

never entered into the head of any man—never, never, (laughter and cheering.) What is very unusual in the Constitution, it has placed a negative on all other purposes for the exercise of this power than those particularly enumerated; and then follow those golden words in the Constitution, reserving to the States the appointment of officers and then disciplining of the militia. That's it! (Cheers)—"Yes, that's it!" Read this clause, and then read in Mr. Poinsett's project that the militia are to be trained by the President! (Shouts) Look on this picture and on that. I do Virginia no more than justice, when I say that she first held upon this monstrous project, and has continued to denounce it, till she has made its author's heart sick, (cheering,) and she don't mean to pardon it even now. (No, no!)

As to the Sub-Treasury, the subject is worn out. It is almost empty as the Treasury itself. (laughter and cheers.) I had the other day the honor to address an assemblage of the merchants of New York. I asked them among other things, whether all this eternal cry about a separation of Bank and State, was not all mockery and humbug, and ten thousand merchants, intricately acquainted with the whole subject, cried, "yes, it is!" The fact unquestionably is, that the funds of the Government are just as much in the custody of the Banks at this moment, as they ever were; yet at the same time, I believe that under that law, there does exist at Washington, a vast power to stop at its pleasure, all the solvent Banks in the community. Such is the opinion every where held by the best informed men in the commercial parts of the country.

There is another expedient to augment Executive power quite novel in its character. I refer to the power conferred upon the President to select from among the appropriations of Congress, such as he may suppose the state of the Treasury most to justify, and may give or withhold the public money accordingly. This is certainly a marvellously democratic doctrine. Do you remember the emphasis with which Mr. Jefferson expressed himself on the subject of specific appropriations? The law, as it now stands, requires them to be specific. If Congress appropriate so many dollars for building of ships, no part of the money may be applied to the pay of sailors or mariners. But how has this legal provision been treated? The restriction remains in the statute as it did before—the appropriations are specific still—but then a specific power is given to the President, to dispense with the restriction—and thus one specific is set against the other. (Laughter.) Let this process be carried but one step farther and although there may be a variety of appropriations made by Congress, yet, inasmuch as we have entire trust and confidence in the executive discretion, that the President will make the proper selections from among them, therefore, be it enacted, That what little money there may be at any time be found in the Treasury, the President may expend very much as according to his own pleasure. (Loud laughter.)

There is one other topic, I must not omit.—I am now endeavoring to prove that of all men on the face of the earth, you of Virginia, the descendants and disciples of some of the greatest men of the revolution, are most called to repudiate and to condemn the doctrines of this administration. I call upon you to apply to this administration all that body of political truth which you have learned from Henry, from Jefferson, from Madison, from Wayne, and that whole constellation of revolutionary worthies, of whom you are justly proud, and under this light to examine and to say whether this present only Democratic administration are the favorers of civil liberty and of State Rights, or the reverse. And, in furtherance of this desire, I call your attention to the conduct of the President, of the Executive Departments, and of the Senate of the United States, in regard to the right and practice of the States to contract debts for their own purposes. Has it occurred to you what a deadly blow they have struck at the just authority and rights of the States? Let us follow this matter out a little. In the palmy times of the Treasury, when it was not only full but overflowing with the public money, the States to a very considerable extent, engaged in works of Internal Improvements, and in consequence of doing so, had occasion to borrow money. We all know that money can be had on much easier terms on the other continent than on this; hence the bonds of the States went abroad and absorbed capital in Europe, and so long as their credit was unimpaired for the most part by very reasonable rates. During this process, and while a number of the States had their State securities in foreign market, the President of the United States, in his opening message to Congress at the commencement of the last Session, comes, out with a series of the most discouraging and most disparaging remarks on the credit of the States.—He tells Congress that the States will repeat what they have done, and that they will find it difficult to pay the debt they have contracted, and this official language of the Chief Magistrate to the Legislature goes out into the very market where these State bonds are held for sale. Then comes his Secretary Mr. Woodbury, with a report in the same strain, giving it, as his opinion, that the States have gone too far in this assumption of liabilities. But the thing does not stop here.—Mr. Benton brings forward a resolution in the Senate, declaring that the General Government ought not to assume these debts of the States—that resolution is sent to a committee, and that committee make a report upon the subject as long as yonder bridge—though not, I believe, as much travelled or as often gone over—the whole object and tendency of which is, to disparage the credit of the States, and then Mr. Grundy makes a speech upon it. What had Mr. Benton or Mr. Grundy to do with the matter? Were they called on to guarantee the debts of Virginia or of Maryland? (laughter.) Yet, the effect very naturally and inevitably was to depress the value of State securities in the Foreign market. I was in Europe at the time. My own State had her bonds in that market; and what did I see? The most miserable, pitiful, execrable lubrications taken from the public presses in New York, endeavoring to prove that the States had not sovereignty enough to contract debts. Those wretched productions declared that the bonds issued by the States of this Union were all void; that they were no better than waste paper, and exhorted European capitalists not to touch one of them. These articles, coming as they did, from this side of the water, were all seized on with avidity and put into circulation in the leading journals all over Europe; at the same time, the administration presses in this country, unrebuked by the Government, put forth arguments going to show that Virginia has no authority to contract a debt in the name and on the credit of the Commonwealth; that Massachusetts is so completely shorn of every particle of sovereignty, whatever, that she can issue no public security of any kind on which to borrow money! And this the doctrine of State Rights! Well, gentlemen, I was called on to meet this question, and I told those who put to me the enquiry, that the States of the American Union were, in this respect just as sovereign as any of their States in Europe. I held a corres-

pondence on the subject, which was published at large; and for that, yes, for defending State Rights before the face of all Europe, I have been denounced as one who wants the General Government to assume the debts of the States; as one who has conspired to buy up British Whigs with foreign Gold! (Loud laughter and cheering.) All this, however, has not ruffled my temper. I have seen it all with composure. But I confess there is one thing which has disturbed the serenity of my mind. It is what appears to be a studied attempt on the part of this whole administration, including its head, to fix a spot upon the good name of the early founders of our Constitution. Read the letter of the President to some of his friends in Kentucky, who he calls "the entire Democracy of Kentucky." I should like much to know what constitutes the Democracy of a State. These good friends of the President write to him that the entire Democracy of the State is with him and he writes back how glad he is to hear that such is the fact. The State comes to the vote, and two-thirds of the People of the State are found against him; yet still he clasps to his breast, with exultation, the "entire Democracy of Kentucky!" (Great laughter and cheering.) And so it will be a month hence, Gen. Harrison will have been elected by a simultaneous rush of the free voters of the whole Union; yet Mr. Van Buren will continue to clasp to his embraces "the entire Democracy" of the country. Be this as it may, he does in that letter, ascribe to President Washington, in 1789, and to Mr. Madison, in 1816, corrupt motives for their public conduct. I may forgive this, but I shall not forget it. I ask you to read that letter, and one other written on the occasion; and then, if it comes in your way, I ask you to peruse an address put forth by the Administration members of the New York Legislature. What do you think they say? You, countrymen of Jefferson and of Madison, of Henry, of Wythe, of the Lees, and of a host of kindred spirits of the same order—you, who inherit the soil and the principles of those men who shed their blood for our national independence—what do you think they say of your fathers, of my fathers? Why, that in all their efforts and sacrifices in that great struggle, they meant, not independence; not civil liberty; not the establishment of a Republican Government; but merely to transfer the Throne from England to America, and to be themselves Peers and Nobles around it. Does it disturb the blood of Virginians to hear language like this? (Cries of yes, yes, mingled with cheering.) I do say that this attempt to scorch the fair, unspiced reputation of our ancestors—but no, no—they cannot scorch it; it will go through a hotter furnace than their detraction can kindle, and even the snell of fire shall not be upon their garments. Yet it does raise one's indignation to see men, certainly not the greatest of all benefactors of their country, thus attempt to scorch the fame of men both then and ever since universally admitted to have been among her greatest and her best of friends. (Cheers.)

While speaking of the attacks of this Administration on State Rights, I should not do my duty if I omitted to notice the outrage recently perpetrated on the most sacred rights of the State and People of New Jersey. By the Constitution of the United States, New Jersey like the other States is entitled to have a certain quota of Representatives in Congress, and she chooses them in their various districts in the manner she thinks fit. The right to have a specific number of Representatives is a State Right under the constitution. Under the Constitutional guarantee of this right, New Jersey sends up to the House of Representatives her proper number of men. Now I say that, by universal principles, although Congress be the judge in the last resort of the election, return and qualification of her own members, those who bring in their hand the prescribed evidence of their election, by the People of any State, are entitled to take their seats upon the floor of that House and to hold them until disturbed by proof preferred on general petition. That this is so, must be apparent from the fact that those members who voted them out of their seats possess no better or other means of proving their own right to sit and to vote on that question, than that which by any one of those whom they exclude.

Were there other States situated precisely in this respect as New Jersey, would it not be as fair for the New Jersey members to vote these representatives out of the Representative Hall as it was for them to vote her's out? That I think is Virginia law—it is at least plantation law, and that is very good law.—That until the House is organized, he who has the evidence of his return as a Representative elected by the People of his district, is entitled to take his seat. But the Representatives of New Jersey, with their evidence in their hand, were voted out of their seats—their qualifications, while the evidence was still under examination, were voted in, and immediately gave their complacent votes for the Sub-Treasury bill.

Gentlemen, I cannot forget where I am. I cannot forget how often you have heard these subjects discussed by older hands than mine, (cries of no, no—none more able—go on—go on.) I will not further dwell upon these topics. The time has come when the public mind is nearly made up—and very shortly about to settle these questions together—with the prosperity of the country for many years to come. (Cheers.) I am only desirous of keeping myself to the line of remark with which I have commenced. I say then that the enemy has been driven to his last citadel. He takes to himself a popular name, while beneath its cover he fires all his abuse upon his adversaries. That seems to be his chief mode of warfare. If you ask him what are his pretensions to the honors and the confidence of the country, his answer is, "I am a Democrat!" But are you not in arms against Mr. Poinsett's bill? The answer still is, "I am a Democrat, and support all the measures of this Democratic Administration." Yes, but what is that? "I am a Democrat." But do you approve of the turning out of members from New Jersey? Oh yes, because the words are written on our banner (words actually placed on one of the Administration flags in a procession in Ohio.) "Democracy scorns the Broad Seal of New Jersey."

My friends, I only desire that the professions and principles of this Administration may be examined. We are coming to those times when mere professions can no longer deceive. Virginia has once been deceived by them—but that day's past, times are coming—they are, I trust just at hand—when that distinguished son of Virginia, that eminent and patriotic citizen who has been put in nomination for the Chief Executive office under this Government will be elected by the unthought, unconstrained suffrage of his countrymen. (cheers.) To that event I look forward with as much certainty as to the duration of his life.—(immense cheering.)

My acquaintance with the feelings and sentiments of the North has been extensive; and I believe that from Pennsylvania, East, New Jersey, and New York, and the whole of New England, with the solitary exception probably of New Hampshire—I say, I have not a doubt that the whole country will go for the election of William Henry Harrison for the Presidency.—

(Cheering.) Of my native State—New Hampshire, I shall always speak with respect. I believe that the very foundations of her granite hills begin to shake; (cheers) indeed my only fear for her is, that she will come into the great family of her sister States, only when her bid will be no longer needed. (laughter and cheers.)

Fellow Citizens: We are on a great march to the triumphal victory of the principles of liberty over executive power. If we do not accomplish it, the future dawn, appears to me full of darkness and doubt.—If the American people shall sanction the course and the principles of this Administration, I for one, though I have been thought hitherto of rather a sanguine temperament, shall begin not a little to despair of the republic. But I will not despair of it. The public mind is aroused, men are beginning to think for themselves, and when they do this they are not far from a right decision. There is now an attempt on the part of the Administration, who seem beginning at length to fear for the perpetuity of their power, to excite a feeling of acrimony and bitterness among neighbors. Have you not seen this particularly of late in the Administration papers? Be above it. (Cries of *we will—us are*, mingled with cheering.) Tell your neighbors that we are embarked in one cause, and that we must sink or swim together. Invite them not in a taunting, but in a generous and a temperate spirit, to come forth and argue the great question of the day, and to see if they can give good and solid reason, why there should not be a change. Yes, a change. I said when I was in Baltimore, and I repeat here, the cry, the universal cry, is for a change. (cheers) However well many may think of the motives and designs of the existing administration, they see it has not succeeded in securing the well-being of the country, and they are for a change. Let us revise nobody—let us repeal nobody. They desire but light; let us give it to them. Let us discuss with moderation and coolness the great topics of public policy, and endeavor to bring all men of American heart and feeling into that I sincerely believe to be, the true AMERICAN CAUSE. How shall I—Oh! how shall I—express to you my sense of the obligation which rests upon this generation to preserve from destruction our free and happy Republican institutions? Who shall spread dissensions among us? Are we not together under one common Government to obtain which the blood of your fathers and of mine was poured out together in the same hard-fought fields? Nay—does imagination itself, in its highest flight, suggest any thing in the form of political institutions, for which you would exchange these dearly-bought institutions of our own? (Shouts of "No, no!")

For my part, having now arrived at the period of life when we begin to reflect upon the past, I love to draw around me in thought, those pure and glorious spirits who achieved our revolution. I cannot find a deeper or more fervent sentiment in my heart, than that these precious institutions and liberties which we enjoy may be transmitted unimpaired to the latest posterity—that they may terminate with the termination of all things earthly.—when the world itself shall terminate.—

When rapin flames the realms of ether glow,  
And Heaven's last thunders shake the world below.

NOTE.—The following is the passage to which Mr. Webster referred in a previous part of his speech:  
Extract from Mr. Webster's speech in reply to Mr. Hayne, January 21st, 1850.

At the very first Congress, petitions on the subject of slavery were presented, if I mistake not, from different States. The Pennsylvania society for promoting the abolition of slavery, took a lead, and laid before Congress a memorial, praying Congress to promote the abolition of such powers as it possessed. This memorial was referred, in the House of Representatives, to a select committee, consisting of Mr. Foster of New Hampshire, Mr. Gerry of Massachusetts, Mr. Huntington of Connecticut, Mr. Lawrence of New York, Mr. Lincoln of New Jersey, Mr. Hardy of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Parker of Virginia—all of them, sir, as you will observe, Northern men, but the last.—This committee made a report, which was committed to a committee of the whole House, and there considered and discussed on several days; and being amended, although without material alteration, it was made to express three distinct propositions on the subject of slavery and the slave trade. First, in the words of the Convention, that Congress cannot, prior to the year 1805, prohibit the migration or importation of such persons as any of the States then existing should think proper to admit; second, that Congress had authority to restrain the citizens of the United States from carrying on the African slave trade, for the purpose of supplying foreign countries. On this proposition our early laws against those who engaged in that traffic, are founded. The third proposition, was that Congress should, at the present question, be expressed in the following terms:

Resolved, That Congress has no authority to interfere in the emancipation of slaves or in the treatment of them in any of the States—it remaining with the several States alone to provide rules and regulations therein which humanity and true policy may require.

This resolution received the sanction of the House of Representatives so early as March, 1790. And now sir, the honorable gentleman will allow me to remind him, that not only were the select committee who reported the resolution, with a single exception, all Northern men, but also that of the members then composing the House of Representatives, a large majority, I believe nearly two-thirds, were Northern men also.

The House agreed to insert these resolutions in its Journals, and from that day to this, it has never been maintained or contended that Congress had any authority to regulate or interfere with the condition of slaves in the several States. No Northern gentleman, to my knowledge has moved any such question in either House of Congress.

The fears of the South, whatever fears they might have entertained, were allayed and quieted by this early decision, and so remained until they were excited afresh without cause, but for collateral and indirect purposes. When it became necessary, or was thought so by some political persons, to find an over-riding ground for the exclusion of Northern men from confidence and from lead in the affairs of the Republic, then, and not till then, the war was raised, and the feeling industriously excited, that the influence of Northern men in the public councils would endanger the relation of master and slave.

For myself I claim no other merit, than that this gross and enormous injustice toward the whole North, has not wrought upon me to change my opinion as to my political conduct. I hope an able and illustrious man, who has been the victim of injury and false imputations. Unjust suspicion and undeserved reproach, whatever pain I may experience from them, will not induce me, I trust, nevertheless, to overstep the limits of constitutional duty, or to encroach on the rights of others. The domestic slavery of the South, I leave where I find it—in the hands of their own Governments. It is their affair, not mine.

I go for the Constitution as it is, and for the Union as it is; but I am resolved not to submit in silence to accusations, either against myself individually, or against the North, wholly unfounded and unjust; accusations which impute to us a disposition to evade the constitutional compact and to extend the power of the Government over the internal laws and domestic condition of the States. All such accusations, wherever and whenever made, all insinuations of the existence of any such purpose, I know and feel to be groundless and injurious.—And we must trust to those whose integrity of

heart and magnanimity of feeling will lead them to a desire to maintain and disseminate truth, and who possess the means of its diffusion with the Southern public, and we must leave it to them to disabuse that public of its prejudices. But in the mean time, for my own part, I shall continue to act justly, whether those towards whom that justice is exercised receive it with candor or with contumely.

From the Baltimore American.  
PROFESSION AND PRACTICE.

In 1826 when JOHN Q. ADAMS was in office, the opposition complained much of the increase of Executive power. The election of Gen. JACKSON, and the elevation into power of the party supporting him were declared to be necessary in order to the purification of the Government. In the Senate of the United States the following resolution was adopted:—

Resolved, "That the committee to whom have been referred the several resolutions to amend the Constitution of the United States, be instructed to inquire into the expediency of diminishing or regulating the patronage of the Executive of the United States, and that the committee have leave to report by bill or otherwise."

Mr. BENTON was chairman of the committee appointed under the resolution, and Mr. VAN BUREN was a member of it, it included also seven other Senators. In their Report afterwards submitted, the committee declared:—

"That they have reviewed, as carefully as time and other engagements would permit them to do, the degree and amount of patronage now exercised by the President, and have arrived at the conclusion that the same may, and ought to be, diminished by law."

"In coming to the conclusion (says the Report further) that Executive patronage ought to be diminished and regulated, on the plan proposed, [by several bills reported by the committee, but never passed upon,] the committee rest their opinion on the ground that the exercise of great patronage in the hands of one man has a constant tendency to subvert the purity of our institutions and endanger the liberties of our country."

In order to give an idea of the greatness of this power of patronage, the Committee refer to a single city—New York, and go into an enumeration of the various officers appointed in that city by the President, with the amount of salary allowed to each. We invite attention to the contrast which follows. This one specimen will afford a good idea of the sincerity of those professions which were so loudly trumpeted forth by the leaders of the party—professions of economy, of patriotic dread of Executive encroachment, and of unbounded love for the people. We quote from the National Intelligencer of Thursday, which contains the list of officers and salaries in the city of New York for 1839:

In Mr. ADAMS' time, the whole number of officers employed in the collection of the customs (excluding the officers of the revenue cutters and the light-house keepers, not included in the late enumeration) was one hundred and sixty-six, and the aggregate amount of their compensations about one hundred and twenty thousand dollars; on the 30th of September last, the number of officers employed in the same duty was, as the reader will discover by counting them, FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-EIGHT, and the amount of their salaries (in round numbers) about FIVE HUNDRED AND FORTY THOUSAND DOLLARS. Here we have an arithmetical demonstration of the true difference of value between profession and practice—between the *aristocracy and extravagance* of the Administration of Mr. J. Q. ADAMS, and the *democracy and severe economy* of that of Mr. VAN BUREN.

It is to be borne in mind that these four hundred and eighty-eight officers are employed in the various branches of Custom house business, and that the revenue and of course the amount of labour in the collection of it, have fallen off since 1826 when one hundred and sixty-six officers only were employed. Mr. VAN BUREN requires in New York about three times as many officers as Mr. ADAMS, to perform a less amount of duty. How has it happened that the number of office holders was increased in this manner without any increase of business to demand it, but on the contrary with a decrease of business which should have a lessening of the number? Was Congress imposed upon and made to believe that such an increase was necessary? Now let the people understand that Congress had nothing to do with the matter.—The number of these officers of the customs is optional with the President; there is no law specifying how many shall be appointed. The President may create as many as he please, and their salaries are paid out of the revenue before it reaches the Treasury. Thus Congress has no occasion to pass appropriations or to know anything of the matter unless a special inquiry should be instituted. The Intelligencer says:

"The compensations of Inspectors, Weighers, &c. is indeed fixed by law, but the number is dependent on the unrestrained will and pleasure of the Executive; no account is rendered to Congress whether, after being appointed and salaried, they really do daily duty in their places, or spend their time in electioneering to maintain their employers in power. Some of them, it is notorious, perform little more official duty than the signing receipts for their salaries, their more important duties being those of taking care of the interests of 'the party' at home and abroad, the city of New York being too narrow a field for their useful labors."

Was it with a prophetic glimpse looking forward some thirteen years or more, that the Committee with Mr. BENTON at its head and Mr. VAN BUREN at its side, spoke of the great increase of Executive patronage which was to be apprehended in the government—when its power would be all pervading, or, in the words of the Report—

"When its influence over individuals will be multiplied to an indefinite extent, when the nomination by the President can carry any man through the Senate, and his recommendation can carry any measure through the two Houses of Congress; when the principle of public action will be open and avowed, the President wants my vote, and I want his patronage, I will vote as he wishes and he will give me the office I wish for. What will this be but the Government of one man? and what is the Government of one man but A MONARCHY! NAMES ARE NOTHING. The nature of a thing is in its substance, and the name soon accommodates itself to the substance."

"Those who make the President must support him. Their political fate becomes identified, and they must stand or fall together.—Right or wrong, they must support him; and if he is made contrary to the will of the People, he must be supported not only by votes and speeches, but by arms."

The one specimen which we have here given of the course of the Administration in the way of profession and practice, may suffice to illustrate a great deal. Let the men now in office be tried by their own test. If their own words condemn them, what have they to expect at the hands of the people but condemnation too?

Gov. Cass, our Minister at Paris, in a recent publication, says, "Perhaps thirty cents a day, or a little more, may be the average price of labour throughout France, and out of this the workman must clothe and feed himself." France is one of Mr. Van Buren's Sub-Treasury models.

**THE TIMES.**  
FAYETTE, MISSOURI, OCTOBER 31, 1840.

ONE PRESIDENTIAL TERM—  
Proposed by General Jackson—Disavowed by Van Buren—THE PEOPLE WILL ESTABLISH IT BY THE ELECTION OF GENERAL HARRISON.

—THE TRUE REPUBLICAN TICKET.—  
FOR PRESIDENT,  
**Wm. H. Harrison,**  
OF OHIO.  
FOR VICE PRESIDENT,  
**John Tyler, of Virginia.**

For Electors of President and Vice President of the United States,  
PHILIP COLE, of Washington,  
JOSEPH C. BROWN, of St. Louis,  
SAMUEL C. OWENS, of Jackson,  
STEPHEN CLEAVER, of Rails.

The popular majority will be  
FOR HARRISON AND TYLER—  
NEW YORK  
INDIANA  
VIRGINIA  
KENTUCKY  
TENNESSEE  
NEW JERSEY  
CONNECTICUT  
PENNSYLVANIA  
MASSACHUSETTS  
NORTH CAROLINA  
RHODE ISLAND  
LOUISIANA  
MARYLAND  
MICHIGAN  
DELAWARE  
GEORGIA  
VERMONT  
MAINE  
OHIO

UPFIELD & DEFENDED BY ITS SOVEREIGNS.  
THE TREE OF REPUBLICAN LIBERTY.  
TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIX VOTES.  
at least one hundred thousand!

They have come!

We have not deceived our readers. Our friends have neither lost their money, nor been ridiculed for their judgment, on our estimate, or our predictions. Our "tree" loses nothing—but has gained at least one bright and spreading branch since we planted it in the summer. Look how gloriously and sublimely it overshadows and palsies Locofocoism—the giant of yesterday. Oh, gratitude! Oh, honor! Oh, Shame! that Missouri should be destined, on Monday, to bear the scathing winds of the destroyer and destructives, while honor, gratitude, patriotism—every manly, every noble incentive invites her to sit at the communion table with Virginia, and Kentucky, and Tennessee—the mothers of us all!

But we are detaining our readers from the brilliant confirmation of the news we announced last week.

Full returns from Ohio make Corwin's majority 15,000, instead of 17,000.

In Georgia, instead of the race being a close one, as stated in our last, the entire Whig ticket has succeeded for Congress by at least 4,771 votes majority.

In Maryland, the exact popular majority is 3200.

In New Jersey, which was not in our last, and which the Locos disfranchised last winter in Congress, the Whig majority is 1440.

In Pennsylvania (God bless the old Commonwealth) we have gained 3 if not 4 members of Congress, and the popular vote, as far as heard from, is such as to render it certain that the Hero of the Thames, like the Hero of New Orleans, is the man for the constituents of Simon Snyder.—  
Both branches of the Legislature are decidedly Whig.

Arkansas is still in doubt—the majority either way being but a fraction of the difference between the strength of the old Hero himself and any of his friends. That State is sure to bite Missouri on the South, as it is believed Illinois will on the North—leaving us "solitary and alone" in the degradation of supporting our worst enemy and casting off our best friend. How proud some men will be to call themselves Missourians—after the election.

We have but little room for details, and must hence condense our statements. Our readers may rely, however, on the entire accuracy of our brief memorandum. Of the Lococo Congressmen upon whom the people have passed even during the present month, we have certainly laid out thirteen, to wit.—Four in Ohio, two in Maine, three in Pennsylvania, one in Delaware, and three in Georgia—a difference of 26 (or 24, counting Ingersoll, who is elected in the 3d Pennsylvania District) which will lay the infamous sub-treasury "to the land" before a single building will be covered in for the reception of the Receivers General of his de-throned Majesty—Martin I.

Of the Legislatures which have been chosen, it is sufficient to say—and we have only room to say that they are WHIG ALL OVER—thus rendering certain the election of a sufficient number of new Senators to give the republican party a majority of at least six, when they shall convene to pass upon the nominations of "old Tip," on the 5th of March next.

Glory! Glory! Glory! Eternal honor to the fairness, integrity and intelligence of the people—of the United States!

**Waterloo! Waterloo!**

WHAT WILL THE LOCOS SAY NEXT!  
In the recent Ohio election, General Harrison carried not only his own State by the largest majority ever polled, but his own county and his own township. The State, the County and the Township had been the very strongest holds of old Jacksonism—but that, it is shown, does not mean Van Burenism!

When Martin Van Buren can carry Kinderhook; when General Jackson can carry the Hermitage or Nashville precinct; when Thomas H. Benton can carry the city and county of St. Louis—then the Locos may feel themselves relieved of an objection which they made, but which has been removed, in reference to the soldier of Ohio.

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF A BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

In the *Vandalism* of the times which are fast hastening to a close, every man has been pointed to as a *Federalist* who did not join, not only in denouncing the conduct of the late bank, but also in denying the constitutional power of Congress to make any bank. No difference—no dissent of opinion was allowed. Mr. Van Buren and Col. Benton declared it unconstitutional, and the example of such men as Washington, Madison and Crawford was hooted at by the Vandals, who called themselves democrats! If a gentleman, once doubting or denying the power, changed his opinion in deference to the argument of a Crawford or the opinion even of General Jackson (as expressed eight years ago, in his veto Message) he was denounced as a "turn coat," and the Vandal voice drowned all reason, all expostulation. Time, however, has wrought the overthrow of the Vandals—and now, when those who have been so long misled by their falsehoods and delusions, are awakening to a sense of the worthlessness of those who have heretofore essayed to lead them, it may be well enough to recur to some of the authorities and reasonings on which the republican party predicate the constitutional power of Congress to make just such a bank as General Harrison has pledged himself to approve. Is the authority of William H. Crawford as good with "the democracy" as it is with Virginia Republicans? If so, we again place it on record, in the shape of a letter often published by the *Wino* press, but never by those of "the democracy." It is the letter of that eminent States Rights Republican to Charles Jared Ingersoll, as follows:

WOOD-LAWN, Dec. 5, 1831.

DEAR SIR—Your friendly letter on the subject of the Bank of the United States, has been received by due course of mail. The opinion which I formed of the U. S. Bank, when I was a member of the Senate, was the result of careful examination of the Constitution of the United States made without any preconceived opinions. That opinion is recorded in two speeches which I made in the Senate in the year 1811. Since that time I have had no occasion of reviewing the question.

My opinion remains unaltered. "I was Secretary of the Treasury more than eight years, and during that time I had ample evidence of the great utility of the Bank of the United States, in managing the fiscal concerns of the Union. I am persuaded that no man, whatever his preconceived opinions may be, can preside over the treasury one year, without being deeply impressed with the expediency of Bank of the United States, in conducting the finances of the Union. The provision in the constitution which gives to Congress the power to pass all laws which may be necessary and proper to carry into effect enumerated powers, gives Congress the right to pass the bank bill, unless a law most proper to carry into effect the power to collect and distribute revenue, should be excluded by that provision.

The opponents of the constitutionality of the bank, place great stress upon the word necessary, contained in the grant of power, and insist that no law can be necessary but such, without which the power could not be carried in effect. Now this construction appears to me to be indefensible.

It does seem to me that the words "necessary and proper" cannot exclude a law that is most proper to carry the power into effect. Yet the unconstitutionality of the bank can be pronounced only upon that construction of the constitution! My construction of the grant of power, to pass laws which are necessary to carry the enumerated powers into effect, includes the power to pass all laws which are necessary to carry the enumerated powers into effect in the most perfect and complete manner, and not in an incomplete and imperfect manner.

I have not seen a complete development of the President's plan of a bank. It is possible that by his plan, the transportation of the revenue may be effected. The advantage of this security to the public is incalculable. It ought not to be relinquished, unless it can be satisfactorily proved that the Bank of the United States is unconstitutional. This I think cannot be satisfactorily shown. My speeches are recorded, and can be republished if necessary. They contain the result of the best investigation I was able to give the subject. I am persuaded that I could not improve upon it now, if I had the means of investigating the subject, which I have not.

I am, sir, your friend, &c.  
W. H. CRAWFORD.

But we have copied this letter mainly for the purpose of assisting every citizen, on Monday next, to cast his vote understandingly, in reference to Mr. Van Buren and General Harrison. The latter agrees with Mr. Crawford, and every Secretary of the Treasury we have ever had, we believe, except the corrupt and stupid dolt at present employed by Mr. Van Buren, who, we desire to impress it, is pledged to VETO any bank bill the wisdom of Congress may enact. We hope the people of Howard, at least, will veto him. In addition to this, we understand that the question of "bank or no bank," as proposed in our paper of the 5th September, will be submitted to the people—a column being easily kept by the respective clerks, and it being the most convenient way of instructing our Senators and Representatives, respecting the wishes of a majority of their constituents, on this vitally important proposition. We will but add that, if there should be any thing like a full Whig vote, the result must show a decided majority in favor of a properly organized National Bank. Many, very many democrats, have expressed themselves freely to the measure—many of whom, we know, will not vote for Mr. Van Buren purely because of his sworn hostility—to any National Bank.

DANIEL WEBSTER'S SPEECH.

Before fifteen thousand Virginians, will be read with interest and gratification. How immeasurably beneath contempt will sink the wholesale slanders of the demagogues of the day, who have sought to prejudice the republican party against General Harrison, because Daniel Webster is for him, and, in some things, and on some points (not now in issue) has thought differently, and acted differently from the fathers of Republicanism. It will be seen, with delight, that he agrees with them in enough—abundantly enough—to join them in putting down the strongest, most arrogant, and thorough federal dynasty that ever held the reins of government. It was well shouted from the crowd—as will be seen in reading this cool and masterly production—that one sentiment alone was "two thousand votes for Harrison."

THE BIGGEST ABOLITION VICTORY YET.

The abolitionists have carried Ohio, they say, by about 20,000.—Democrat of Wednesday.

And Kentucky, by about 17,000  
And North Carolina, by about 8,000  
And Maryland, by about 5,000  
And Virginia, by about 4,000  
And Louisiana, by about 3,000  
And Georgia, by about 2,000  
And will carry several other "abolition States"—next week, and the week after.—Times.