

## COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE PALLADIUM.

"The galled jade will wince."

Mr. Editor: In looking over "Liberty's" first communication, I came to the conclusion that he had the promissory symptoms of insanity upon him, and I would advise his friends to put him in a straight jacket, and confine him till after the August election. I am somewhat acquainted with the gentleman, and know that his disorder, generally, increases as the election approaches, till he will get "in a very bad way." Just before sitting down to write this communication, the last Palladium was handed me; I read the second communication of "Liberty," which goes to strengthen me in my former opinion.

"Liberty" thinks it is but just to compare the tales of Homespun with facts, "and see if they are not the production of some demagogue," &c. So do I think; but where are his facts? for, in the elegant language of "Liberty," the wool is so completely pulled over my eyes, that I have not been able to discover them.

"Liberty" seems to think "that National Republicans are not party Republicans." Now this is only a new edition of the old story, which they have told for years, and when they will quit it. Heaven only knows. That they are not "party Republicans," (the leaders I speak of,) nor any other kind of Republicans, is certainly true; but Federalists. It is a well known fact that the old federal party supported Mr. Clay for the presidency; but the name of Federal did not please them, therefore they took upon themselves the name of "National Republicans." I felt disposed to use the name which they as a party, What shall I call it? It will not do to say party. Ah! it just struck me: well, as I said, I felt disposed to use the name which they as a party chose to go by. But, sir, I think it a wrong application of the term, as regards some of the no party folks, (let it here be distinctly understood that I believe that there are many of the supporters of Mr. Clay true Republicans,) and I would as soon suspect Liberty unworthy of that title as some others. When I see men of information, (I have no reference to Liberty,) after all the testimony that has been adduced against the bank—its hostility to the government, &c., still clinging to her as they would to an idol, and try to hide her crimes, which she has committed against the American people, and use their utmost power to perpetuate her existence, at the risk of every thing that is or should be dear to the American citizen, I conclude that there is "something rotten in the state of Denmark."

Liberty thinks that I should have recollected Gen. Jackson's letter before I attacked others who believe in the doctrine therein contained. I did not attack those that believe in that doctrine. If I attacked any body, it was those political shufflers, who wish, by intrigue and management, to get themselves or their political friends into office, in spite of the will of the majority.

"But sir," says Liberty, "did the result of the last August election, compared with the state of parties at the last presidential election, warrant Homespun in making such an assertion, or in giving such precautionary advice?" What assertion, Mr. Liberty? Where was it made? and at what time?—please not to be so vague—point out the assertion. Suppose I did give advice, what has "the result of last August election" to do with it? If I thought, from present appearances, that there was danger, it would certainly "warrant" me in giving advice, however plain and uncouth, without having any reference to last August election. But, sir, let "Liberty" make any thing he pleases out of the result of last August election, and I will "toe the mark with him."

Liberty charges me with making "palpable misstatements." Now, who will believe him without he makes it appear? This he has not attempted, for this very good reason: he knew he could not do it; therefore he is the one that is guilty of misstatements. Again, Liberty says, "He advises them to do that," in principle, which he says flatly, "is not fair." No such thing; I never advised any body to proclaim a thing to deceive, and then act, secretly, to the reverse of it. This, sir, is what I said, "is not fair," and if Liberty's perception had not been very obtuse, he would have understood it so.

The way Liberty answers my question "in the Yankee style," is a "sin to David Crockett." In answer to my question, which is as follows: "If they [the Nationals] mean to vote on party ground, why not come out boldly and say so?" he says, "Sir, I would answer his question, in the Yankee style, by asking another. Does Homespun think that men who believe, that all the officers from the president, down to the lowest township officer, should exercise the duties of their office with a single eye to the duties prescribed for them by the constitution and law, without asking or knowing who voted for them, or who did not, will vote for a man who professes principles entirely the reverse, and purposes to act upon them, with a view to reward and punish all in their power?" I always thought that Yankees were like other folks, even if they had a shrewd way of answering questions, by asking others; that when they pretended to answer a question, if it was by asking another, they gave an answer to the question which was asked; not some one which was not asked. Suppose, for instance, I should ask Henry Hopkins, Esq., of Manchester, why do not the Claymen declare openly and aboveboard what they intend to do? And he should say, I will answer your "question in the Yankee style, by asking another." Do you think that men who believe so and so, will vote for a man who professes principles entirely the reverse? Would I receive an answer to the question asked? I think not. The least that can be made of it, sir, is an improvement on Yankee ingenuity; and I judge, that if "Liberty" had lived in Salem, in the days of witchcraft, and had invented this new mode of answering questions, he would have been burnt for a witch.

"Our whole country, and nothing but our country." As regards Liberty, and some others, he would have come higher the fact he had said, "our whole Clay, the unconstitutional land-bill, national fast, high low tariff, as he pleases, and all, and nothing but our Clay, so help us president Biddle."

The gentleman is altogether mistaken in presuming that I intend "to be up for office," or that I wish to have a particular friend elected, who has no merits of his own. But, sir, suppose that I do calculate to be up for office, all will agree that it is a good thing to know that I have not "merits," for men often render themselves very ridiculous by lacking this information: I once knew a candidate in this very "fix," who rode all over Dearborn county, exposing his own weakness, and just on the eve of the election his own political friends, who belonged to the same no party, led him off the track; because he lacked bottom.

"Liberty" exclaims O! tempora! O! mores! What of the times and manners, my dear sir! Have you run for office and failed? Are the people so stupid as not to see your claims? Cheer up Mr. Liberty, president Biddle may do something for you. But, sir, I would gently whisper one thing in your ear—that is, if you calculate to spout Latin, be a little more particular in the arrangement of your English sentences. I will cite one or two of the many errors in your first production, trusting that it will make you more careful in future. "Will vote for a man who professes principles entirely the reverse, and purposes to act upon them, with a view to reward and punish all in their power." "And as he knows that it won't do" &c. Now, if Homespun had committed

these errors, it would not have been wondered at; for he sets up no pretensions to learning. But, that a Latin scholar should be guilty of such gross mistakes, is certainly very strange.

Liberty supposes that I had two objects in view: the first I have noticed. "The second object, he says, is punishment for daring to assert the rights of freemen," &c. He has not the shadow of evidence, sir, for this charge. If I could be made to believe, that the policy which the National Republicans believe in, is the best, I would freely vote for them. But as I believe that the Bank of the United States is at war with the Government, and if re-chartered, will in all probability, subvert our free institutions, and destroy the fairest fabric of human wisdom; and, as I believe that Mr. Clay's land-bill is unconstitutional, and, if it should become a law, would prove dangerous to these United States, who could think, if they believe me a friend to my country, that I would wish to see our State Senate and Legislature filled with the advocates of these measures? I have not yet forgot the case of the Legislature of Virginia, and Mr. Rives. Suppose the friends of the administration should neglect their duty all over the Union, and the no party folks should get a majority, in every Legislature and Senate, of their own friends.—What would be the consequence? Why our Senators would be instructed, and our Representatives requested to vote for the re-charter of the Bank, and Mr. Clay's land-bill, &c. If I disagree with a man in politics, I conclude it is good reason why I should not vote for him; for if I vote for him, I vote that his policy may be carried into effect. How does it look in the Nationals, after they have said that the policy which the Democratic Republicans hold to, will ruin the country, to wish to compromise with, and vote for these enemies of their country? It proves, beyond doubt, that they are very reckless, or are not sincere. Will any true friend of his country, vote for an enemy to the same? I will briefly examine "Liberty" in a future No. of the Palladium.

HOMESPUN.

Manchester, April 7th, 1834.

### To the voters of Dearborn county.

FELLOW CITIZENS: In suffering my name to continue before you as a candidate for your suffrages, at the approaching August election, I deem it both ideious and due to all concerned, that I should say a few words on reference thereto at this early day. Having been a candidate before you a number of times already, and having as often failed, it will doubtless be asked by some—what does the man mean? Does he intend to be a candidate forever? Will he take no denial? Why then does he wish to stand another poll? Has he not already fairly tested his political strength? These inquiries demand of me severally a categorical answer. In the first place I answer that I do not intend to be a candidate forever. I will take a fair denial—that is all I ask. I have not as yet fairly tested my political strength, as will be easily made to appear. This then is why I wish to stand another poll—this then is just what I mean. To give over the pursuit under these circumstances, and have it said that I could not be elected, when at each succeeding election I have made a handsome advance, properly considered, & with prospects infinitely more flattering than on any former occasion, is not perfectly congenial with my feelings—is what few men would do. Reader, pause with care—weigh deliberately, and judge impartially upon the following expose, and then say whether I act prudently or imprudently in the course which I have marked out as the rule of my own action.—In '29 I stood a poll for Representative, and received just 200 votes—100 of which I received in Manchester. The year following I was re-nominated but declined, being at that time on the eve of departing to visit my parents and friends in Maine. While there I was put in nomination for associate judge and received 3 or 400 votes—in Manchester was second best. The whole was performed in my absence—I did not return until Nov. In '32 most unexpectedly the county convention gave me a nomination for seminary trustee. I should have declined but for the remonstrance of my friends, because I apprehended that the election would be both local and sectional—and so it was. Will any man suppose that 11 votes are all I could get in Laughery township at a fair poll? No. Consequently I was defeated. Add to this, it may well be doubted whether it was possible to have found another man in the county better known and more justly respected, and better qualified for the office, than the gentleman with whom I had to compete; and with all, he was one of my much respected friends, and is to this day, notwithstanding he was elected over me with a majority of from one to two hundred votes; yet, in our own district I received more than two to one votes. Last year I stood a poll for Representatives being the second time for that office, and received 835 votes—201 of which I received in Manchester; which, when compared with the first result, would stand thus: In Manchester, in '29, 100—in '33, 201—a little more than two to one.—In the county in '29 200—in '33, 835—a little more than four to one; in all, a net advance of 635. I now ask in candor is that not a pretty fair advance? Would any man who had ever suffered his name to be thus used abandon the field without a third effort? But let him be aware of the third.—Fellow citizens, am I too aspiring in calmly submitting my claims to your consideration once more? If so, proclaim it at the ballot box and it shall suffice, (for the present at least.) But should you decide in my favor, I frankly declare that I will not cling to office "with a life tenure." And here let me ask you to consider the disadvantages under which I laboured last year. As my luck would have it, there were two opposing candidates in my own township until the election morn. I say opposing, because none of us believed that more than one could be elected, consequently there was a laboured effort made in every part of the county to persuade the "sovereigns" that this man would run best, &c. Hence there was a division of sentiments; consequently, as the people thought me or Heustis the Manchester man, and the most likely to succeed, so they voted; and as a consequence, we were both defeated—that difficulty cannot exist this year—the question is fairly settled through the ballot box.

My friends, in the different townships, tell me that if it had been known that I should have run so well at home, I should have been elected without a remaining doubt. Others have had the frankness to say that they did not vote for me, because they had been made to believe that I was far from being the choice of Manchester. They were willing to give Manchester one Representative and no more, and they wished to go with her in the selection. What could be more honorable? This I believe to be the true merits of the case. I believe either Heustis or I should have been elected single handed. Both running was the misfortune. I deem it due to myself to say that I should not have been a candidate, had not Mr. H. assured me in the most unequivocal terms, that he should not be a candidate—we talked the subject over more than once. It was with surprise that I learned from him that he should "go ahead," a few weeks only before the election. I had then gone too far to decline, else I should have done so. I did not become a candidate to oppose him; nay I was his friend, and viewed him as being mine. In fine, it was bad management, without bad intention. We defeated each other unintentionally—let that suffice. I do not attribute my defeat to any political party management. Some of the most prominent Clay men were among my most zealous supporters. This I know to be a fact. For

instance in Jackson township I received every vote except six. There is, in all probability, three times that number of Clay men in Jackson; nor is it probable that every Jackson man voted for me. In fine, I was as well pleased with the result as I could well be, and not be elected. I suppose I should have liked that a little better, and not so very little neither. However an election this year would do me better, but there is some thing in getting it—that is the rub. Be that as it may the voluntary assurances which I continue to receive from different parts of the county since the last election, and not unfrequently from those who then opposed me, warrant the belief that if I can ever be elected, it will be the present year; and hence I wish to try my luck once more, and be done with it. This is a fair explanation of my case.

All of which is respectfully submitted,  
With respect A. J. COTTON.

Manchester, April 10, 1834.

P. S. Should the county seat question be made the pivot on which the election is to turn, that is to say, if there is to be two full tickets made out—the one pledged for and the other against "Removal," I shall postpone my claims, if any I have, until the storm is blown over. My friends, therefore, will make no effort in my favor until that point is settled, at which time they may hear from me again. I shall at present simply let my name remain until a direction is given to that subject. And should I see my way clear to "go ahead," I intend neither to write, say, or do much in an electioneering line of business—shall passively submit my case without much debate—shall diligently apply myself to the cultivation of my farm—let opposing candidates alone—speak evil of none, without just provocation, that is to blazon their real faults. If I am elected, let it be the free will offering of the people, founded upon my own humble merits, and on merit alone.

Will the editors of the "Statesman" and "The Rising Sun" give the above an insertion in their respective papers without delay? and oblige  
A. J. COTTON.

### United States Bank.

The vexed question of the removal of the Deposits has at length been settled in the House of Representatives—the "Previous Question" has been moved and sustained. In the National Intelligencer of the 5th inst. we have the proceedings in the House on the preceding day—of which we make a summary.

Columbus Sentinel.

The resolutions reported by Mr. Polk, from the Committee of Ways and Means, on the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the amendment to the same offered by Mr. WILDE (of Georgia), declaring the reasons of the Secretary unsatisfactory, being the question pending—at a quarter past 4 o'clock Mr. DUFFIE concluded a speech against the removal of the Deposits—in favor of the amendment, and in favor of the Bank; when Mr. MASON (of Virginia) obtained the floor, and moved the PREVIOUS QUESTION. The motion, which requires a majority of the House to second it was sustained—Yeas 114, Nays 105. Mr. VANCE, the hour being late, moved an adjournment—negative, Yeas 103, Nays 110. Other motions followed, which were also negatived.

The PREVIOUS QUESTION cutting off the amendment, Mr. WILDE inquired if it would be in order to move to suspend the rules of the House, so as to obtain a direct vote on his amendment.

THE CHAIR decided in the negative; and, further, explained that the question now was, only whether the Main Question itself would be susceptible of division, so as to get a separate vote on each of the resolutions.

"The Previous Question was now put as follows:

"Shall the main Question now be put?" and decided by yeas and nays as follows: Yeas 116, Nays 107. [The vote of the Indiana delegation on this question was as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Boon, Carr, Hannegan, Kinnard & Lane. Nays—Messrs. Ewing and McCarty.]

So the House determined that the Main Question should now be put.

The Main Question was then put, viz: will this House concur with the Committee of Ways and Means in the resolutions reported by them to this House?

Mr. WILDE demanded that the question should be divided, so as to take a vote separately on each resolution.

It was decided accordingly; and put, first, upon concurring in the first of the resolutions reported; viz:

"Resolved, That the Bank of the United States ought not to be re-chartered."

The question was decided by yeas and nays as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. John Adams, William Allen, Anthony, Archer, Beale, Bean, Beardsley, Beaumont, John Bell, Blair, Bockee, Boon, Bouldin, Brown, Bunch, Bynum, Cambreleng, Carmichael, Carr, Casey, Chaney, Chinn, Claiborne, S. Clark, Clay, Clayton, Clowney, Coffee, Connor, Cramer, W. R. Davis, Davenport, Day, P. Dickerson, D. W. Dickinson, Dunlap, Felder, Forester, Foster, W. K. Fuller, Fulton, Galbraith, Gholson, Gillet, Gilmer, Gordon, Grayson, Griffin, Joseph Hall, Thomas H. Hall, Halsey, Hamer, Hannegan, J. M. Harper, Harrison, Hathaway, Hawkins, Hawes, Heath, Henderson, Howell, Hubbard, Abel Huntington, Inge, Jarvis, R. M. Johnson, Noddiah Johnson, Cave Johnson, Seaborn Jones, Benjamin Jones, Kavanagh, Kinnard, Lane, Lansing, Laporte, Lawrence, G. W. Lay, L. Len, T. Lee, Leavitt, Lovall, Lucas, Lyon, Lytle, A. Mann, Jr., J. K. Mann, Madras, John V. Mason, Moses Mason, Jr., McIntire, McKay, McKinley, McLene, McVean, Miller, Henry Mitchell, Robert Mitchell, Mulenberg, Murphy, Osgood, Page, Parks, Parker, Patterson, Pearce, Peyton, Pierce, Pierson, Pinckney, Plummer, Polk, Rencher, Schenck, Schley, Shinn, Smith, Speight, Standifer, Stoddert, Sutherland, W. Taylor, W. P. Taylor, F. Thomas, Thomson, Turner, Turritt, Vanderpool, Wagener, Ward, Wardwell, Wayne, Webster, Whallon—135.

NAYS—Messrs. John Quincy Adams, H. Allen, John J. Allen, Chilton Allan, Ashley, Banks, Barber, Barnitz, Barringer, Baylies, Beatty, James M. Bell, Birney, Briggs, Bull, Burgess, Cagle, Chambers, Chilton, Choate, William Clark, Corwin, Coulter, Crane, Crockett, Darlington, Amos Davis, Deberry, Deming, Denny, Dennis, Dickson, Duncan, Ellsworth, Evans, Edward Everett, Horace Everett, Fillmore, Foot, Philo C. Fuller, James Graham, George Grennell, Hiland Hall, Gideon Hard, Hardin, James Harper, Hazeltine, Jabez W. Huntington, Jackson, William Cost Johnson, Lincoln, Martindale, Marshall, McCarty, McComas, McDuffie, McKennan, Mercer, Milligan, Moore, Pope, Potts, Reed, W. B. Shepard, A. H. Shepperd, W. Slade, C. Slade, Sloane, Spangler, Philemon Thomas, Tompkins, Tweedy, Vance, Vinton, Watmough, E. D. White, Frederick Whittlesey, Elisha Whittlesey, Wilde, Williams, Wilson, Young—82.

So the House concurred in the first resolution. The second resolution was then read as follows:—

"Resolved, That the public deposits ought

not to be restored to the Bank of the United States."

And decided by yeas and nays as follows: Yeas 119, Nays 104. [The Indiana delegation voted as follows on this question: Yeas—Messrs. Boon, Carr, Hannegan, Kinnard, Lane & McCarty. Nays—Mr. Ewing.]

The third resolution was then agreed to, as follows, by Yeas and Nays—Yeas, 117; Nays, 101. [The delegation from Indiana voted as follows on this question: Yeas—Messrs. Boon, Carr, Hannegan, Kinnard, Lane & McCarty. Nays—Mr. Ewing.]

The following is the third resolution: "Resolved, That the State Banks ought to be continued as the places of deposit of the public money, and that it is expedient for Congress to make further provision by law, prescribing the mode of selection, the securities to be taken, and the manner and terms on which they are to be employed."

The fourth was then read as follows:

"Resolved, That, for the purpose of ascertaining, as far as practicable, the cause of the commercial embarrassment and distress complained of by numerous citizens of the United States, in sundry memorials which have been presented to Congress at the present session, and of inquiring whether the charter of the Bank of the United States has been violated, and also what corruptions and abuses have existed in its management; whether it has used its corporate power or money to control the press to interfere in politics, or influence elections, and whether it has had any agency through its management or money, in producing the existing pressure, a select committee be appointed to inspect the books and examine into the proceedings of the said Bank, who shall report whether the provisions of the charter have been violated or not, and also what abuses, corruptions, or malpractices have existed in the management of said Bank, and that the said committee be authorized to send for persons and papers, and to examine into the affairs of the Bank and Branches; and they are further authorized to visit the principal Bank, or any of its Branches, for the purpose of inspecting the books, correspondence, accounts and other papers connected with its management of business; and that the said Committee be required to report the result of such investigation, together with the evidence that they may take, at as early a day as practicable."

And decided by Yeas and Nays as follows—Yeas 174, Nays 41. [On this question the Indiana delegation voted all in the affirmative.]

So the House concurred in the Fourth Resolution.

Mr. POLK moved that the Committee consist of seven members; which was agreed to.

Mr. WILDE asked consent to offer a 5th resolution, declaring the reasons offered by the Secretary insufficient and unsatisfactory.

Objections being made he moved to suspend the rules.

Mr. POLK thereupon moved to adjourn—on this Mr. WILDE demanded the Yeas and Nays, which were taken as follows—Yeas 123, Nays 70.

So the House at half past seven adjourned to Monday next.

### THE PRESSURE.

THE LONDON TIMES, one of the commanding journals of England—one which only looks to America to guard the interests of Great Britain—takes the view we insert below, of the state of things in this country. The whole object of the editor is explained by this concluding remark of the elaborate article, which is too long and irrelevant in some particulars, to be given entire. The editor says:

"It must be allowed, that it is extremely proper to direct proper attention to this subject, which will be of some service, if it only checks the mania for speculation in the foreign funds, which now prevails at the Stock-Exchange."

From this, and the tenor of what we extract below, it is evident that the Times is disposed to prevent investments of capital in American stocks, and in this way contributes to the design of the United States Bank in oppressing this country to serve British interests.

But we would invite attention particularly to that part of the article of the Times which explains the panic and distress under which this country now suffers. The keen-sighted speculators of the London money-market, have no political party-interest to induce them to disguise the cause of the present state of things here, and they at once point to it, that the ultimate consequences may be anticipated, by those interested abroad. The Times unhesitatingly indicates the true origin of the evil. It is not, it tells us, "the quarrel between the United States Bank and the Government." No—that is "but the match to a heap of combustible matter, accumulated by over issues of paper money, and a long series of other injudicious banking operations." And the editor directly alludes to the extraordinary extension of the United States Bank's loans from forty-two to seventy millions, which, together with its sudden revulsion, has produced the irregular action complained of in our moneyed concerns, and all the mischief that the Bank Orators are daily deprecating.

The foreign editor does not choose, however, to enter into the motives of the Bank Managers, for this extraordinary movement. He does not choose to inform his readers that this convulsion in the commercial world, is the consequence of a determination on the part of the money changers, to give a President to a nation of freemen—to enlarge and perpetuate their own great corporate privileges—and to superadd to their power over the currency, a power over the Government of the country. The comment was unnecessary. The intelligent every where must see, that the alliance into which the Bank has entered with the political opposition to our Government and its principles, is the source of all the mischiefs, which the confederates are now every way interested to impute to the Chief Magistrate who has so far defied their joint machinations.—Globe.

### THE MONEY MARKET.

The possible consequences of the crisis in the United States to this market, continues to be a subject of much discussion, and some anxiety in the city. A view of it will, therefore be useful, in letting the public, as well as the initiated, know something of the real state of the case. In general, the impression is, that the quarrel between the U. S. Bank and the Government, is the sole cause of the panic, but this is an error: it merely applied the match to the heap of combustible matter, accumulated by over-issues of paper money, and a long series of other injudicious banking operations.

One fact alone is sufficient to show this, when it is stated that one establishment, the United States Bank above mentioned, increased its issues of notes between the end of the year 1830, and the month of February in the year 1832, from \$12,000,000 to 70,000,000. Within that interval, a mania commenced in New York, Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia and the other large cities of the Union only to be paralleled by our own bubble-year in 1825. Rail-roads, canals and banks, were, however, the favorite objects of speculation. In August 1831, a prospectus was issued in Philadelphia for a new bank, with a capital of \$1,000,000, when such was the eagerness to obtain subscriptions in it, that men had their coats torn from their backs, and women (for they also partook of the mania) fainted from the extreme pressure of the crowd. At this time no names were given, no list of directors for the new bank was published, but the subscribers were to put their names, and the number of shares they wanted, into a letter box, in a house fixed upon for the purpose. On this occasion, the subscriptions amounted to 40,000,000 of dollars, that is, to ten times the capital proposed to be raised. With the additional supplies of paper, however, from the U. States and other banks, all went on smoothly enough, till the removal of the Government deposits from the former, and the subsequent differences, compelled the whole of them to contract their issues suddenly to an enormous extent, and to call in the greater part of the outstanding engagements with them. This was the commencement of the crisis. Nothing was heard on all sides but the cry of ruined speculators, making up their accounts as well as they were able, and meetings of directors of the different bubble companies to make arrangements for winding up and abandoning them. Next began the action of this state of things on the solid and substantial undertakings with which the Union abounds, and on the manufacturing and mercantile interests. Money had become so scarce that it was not to be had but on the ruinous terms of 2 or even 3 per cent. monthly, in consequence of which all business was paralyzed. Men of real credit and substance prepared themselves to weather the storm by shipping off what goods they possessed to England and the continent of Europe, in order to obtain specie in return for them, at the same time sending out orders to stop all purchases of manufactured and other goods in this country and elsewhere. Bills on London were so scarce that they fell from 8 to 9 premium to par—a circumstance which has not occurred for 20 years before. Besides these, large amounts of inscriptions in the stock of the different States of the Union have been sent off to Europe for the purpose of borrowing money on that security. In fact, there are no means of raising money abroad which have not been resorted to. The calculation of persons conversant with American business is, that specie to the amount of from \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 must be imported into the United States before affairs can be restored to their natural level.

The Committee appointed to investigate the conduct and condition of the Bank, under the 4th resolution of the Committee of Ways and Means, which passed by a vote of 174 to 41, are Messrs. Thomas, of Maryland, Chairman; Everett, of Massachusetts; Muhlenberg, of Pa.; Mason, of Virginia; Ellsworth, of Conn.; Mann, of New-York; and Lytle, of Ohio. The gentlemen have a Herculean task before them. They are appointed by the fiat of an immense majority of the Representatives of the people, and have the eyes of the nation fixed upon them. The Government having no Representatives in the Board of Directors, in consequence of the course of the Senate, the responsibilities of the Committee, and the difficulties incident to the performance of their duties, are immeasurably increased.

Globe, April 8.

The state loan of a little more than \$720,000, was taken on Tuesday, by Mr. Moss of Philadelphia, acting as agents for the Rothschilds, of London.—The premium given, is one-fourth of one per cent., or two dollars and fifty cents for a thousand dollars. The premium promised by Dr. Burden on the same loan, was thirteen and fifty-one hundredths per cent. The premium now received, is about \$1,823—making a loss to the state of more than thirteen and a quarter per cent., or a portion more than \$97,564. It is said, that the Messrs. Allens, who purchased the loan of Dr. Burden, will pay the difference to the state. Whether they are obliged to do it, we do not know.—Harrisburgh Intelligencer.

Mr. CALHOUN's plan of a Specie Currency Bank, as far as we can form an idea of it, is reducible to an identity of principle with that of General Jackson; for if all notes of a less denomination than \$20, be banished from circulation, the amount of the Bank Notes about will be very inconsiderable, so much so, as to render the business of banking, if not altogether unprofitable, so very limited as to destroy its monopoly, and consequently its gains. We infer that, the basis of Mr. Calhoun's plan is the State Rights doctrine; in contradistinction to the old established federal principle, which gives the power to the general government, to charter a National Bank. This is what we always anticipated, that the principle of State Rights common to General Jackson and the Southern States, would produce a union of sentiment and action, inimical to the re-charter of the existing institution. Properly viewed, in relation to the excessive issues of State Bank paper, and its perfect rottenness, when under the pressure of a demand for specie; Mr. Calhoun's plan appears highly eligible; but we must confess, it strikes a fatal blow at the principle of Federal authority, which sustains a Bank of the United States! For the people, and the productive classes, it promises a more equitable reward for their labor, and less fluctuation in the nature of property.—National Banner.

The York, Pa. Harbinger of Saturday week says, "On Tuesday last, a colored man, taken up on a runaway, and confined in the jail of this place, under an impression that if his master got him, he would be sold to Georgia, made his way to the wood cellar, seized an axe, and very deliberately chopped off his left hand at the wrist; his reason for this savage act, was, that he was determined not to be a SLAVE any longer."

A Bill has been introduced into the House of Representatives of the United States, by Mr. SLADE of Illinois, authorizing an appropriation of ninety thousand dollars, for the improvement of the great western "Thoroughfare and United States" mail route between Louisville and St. Louis.

Pauli Ind. Patriot.

The net proceeds of the post office in Indiana, during the year 1833, as given in a letter from the Post Master General in answer to a resolution of the House of Representatives, is \$18,448 cents.

Columbus Chronicle.