (you said) whether a National Bank would be favorable to the administration of the finances of the Government, it was one on which there was no little doubt, that gentleman must excuse you, if you did not enter into it? Again, in your Speech on the Removal of the Deposites, Jan. 13th, 1834, you said:

But while I shall not condescend to notice the charges of the Secretary against the Bank, beyond the extent which I have stated, a sense of duty to the Institution, and regard to the part which I took in its creation, compel me to notice two allegations against it, which have fallen from another quarter.

It is said that the Bank had no agency, or at least efficient agency, in the restoration of Specie payments in 1817, and that it had failed to furnish the country with a sound and uniform currency, as had been promised at the time of its creation. Both of these allegations, I pronounce to be without just foundation. To enter into a minute examination of them, would carry me too far from the subject, and I content myself with saying that, having been on the political stage without interruption from that day to this—having been an attentive observer of the question of the currency throughout the whole period—that the Bank has been an indispensable agent in the restoration of Specie payments; that without it, the restoration could not have been effected; that the restoration of all the moneys of the country, and an entire depreciation of Bank paper, and that it has not only restored specie payments, but has given a currency more uniform between the extremes of the country, than was anticipated or even dreamed of at the time of its creation.

I will say for myself, that I did not believe, at that time, that the exchange between the Atlantic and the West, would be brought lower than two and a half per cent; the estimated expense then, including insurance and loss of time, of transporting specie between the two points. How much it was below the anticipated point, I need not state; the whole commercial world knows that it was not a fourth part at the time of the removal of the Deposites.

These sir, are strong admissions to the expediency of a National Bank. As a fiscal agent, its necessity was so obvious and essential, that you could not bring yourself even to the discussion of the point. Pray, is it not as "favorable to the administration of the finances of the Government" now as formerly? Has any change taken place in its capabilities for fiscal operation? You spoke then from experience—the experience of the thing from 1791 to 1811. Now, you have superadded to that, the yet stronger experience of the country from 1816 to 1836, during which period, as well as from 1791 to 1811, the finances were administered with the most perfect smoothness and ease, with the greatest possible despatch, and without a cent's cost or a cent's loss to the Government, while the business of the country went prosperously on. Besides this positive, you have before you a negative kind of experience. From 1811 to 1816, and from 1836 to the present time—the intervals of intermission of a National Bank—a dear lesson was taught the country—one that ought to teach it wisdom in all future time, and that should be kept constantly before the abstractionists of the present day.

During the whole time of the absence of a National Bank, the finances were in confusion, the whole currency disordered, and the business of the country paralysed. Now, sir, if in 1816 you believed a National Bank an indispensable fiscal medium, how is it, that with an increased and most instructive experience before you, you now give up the Bank as a fiscal agent? If its financial adaptation was a self evident proposition then, why is it doubtful now?

But at a later date—viz: in 1834—you reiterated your eulogium of the Bank. You not only claimed for it the credit of having effected the restoration of specie payments, but that it had reduced the exchanges between the remote sections of the country to a nominal amount, and had given the country a sounder and more uniform currency than its most sanguine friends had "even dreamed of at the time of its creation."

Well, sir, why will not a National Bank restore specie payments now? Why will it not again bring down exchange to a nominal amount? Why will it not once more give us a sound and uniform currency? Why will it not do now what it has twice done before? Sir, you spoke strict truth when in 1816, you declared it a self evident proposition that a National Bank was a good fiscal agent. Then it had for twenty years safely kept, transferred and disbursed millions upon millions of the public money, and through your widely extended country these important functions had been discharged with so much regularity and ease, that one was scarcely conscious of the going on of any fiscal operation. Since 1816, another Bank kept, transferred and disbursed more than 400 millions of the national revenue, without a moment's unnecessary delay, with-

out a groat's expense or the loss of a dollar to the Government.

And you as much spoke the truth when you said it had brought down the exchanges of the country to almost nothing. It had, in truth, revealed a new phenomenon in Exchange—that the cost of commercial remittance between remote sections might be reduced below the risk and cost of transportation of Specie, which, until the existence of the U. S. Bank, had constituted the natural rate of Exchange. A merchant in Boston could remit to his correspondent in New Orleans at less cost than he could send the Specie, and without any risk whatever—no small consideration in mercantile transactions, because the cost of insurance is saved. The fact is, every Merchant in the Union knows, that while the United States Bank was in operation, exchange was a mere nothing—hardly worth enumeration in fixing the price to be demanded of his customers for his goods. What is it now, I might stop to ask? A heavy item in the list of mercantile expenses, and of course, a heavy burden upon the consumer, who, after all, pays every tax, of whatever kind, that the merchant has incurred before him?

And when you so emphatically asserted that the Bank had blest the country with a sound and uniform currency, you did it but the simplest justice. So sound it was that a bill of the U. S. States Bank would purchase broad cloths in London or Liverpool, and there never was a day, after the Bank got well under way that a U. S. Bank note was not equal to Specie any where in the Union, no matter at what point it had issued. So uniform was it, that not only would a note of the late Bank pass current all over the Union, but its notes and drafts were actually better than specie. A Merchant in Norfolk, having a payment to make in New Orleans, had only to go to the Branch Bank in the Borough and purchase a draft on the Branch at the latter place, and he had where-with to pay his debt in New Orleans, something better than the same amount in Gold and Silver. The draft purchased of the Bank, would cost him but one fourth of one per cent. whereas had he to remit the Specie, the cost of transportation and insurance would be several per cent; or if he had to resort to a broker to obtain exchange on New Orleans, he would have to pay at the least the amount of the cost of transportation and insurance, for the individual dealer in exchange never charges less for his draft than the natural rate of Exchange, that is, never sells his drafts for a less premium than it would cost the remitter to send the specie. To make the proposition palpable, what would a draft of N. Orleans have cost while the Bank was in existence, and what would such a draft cost now when there is no Bank? In the former case, it would not exceed one quarter per cent. in the latter it could not be had for less than 5 per cent. nor could it be had even for that? Now the difference of exchange, in the two cases is just the difference in the value of U. S. Bank notes and Specie. It is most true, then, that a National Bank did furnish a sound and uniform currency indeed, as to be superior even to the precious metals.

Now, sir, that the Bank did effect these glorious results, I have your own high authority—your own most emphatic asseveration. I make you the witness to the country for the Bank. I produce your own positive and unimpeachable testimony in its behalf. And since it did, in past times, so inestimable service for the country, why is it now—to use your recent language of condemnation—"unconstitutional, inexpedient and dangerous?" What "change has come over the spirit of your dream?"

Sir, I hold you to your admissions in favour of the Bank. I demand, in the name of the country, how it is that you now so bitterly denounce a measure which you have said gave to the Government a good fiscal agent, to the country a sound and uniform currency, to its commerce a cheap and easy medium, and to all the great interests of the nation, prosperity? You must assign a satisfactory reason, or your present course in relation to the Bank must be divested of all its moral force.

A sound and uniform currency, Sir, is, as you know, the greatest of national blessings. It is indispensable to public prosperity and to private happiness. An easy medium of exchange, too, is another national blessing and individual good, particularly in a commercial, a confederated and widely extended country like our own. The Statesman who will secure once more for our beloved country these inestimable benefits, will merit, as he will doubtless receive, her warmest benedictions. You, Sir, who, in times gone by, stood forth a public benefactor, and by carrying through a National Bank, relieved your country from the evils of confused exchanges and a disordered currency, I invoke to come once more to the rescue. Give us your aid at this the moment of great national necessity; and if I invoke your assistance in vain, I turn with hope to a wiser, if not a more patriotic source—to an enlightened Congress and to a President, who I trust, will render his name illustrious in all future time by discarding all petty abstractions and yielding his approval to that measure of vast national importance, whose utility has been tested by time and experience, and which the popular will so loudly demands.

I may close the subject in my next. LOWNDES.

NO FARMERS AND PLANTERS.—The Subscriber will pay the highest Cash prices for ten thousand bushels of clean white Wheat, and will also take from five to ten thousand bushels of red. It must all be in merchantable order, and delivered at his Lumber House at Henderson. Those wishing to contract will, during his absence, call on Messrs. W. W. Vass & Co.

H. B. MONTAGUE.

The Subscriber will be ready, this Fall, to buy crops, or parcels of loose Tobacco to any amount, and should be pleased to see those wishing to sell. August 1, 1841. 65 law4w.

PLANTERS AND FARMERS.—The Subscriber will be ready, this Fall, to buy any quantity of loose Tobacco at his factory in Henderson. ROBT. B. SMILEY. August 1, 1841. 65-law4w.

REVENUE BILL.

In the House of Representatives, the engrossed bill in relation to duties and drawbacks coming up in its order, and the question being on the final passage thereof—

Mr. Prentiss said it was well known that, three weeks ago, he had offered a Resolution providing that the House and Senate should be taken on amendments submitted in committee upon this bill, and also upon the Bank bill. He had never been able to get up that Resolution, though he had frequently endeavored so to do. And what was the consequence, and what was now the spectacle presented? The consequence was that the sum of eight (and probably even of twelve) millions had been directed to be raised by imports, under a bill which had been hurried through with rash and indecent haste, and without the members being allowed to assign one solitary reason for the votes they had given. Not a single individual out of this House could tell how any one of the members had voted. Here was a bill imposing duties on articles which, in his section of country at least, it was supposed never would have been taxed; and yet no one was responsible for it, because, the moment the bill had come into the House, the previous question cut off all debate, and forbade any expression of opinion or sentiment on the part of any member.

He knew that in this matter he differed from a large majority of his political friends. He had regretted that it should be so. But he opposed, and so long as he had a seat on that floor, he would continue to oppose the principle which had been introduced, this session in legislating as they had done. He had no opportunity to express his sentiments, neither he nor any other member had had an opportunity of saying one word upon any amendment which had been offered; and he contended that the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Pickens) striking out the article of raw hides, (an article of which two and a half millions in value were imported into this country—was, of itself, of sufficient importance to be debated one day; yet not a word had been said upon it. And thus they were called blindly to vote upon the passage of a bill containing numerous items upon which they had not the privilege of opening their lips. And when the members of this House went home, and the question should be asked upon Coffee, the answer would be "Not I, not I, and not I." Who they were that had given such a vote was a matter not to be found out; and yet, if his vote were recorded in favor of the passage of the bill, it would be taken for granted that he had voted for all these propositions. No debate, no reasoning, no analysis had been allowed, and gross injustice had been done to the mercantile classes, without even allowing them to be heard through their Representatives. Not a word had been allowed on the important amendment offered by a member from Massachusetts, (Mr. Saltonstall), giving to men who had shipped cargoes in good faith under the last Tariff the poor permission to land them under that Tariff; and they had thus been subjected to an additional duty of twenty per cent.

He had made it a rule of his legislative life, (not now a very brief one, at least in the Legislature of Indiana,) where, on matters of this importance, a free discussion was not allowed—where he believed the legislation to be hasty, unjust, and contrary to the spirit of the Constitution, and of the House—to vote against it; and he would do so.

(A voice—"Agreed.") Mr. P. continued. The gentleman says "Agreed." Suppose he was not agreed, does he suppose that would make any material difference? (Loud laughter.) He (Mr. P.) presumed it amounted to about the same thing; whether the gentleman was agreed or not. He (Mr. P.) thought it had been sufficiently tested here, that on all these matters, he had pursued the course which he believed to be correct, without regarding the little popularity of the day, or caring what other gentlemen might say or think of his position here.

Mr. Stanley replied at some length to Mr. Prentiss. Mr. S. in the course of his remarks, expressed his surprise at the remarks which had fallen from the gentleman from Indiana. The gentleman got up here, not a very old man, and lectured this House, composed as it was of a large majority of his own friends, for passing a measure of more importance than all the other measures upon which they were called to act put together, with hot and indecent haste. This Mr. S. thought, was unbecomingly, highly unbecomingly—it was disrespectful to this House, and to every member of it. Mr. Prentiss explained. If he had used any language unbecomingly to the House, the Speaker would have called him to order. He Mr. P. had not intended to say anything disrespectful to the body. He spoke merely of what he conceived to be the haste and hurry with which this bill had been passed through; and if the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Stanley) had supposed that he (Mr. P.) had in any manner violated the sanctity of the proprieties of debate, he (Mr. P.) was astonished that the gentleman should not have called him to order.

Mr. Stanley continued. He had preferred taking his own course. But if, as the gentleman now intimated, he did not mean any disrespect to the House, he (Mr. S.) would pass over that matter. The resolution sounded the more harsh, coming as it did from one of our own friends. Could the House remember that, during the very last week, the gentleman from Indiana had offered a Resolution to take a measure out of Committee which his own friends the next day rescinded? Where was the gentleman's dread of hot and indecent haste then? The gentleman himself, without consultation with any one, so far as he (Mr. S.) knew, brought in that resolution.

Mr. Prentiss. It was handed to me by the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, who requested me to offer it.

Mr. Stanley continued. Very well, so be it. But the gentleman said not one of his responsibilities for the passage of this bill, now did we differ between this and the last session? The men who came forward here to vote money to pay the Van Buren debts, they were the men who were responsible for this measure. He took his share of that responsibility. He took it before the country, and wished he could take the share of the gentleman from Indiana. They were all responsible. Let the Whig party be responsible before the nation and before the world, not only for the votes which had been given, not only on these articles of tea and coffee, but for every other provision of the bill, and for all the acts which might be done at this extra session. How despised the base arguments that have been used in any other measures which had been voted for by a portion of the Whig party, that they were responsible, when the Van Buren party had the majority in this House. He despised it. Let the responsibility of all the measures of the Administration be fixed upon the party who had the majority; there it belonged, and there let it rest; and if they could not bear it, then let them go out of power, and sink into that low abyss of contempt into which the party just gone out had sunk; yes, let them go out of power, never again to return to it.

The gentleman said that no opportunity had been given to discuss the amendments. How was this? Had not the gentleman from New York objected to the withdrawal of the motion to strike out the enacting clause of the bill, for the very reason that it allowed a greater latitude of debate than could be extended under any other proposition.

The gentleman said that no opportunity had been given to commercial men to express their sentiments. Had not a letter been read from Boston stigmatising the legislation of this body as Mexican legislation, enacted without notice? Had not both the gentlemen from Massachusetts (Messrs. Saltonstall and Winthrop) addressed the committee and discussed the amendments? Did they not go as fully into the subject through the hour allotted to them as any other member? Did not the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Pickens) speak through his hour taking a wide range of observation, and selecting his own topics of debate within the hour? No one, no one. This was indignation for the long delay which had taken place in the first part of the session, and he should not blame himself for something over five minutes which he had occupied in replying to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana.

gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Gilmer.) That gentleman had spoken about Whig proscriptions of the President. He (Mr. S.) wanted to call upon the gentleman for his power of attorney—to show by what authority he spoke here for the President of the United States. He (Mr. S.) wished to know what proscription of the President, on the part of the Whig party, or what suppression of the freedom of debate, there had been. He had heard of none. The gentleman from Virginia, in the remarks submitted by him, had gone on and digressed every thing but the question before the committee.

Mr. Gilmer. When did I attempt or undertake to speak for the President, or for any body but myself? Mr. Stanley. I understood you to do so.

Mr. Gilmer. Then you misunderstood me; and I hope you will understand me better hereafter.

Mr. Stanley said the gentleman's remarks had borne that construction.

Mr. S. then proceeded to say (in reference to what he regarded the political indiscretions of certain gentlemen) that he had never seen the Whig party more united than it was at this time. There would always be differences of opinion amongst them; they belonged to the spirit of the party itself—to the freedom of thought and action which ever characterized that party. If gentlemen expected that they would be ruled as this country had been for years past, by a rod of iron, that they were to be proscribed and have their hands knocked off because they dared to think for themselves, they were mistaken. He liked this freedom of opinion; he liked to see a man oppose his friends even with indignity. He had heard of the honest exercise of his freedom of opinion. Such had been the case, and such always would be the case, when the Whig party had sway. He denied that there had been any proscription of the President by the Whigs, and he asserted that the Whig party at this hour, in this House, and in this country, regarded John Tyler with feelings of respect, admiration, and confidence. And all this talk about proscriptions was just such stuff as dreams were made of.

He thought he might say such much, and more he would not say. The country called on them for action, action. They had given the country some measures of relief and this was to be the crowning measure of all. For his own part, he expected hereafter to be proud of the humble part which he, in connection with gentlemen from all sections of the Union, had taken in consummating these measures. They had struggled hard—they had compromised much. He had himself borne much, and foreborne to speak more than he ever expected to forbear again. He regarded it as among one of the proudest privileges of his life that he had been an humble participant in these measures; and he hoped to live to see it written on their tombstones, that he was a member of the extra session of the 27th Congress. [Roars of laughter, especially from one side of the House.] Mr. S. continued. Let gentlemen laugh. The funds, he did not doubt, sometimes laughed in hell; and before the next four years had elapsed, gentlemen would laugh on the other side of their mouths. The Whig members of this Congress had not, he trusted, labored in vain. He hoped that this extra session was to be the commencement of a blessed Congress, to be signalized by the country, and by generations yet unborn, for having carried out these great and glorious measures. Mr. S. then, remarking that he had said nothing of a personal character which required answer, moved the previous question.

Mr. Prentiss appealed to Mr. Stanley to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Stanley declined.

Mr. Prentiss. Well, I shall have another opportunity to say what I have to say.

Mr. Stanley. I hope you will, and many of them. Mr. Wise made a similar appeal to Mr. S. Mr. W. said he would detain the House but a moment.

Mr. Stanley said he could not withdraw the motion. The gentleman from Virginia had occupied more time than any other member.

Mr. Alfrod rose and said he made a personal appeal to the gentleman from North Carolina to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Stanley. I cannot. I have already refused to do it for my own friends.

And the question was then taken on the demand for the previous question, and was decided in the affirmative: Ayes 110, noes not counted.

The Reporter informed Mr. S. that he said, in the haste of speaking, that "he hoped to live to see it written on our tombstones, that he was a member of the extra session of the 27th Congress." Mr. S. says, if he said this, he meant to say that he hoped not to die like a Loofooco, but to die the death of a righteous Whig, and then he could read inscriptions from another place.

person would have signed a bank bill if presented to him. But how could it be known; it was more correct. Mr. Madison had also signed a bill in 1816, but his argument in 1791 still remained unanswered and unanswerable. The objection of Jackson and Van Buren were strong expressions of opinion against the bank. And so, indeed, was that of Gen. Harrison, who had given an express opinion that Congress had no power to charter a bank; who had voted for Mr. Johnson's resolution to issue a *scire facere*, and even to repeal the charter without it. And as to the opinion of President Tyler, it was known to be decidedly against the constitutional power of Congress to establish a bank. The weight of Executive opinion, therefore, lay on the other side.

Mr. S. next proceeded to examine the judicial authority in favor of a bank, and he insisted that the decisions of the Supreme Court in its favor were operative only during the continuance of its charter, but had now no authority; and therefore Congress might treat the question of charter or no charter as an original question. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Sergeant) had said nothing of any decision in the opposite direction. He took no notice of the disclosures in the late Madison papers as to what had passed in the convention when the proposal to insert a bank power in the Constitution was argued and rejected.

Gentlemen insisted that public opinion now called for a bank. This argument was every where urged; but how was it supported? By what arguments? In the States the bank question was never raised. It had not been raised in North Carolina; and Mr. Badger, in a public speech, had refuted the assertion that Gen. Harrison was in favor of a bank; and denounced it as a false charge. Mr. S. here quoted the speech of Mr. Badger, and then the address of a Whig federal committee, which dwelt on the topics of extravagance, of a standing army, and of the public lands, but contained not a word about a bank. It could not, therefore, be inferred that the Whig vote for Harrison was a vote for a bank. Besides, when the Legislature of North Carolina had become Whig, though resolutions were introduced to instruct Senators and Representatives to vote for a bank, they were not passed, because the party had not power to carry them.

Mr. S. insisted that whenever the question had been directly put to the People, they had always decided against a bank. And even if public opinion were the other way, it would not prove that members of Congress had power to tax and act for themselves. If they had decided opinion on the constitutional question, were they not to be allowed to express it? It was held doctrine, not intended to operate within but without the walls of Congress. Mr. S. insisted he had a perfect right to treat this as an original question, and to act according to his own opinion. He then entered briefly into a consideration of the constitutional question; stated the distinction between specified and implied powers, and insisted that the latter rested upon their being necessary and indispensable to carry out the former. Gentlemen were disposed to judge of the Constitution, not so much from their own letters as from the measures they wish to carry under its sanction. Even the alien and sedition laws had once been considered as constitutional, though now would now venture to express such an opinion.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania had referred to the decision in 1791, and not to the powers in the Constitution. Mr. S. here read the members from the speech of Mr. Clay in 1811, against the Bank. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Sergeant), with his usual tact, had referred to a declaration by the old Congress that a bank was indispensably necessary to carry on the Government. But if they had been led to believe so by the results of the Revolution, why had they not expressed that opinion in the Constitution? It had been twice proposed in the Convention, and twice rejected. Mr. S. here quoted the Madison Papers, to show the opinions of Mr. Madison and Mr. King.

He declined touching on the expediency of chartering the bank, but made some remarks on the project of establishing a fiscal bank in the District of Columbia, which he considered an insidious and dangerous mode of evading the constitutional difficulty. The power of Congress to legislate exclusively for this District was strictly a municipal power, and could not be extended into the States. And even this power must be exercised in conformity with the Constitution. The bill allowed Congress to hold lands, tenements, and hereditaments, for which there was no power in the Constitution.

If Congress could legislate for the States through this District in one case, it could in all cases. If it could act in relation to a bank, it could also in relation to slavery. It might not only see free all slaves in the District, but might declare that all fugitive slaves from the States should be free the moment their feet touched the soil. This was glorious doctrine for Southern gentlemen to advocate! He did not charge the majority with any such design. But let the principle once be established, and put into the hands of fanaticism, and its onward career could never be resisted. He should resist it at the threshold; and placing himself on the ramparts of the Constitution, he should cling to its pillars with a death grasp, and if they fell, was content to be crushed beneath their ruins.

On the next day, Mr. WASHINGTON, of North-Carolina, replied to his colleague as follows: Mr. WASHINGTON, of North Carolina, next addressed the committee, and after a modest exordium, in which he referred to the fact that he was probably the youngest member upon the floor, proceeded to notice some of the positions taken by his colleague (Mr. Saunders) the day previous, (of whom he spoke in very friendly and respectful terms) in relation to the issues put forth before the people at the late election, and especially in their own State. He declined going into the expediency or constitutionality of the bank; being fully satisfied as to both. It was enough for him to know that a National Bank had been recommended by Hamilton, approved by Washington acted on by Jefferson in 1803 and 1805, sanctioned by Madison, and commended by Monroe, and that its constitutionality had been decided by the highest judicial tribunals. In 1791 and 1816, it had been justified on grounds of necessity; and the same arguments of the community, and to the numerous memorials in favor of a bank. He then turned to Mr. Saunders, who had denied that the Bank had the sanction of public opinion, especially in North Carolina. Mr. W. had come to a directly opposite conclusion; and he proceeded to lay down the facts on which his conviction rested. When the Bank was chartered in 1816, one of the Senators from North Carolina had voted for and one against it. While in the House nine Representatives had supported, and but three opposed it. One of the line had been Mr. Yancey, formerly a distinguished leader of the party opposed to the Bank, and a man who wielded a greater influence in that State than any man had ever done, except Nathaniel Macon.

Mr. W. then referred to resolutions in favor of the Bank, which had passed the North Carolina Legislature in the lower branch, the North Carolina Legislature in the Senate (on a vote to lay on the table) by 45 to 4. Again, in 1833, a State Bank having been established, its charter permitted it expressly to deal in the stock of the Bank of the United States, taking it for granted that such Bank would be again established. The same feature occurred in another Bank charter, granted in 1835 by a Legislature in which the democratic party had a large majority, and at the very time Gen. Jackson was carrying on his war with the Bank.

Mr. W. denied that these evidences of public sentiment had since been reversed. And here he vindicated Mr. Badger from the imputation, cast on him by Mr. Saunders, of having represented Gen. Harrison as utterly opposed to a Bank, by quoting more fully than Mr. S. had done the speech of Mr. Badger on that subject, in which he fully stated Gen. Harrison's certain given circumstances: while, on the other hand, if Mr. Van Buren had been elected no National Bank could be chartered without receiving his unequalled veto.

Mr. W. paid a handsome compliment on his distinguished fellow-citizen, and on his speech, of which 5,000 copies had been circulated, with profound effect on the public mind. He then referred to the gubernatorial election in North Carolina, in which Mr. Saunders had been a candidate, and in which, for the first time, both competitors had "taken the stump"; to their strenuous efforts; and to the final defeat of

his colleague by 8,000 votes. He produced and read a letter of Mr. Morehead, (the successful candidate) declaring that the issue made before the People was, was this, that the motto at the head of the leading Democratic paper was this—"The people against the Bank." A corresponding expression of public sentiment had also been marked by the election of Representatives in the State Legislature, in which, while 104 Whigs had been chosen, only 66 Democrats had and one of these was a Virginia abstractionist. [A laugh.] In regard to the Senators from North Carolina, they had been required, in a Legislative Caucus, favor of a Bank; otherwise they could not vote in As to the laying on the table of resolutions to instruct these Senators and to request the Representatives to instruct vote for a Bank; it was a result merely of the pressure of public business and the protraction of debate towards the close of a session. The resolution would have been carried by a large majority; but to save of time, it was patriotically dropped by its friends. And the following election showed how public feeling stood: instead of 8 Democrats and 5 Whigs in Congress, there were now 8 Whigs and 5 Democrats. The 8 Whigs represented a population of 435,000, the 5 Democrats a population of 219,000. After that could any man say that public opinion in North Carolina was against the Bank?

Mr. W. then went on to insist that the issue before the People had been pre-eminently on the Bank question. In support of which he stated a number of facts of a local nature.

Next noticed Mr. Saunders's objection to the bill, on account of its location in the District of Columbia. This he considered very extraordinary, especially in a strict constructionist and a State-right man. It never had been denied that Congress might charter a Bank in this District, of which it was the local Legislature. The bill provided that no branch should be established within any State, without the consent of the State. This surely was in strict conformity with State Rights doctrine. As to the objection that Congress could operate in the States, through the District, by the establishment of a Bank, it might be on the subject of slavery also, it was true that Congress might legislate for the District, but in so doing it could not interfere with vested rights. Slavery was recognized by the Constitution, and slaves as the property of the South could not be interfered with. And if Congress never should abolish slavery in the Southern States till those States gave their consent, little harm could be done.

Mr. W. said he loved his State with as strong an affection as any man; yet he was opposed to fighting her political contests into every debate, in season and out of season. It would have no other effect than to inflame the public mind and weaken the bonds of our happy Union. In a country so extensive, with so a diversity of climate, products, and local interests, it was not to be wondered at that there should be some sectional difficulties; but these, instead of being aggravated, should be met and overcome. Shall New England, asked Mr. W. the nursery of patriotism, piety, and of science, be sacrificed to the luxury of the West and of the South? No. Or shall the enormous abundance of the patriotic South be sacrificed to the engrossing enterprise and blind fanaticism of the North and the East? Whenever that question shall be presented, all the Northern hills will echo with a prompt and overwhelming negative. I have no fear of disunion; there is helm in Gilead for all our political evils; not in physical force—not in the strong arm of the law; but in the conservative influence of kind and mutual forbearance. This alone can soothe the violence of sectional animosities and jealousies. Let the bosom of every enlightened statesman swell with good will toward his brethren, and the demon of discord will quickly be dislodged from our happy country. Then every diversity in soil and climate, in interests and pursuits will be made to add more cord to the glorious bond which holds and secures our national Union. We shall that Union stand like a rock, and, while the waves of faction and of selfish emulation may dash themselves to pieces at its foot, its summit shall be crowned with a beacon-light, cheering the nations of the earth in their struggles for freedom.

Medical College of the State of South Carolina.—The 3rd Annual Course of Lectures in this Institution, will be resumed on the second Monday in November.

Anatomy by J. E. HOLBROOK, M. D. Surgery, E. GEDDINGS, M. D. Institutes and Practice of Medicine, S. H. DICKSON, M. D. Physiology, JAMES MOULTRE, M. D. Materia Medica, PENNY R. FROST, M. D. Obstetrics and Diseases of Women and Children, THOS. G. PRIOLEAU, M. D. Chemistry, C. U. SHEPARD, M. D.

The School for Practical Anatomy has been reorganized, and will be under the charge of Prof. Holbrook, assisted by Drs. DESAUSURE, CHAZAL, SINKLER, GAILLARD and RAVENEL.

Clinical Instruction at the College Hospital, Marine Hospital and Alms House. C. U. SHEPARD, Dean. Charleston, July 30. 65-4w.

JAILOR'S NOTICE.—A negro man, calling himself SAM, or SAM JOHNSTON, (no name matter which) was taken up as a Runaway Slave on the 21st day of July, near Plymouth, and committed to the Jail of Washington County. He says he is free, and belongs in the State of Virginia, Va., that he was raised by Mr. Jacob Duck, of said county, and shows a scrawl, badly written, purporting to be a pass to look for work, and certificate of freedom, and signed by Jacob Duck. Said Negro is 54 feet high, black, has thick lips, prominent breast, full large eyes, and his back appears much scarred by the lash. He has on a brown homespun frock coat, and low cloth shirt and trousers. The owner of said Negro is hereby notified, that unless he shall claim said Negro, by proving his property, and pay all charges accruing against him, with the cost of his Advertisement, within the time prescribed by law, he will be sold for the same, as the law directs, in such cases. R. B. DAVIS, Sheriff. By S. DAVENPORT, D. S. 65-6w.

NOTICE.—STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA—Caswell County.—Taken up by William L. Whittey, near the Rockingham line, West of Caswell Court-house, a stray Gelding. The Gelding is a Sorrel, about seven years old, both hind feet white, four feet six inches high, a natural trot, valued at forty dollars. WILLIAM LEE, Ranger. July 30, 1841. 65-2w.

You'll stock the country with Plano's. It is true that I have sold nearly THREE HUNDRED Plano Fortes in the course of a few years, and you would suppose that so large a number would have a tendency to stock at least some parts of the country; but so far from such a state of things as would naturally bring about a decline in the number of Plano's sold, I can truly say, that the quantity of Plano's sold by me this year has been unusually large, and you may have sold so many instruments in the same length of time as I have done during the present season. I ask no one to depend upon my word only for the quality of my Plano's, but to try them, and see what they will do. E. P. NASH, Petersburg, Va. July 1, 1841.

PERMIT me to place a Plano- Forte at your house upon trial at my own risk. If you see, you, I, observed, return it before paying for it. I will ask the above named privilege (and shall consider it a favor) of such as are desirous of purchasing a really good Plano Forte. An individual wanting a valuable article as a Plano, certainly would accept of such an offer as the one above. E. P. NASH, Petersburg, Va. May 3.