RICHMOND, Va., SATURDAY, JAN. 8, 1842.

FIGHTING OFF!

We understand, that quite a spicy debate took place in the H. of Delegates on Thursday last, on a motion of Mr. Brown of Preston, to take up his resolution concerning the repeal of the *Bankrupt Law*. Mr. Brown and the friends of the resolution went to the house without much preparation for such an issue; not expecting any debate on the mere motion *to take up and consider*, but in the spur of the moment, and in the heat of battle, they bore themselves bravely in the contest. Not much, however, with the Whigs! Several of them had speeches cut and dry for the occasion. No sooner had Mr. Brown submitted his motion, than Mr. Crutchfield addressed the House in opposition to its consideration. He opposed it as useless, inasmuch as the Senators of Virginia had voted against a Bankrupt Law, and he contended that the House might be better employed. Still he took some pains to denounce the law, in the strongest terms, as unconstitutional and inexpedient.

Mr. Crutchfield was replied to by Mr. Brown in a speech of equal length, urging in strong terms the propriety of adopting measures to repeal so odious an enactment, which, by its very provisions, is to go into operation on the first of February. After Mr. B. had concluded, Mr. Hunter, of Berkley, arose and commenced an elaborate speech. He had not progressed far upon the road, before he was called to order by Mr. Crutchfield, on the ground that he was not confining himself to the motion before the House. The Speaker, however, decided, somewhat to the discomfiture of the Whigs, that the motion to take up, involved the *merits* of the resolution itself! With this cue, Mr. Hunter continued his speech, and aimed to widen his sphere of operations. He touched upon various subjects, such as *Virginia Abstractions*, internal improvements, Southern Commerce, the Tariff, &c., &c., and, after being again called to order by his friend from Spottsylvania, took his seat, without his being fairly delivered of the fruits of his lucubrations. It thus became a species of abortion; though enough of it escaped, to show the decided antipathy which the worthy member indulges for the attractions and principles of Virginia.

Mr. Caperton of Monroe then took the floor, fully disarmed, like a champion knight, from top to toe. He delivered a set speech—his maiden effort. He was opposed to any action on the subject of Federal Relations, and computed the cost of the discussions which had taken place on that subject in times past.—He declared, that though a certain print in this city had been attempting to make issues before the people, and to frown on those opposed to action on this subject the charge of endeavoring to shut out light from the people, he should regard it not, but should make issues for himself in spite of that worthy, whom he now thought he had on the hip.

With due deference to a certain Orator in the House of Delegates—he and his friends have made the issue for themselves, and they cannot now shun the responsibility of meeting it before the People. They would have to answer at the bar of the Public, why it is that the Representatives of the good People of Virginia, when they saw our principles threatened, and the Constitution violated by the measures of Congress—and when every bold heart and stalwart arm was summoned to the rescue, should think it politic to shrink from the contest, and to abandon the citadel to the enemy? The people will tell them, that in times past Virginia never shrunk from the assertion of her principles; that she shrunk not in '98-'99, when Federal misrule, like the present, was aiming its blows at the principles of the Government and the Rights of the States; and that now the Whigs are willing to dodge the question, and to suppress a proper protest against certain obnoxious measures, because they have emanated from their party in Washington. The people will tell them, also, that a comparison of dollars and cents, their Constitution is inestimable; and that the cost of any discussion, which the Whigs have it in their power to spin out or cut short, at their pleasure, can never be put in comparison with the liberties of the country and the sovereignty of the States. Whether the worthy member of Monroe, therefore, has us upon the hip or not, we care not; but we are much mistaken in the people of Virginia, if he does not find himself and his friends confoundedly *hipped*, before the discussion has ceased at the bar of the public. But *revenons a nos moutons*!

Mr. Bayly followed Mr. Caperton, and triumphantly, in a most able speech, as we understand, combatted all the objections which had been urged against taking up the resolution in question. He showed, who it was that had heretofore been in favor of introducing Federal Relations into the debates of that body, and read the names of several of the Whig members of the House who formerly were perfectly willing to have the subject discussed. The Whigs, he said, were only loth to have the subject introduced, when the issue might go against them. Messrs. Yerby and Mayo followed—both in opposition to the motion to take up. To adopt the classical epithet of the Delegate from Northampton we understand, he "exploded" in his usual liberal style of debate *his* own "extended bag of wind." Mr. Mayo moved the previous question, but at the solicitation of Gen. Dorman, (a Whig member,) who thought it best to save time, by letting the debate go upon Mr. Brown's motion, Mr. Mayo withdrew it afterwards by leave of the House—Messrs. Bayly and Brown both protesting against being denied the opportunity of replying to the speeches of members on the opposite side of the question. After some further remarks from these gentlemen, and from Messrs. Yerby and Crutchfield, the House adjourned, and thus closed a long and tedious discussion on a mere motion to take up and consider a resolution. It really appears a fit commentary on the desire of the Whigs to have no debate on Federal Relations, thus to see them consuming so much time on a mere motion to take up a resolution, to whose object most of them declared themselves favorably inclined. As Mr. Brown remarked, the resolution might have been passed before the House adjourned, but for the opposition of members, who, at the same time that they opposed its consideration, still professed a most earnest desire to have the Bankrupt Law repealed. The Whigs have indeed given us an advantage, which we did not desire. We would infinitely have preferred to discuss the matter openly, and assist in arresting the mad measures of a Federal Congress by the solemn protestation of Virginia, than to carry the issue before the People, which the Whigs have raised against themselves. We contend with all due respect, that they have shrunk from the discussion and have dodged the question. So much for the first day's debate! Though the Whig orators had the advantage of numbers, as 4 to 2, or two to one, yet they had decidedly the worst of the battle. A liberal Whig had the candor to confess, that he had never seen the Whigs so much worsted, notwithstanding their superiority in the number of their speakers.

Yesterday, the Debate continued on the question whether the House would have a Debate on Mr. Brown's Resolution. Mr. Brown rose to address the House, but he was interrupted by questions of order. Mr. Hunter appealed from the decision of the Chair. This question was laid on the table on General Bayly's motion. Again, Mr. Jackson raised a point of order; but withdrew it, on his friends calling upon him to do so. Mr. Brown then proceeded without open interruption, to address the House in a long and strong speech; going at length into the merits of the law in general. Mr. Crutchfield then moved the Previous Question. Messrs. Hopkins, Bayly, and Holladay, appealed to the justice and liberality of the House, in opposition to the gag law. The motion was not sustained—ayes 61, noes 69. Mr. Holladay, of Louisa, then took the floor, and spoke on the propriety of considering the resolution, without entering into the merits of the Bankrupt law. We understand that it was a masterly effort—clear, forcible, and eloquent. In his usually dignified style, he cut right and left—not sparing the anti-Abstraction slang notions of the Delegate from Berkeley, or the Burlesque Resolutions of the gentleman from Rockbridge.

No Whig rose to reply—and the vote was taken on the motion to take up the resolution—which was lost by a tie, 65 to 65. Two Whigs, viz. Messrs. Scott of Fauquier and French of Giles and Mercer voted in the affirmative—and one Republican, Mr. Fitzgerald of Nottoway, in the negative. Only 4 members absent, viz. Messrs. Holleman, (Rep.,) Thompson, (Whig,) Robinson, (Rep.,) and Semple, (Whig.) Mr. Brown gave notice, that he would call up his resolution again, when the House was full.

We consider yesterday's vote as no defeat—but as auspicious to the success of the motions to take up the Anti-Bank and Anti-Distribution resolutions.—Some of the State Rights Whigs in the House will cooperate on these motions. They will not consent to put the gag upon the lips of the Members upon these great questions. We have every confidence, that Truth is great, and will prevail.

The New County of Clay!

We thank the Richmond Shield for its tell-tale developments. It has literally let the cat out of the bag. It is in extacies about the christening of the new county, carved out of the two Republican counties of *Harrison* and *Lewis*, and Wood, after the name of the Champion of the Whigs. The Shield shows us, what was the design of the movement; for, that it is a party movement, no man in his senses can deny, who looks to the times, to the importance of giving Mr. Clay a lift at this moment, of producing the impression elsewhere that he is the favorite of Virginia. No man can doubt it, who looks to the unprecedented manner in which his name was foisted into the bill, and to the finesse with which it was about to be pushed through the House. What are the facts? We are indebted for the following statement from a most repectable quarter.

COMMUNICATED.

The petition, praying the establishment of a new county, out of parts of the counties of Harrison, Lewis and Wood, was presented to the Committee of Propositions and Grievances, by Mr. Jackson of Wood, on the 9th of December, 1841—was reported reasonable on the 23d—the bill was drawn with blanks in the usual form by the Clerk, and reported to the Committee by Mr. Jackson, but not read. At the time the bill was reported to the Committee, the blank for the name of the county, wherever it occurred, had been filled by Mr. Jackson with the word "Clay," except in the beginning of the bill, and [illegible] title which was left blank. The members of the committee present w[illegible] the bill was reported, from the best information I [illegible] get, were Messrs. Jackson, C[illegible]tham, Mayse, C[illegible] Braxton and Lewis, Foster, Tay[illegible] and Smith (the Democrat, Dr. Tate,) who heard nothing o[illegible] "Clay" till the bill was on its passage in[illegible] nor was the name known to any of [illegible] as far as I am advised, except Mr. [illegible] saw the title of the bill left blank, a[illegible] that the blanks in the body had bee[illegible] bill was read the first time, January 1st [illegible] to the printer under the rule of the Ho[illegible] cond time, January 4th, and ordered t[illegible] read a third time, January 5th. Those [illegible] were not actually made—some Whig [illegible] moving that the actual reading be disp[illegible]—The bill had not been returned from t[illegible] till it was on its final passage, and was only put in possession of members at the very moment of its final passage—when for the first time Mr. Holladay asked for the reading of the bill, and on finding the name of "Clay" in it, moved a reconsideration of the vote, ordering it to its engrossment with a view to change the name. After some discussion, Mr. Armstrong moved the indefinite postponement, which was decided in the negative, ayes 44, noes 74. The question then recurred on reconsidering the vote, and was decided in the negative, ayes 52, nays 64, and then the bill passed.

Several members voted against the reconsideration moved by Mr. Holladay, and against the indefinite postponement moved by Major Armstrong, because they were assured by Mr. Jackson of Wood, that the name "Clay" would be stricken out in the Senate.—But for that assurance, I feel confident the bill would not have passed. A LOOKER-ON.

It is, therefore, a decided party movement, which passing over the names of a departed Governor, and of the illustrious dead, whose ashes are deposited in our own soil, and whose lives were devoted to the principles of Virginia, offers this tribute not to the memory, but to the ambition of Mr. Clay. We must speak plainly. We speak from a sense of duty—for, we have no private griefs to gratify. There is no Whig in the Union who has given us less cause to wound our feelings, or to excite resentment, than Mr. Clay. But believing that he is employing all his talents to prostrate the principles of '98,-'99—and that this is a party movement for the promotion of his views, we feel ourselves bound to enter our protest against the bill. We pray our readers to read the following lines from the Richmond Shield of Thursday last—and then doubt, if they can, about the character of this new movement:

"THE LEGISLATURE—*Clay County.*—Yesterday's proceedings gave some insight to the feeling of the House. We regard it as an omen that the State of Virginia will yet get right as to men and things. The word Clay is not so odious as formerly—and however much Loco Focoism desires to continue the hostility with which it has hunted and abused the statesman bearing that name, it was impotent yesterday to succeed in its object.

"A bill has been passed, notwithstanding all the efforts of the Locos to defeat it, to form a new county, with the name of Clay.

"Well done for the Virginia House of Delegates.—Stop not at this—take courage and go on—the Whigs have a majority—and Mr. Clay is entitled to still greater honor. Why not present him to the people of the U. S. with all the solemnity of legislative nomination as a proper and fit candidate for the next presidency? Proper and fit, did we say? No—*as the only man in the country, fit for the office.* The people of Virginia and of the whole country will sustain it. He is the anchor of our safety, and where and by whom could the nomination be more appropriately made. He is the fruit of our own soil, and shall we not entitle ourselves to the credit of being the first to honor him. Why delay? Is he not the choice of every Whig throughout the breadth and length of the land? To whom besides him can the Whigs look to rescue this Government from the re-ascendency of Loco Focoism, and the corruption and vain aspirations of the present Chief Magistrate? Others may, and do aspire to the office, and hope to reach it by extending the impression, that Mr. Clay has no chance. Let him be brought forward by the legislature, and presented to the legislatures of other States, and the extinguisher will be put over the aspirations of all others.—The attention of the people will be called to him, and ample time allowed to repel the attacks that Locofocoism has and always will make against his integrity and honesty. He is known to be the choice of the Whigs, and by postponing the nomination, the doubt and uncertainty which will therefore hang over the subject, only tends to enhance the prospect of others and flatter the hopes of the Locos. Give no longer time for division in our ranks—it is what the Locofocos desire—concentrate by a nomination the Whig party, and the country, from one end to the other, will respond, *he is the man.*"

Here we have the whole matter, as large as life.—The Whigs are conjured not to stop at this point—but to push on their victory, and bring him out at once as the accepted candidate of the Whig party—"*as the only man in the country fit for the office.*" Nay, the Whigs of the House of Delegates are called upon to bring his claims before the House, and proclaim their candidate "to the People of the United States with all the solemnity of *Legislative* nomination." Aye, to throw out all the resolutions against the encroachments of the Federal Government; to stop all debate—and yet bring an ambitious candidate before the House, and let this "*Legislature* present him to the Legislatures of other States." Such a movement would, indeed, cap the climax of Whig discretion. But should they decline this further step in their "Political Progress," the Shield has said enough to satisfy us of the character of the present movement, and to arouse the determined opposition of the Republican party.

THE FISCAL SCHEME.

The Madisonian is kind enough to devote nearly a column to our article of Tuesday last. It would seem, that one of its Amanuenses has stept forward to wield the pen for our edification.—We are almost sure, we could lay our finger upon him—for, we can track him, as Gibbon says, through his own snows. His researches in the letters of Mr. Jefferson, and the Messages of Mr. Madison point him out, as clearly as if the inscription were under the portrait, "This is Mr. ———." We take the criticism, however, in good part; for there is nothing of a very acrimonious character in it; and its arguments, such as they are, are drawn from the errors of very superior minds indeed;—but minds, in all their power that were liable to occasional errors.

We can assure the Madisonian, that we were perfectly familiar with all the authorities which it is pleased to quote. We have, but a few days ago, read the whole of them, and indeed, much more, which we will produce in due season. We had read Mr. Madison's seventh annual Message in Clark's History of the Bank, along with the powerful reports of Mr. McDuffie of the House, and Gen. Smith of the Senate, against any thing like a National Bank. We had seen also the error, which Mr. Dallas, as Secretary of the Treasury, had fallen into about bills of credit, issued by the United States. We had seen, (in the 4th volume of the Jefferson Correspondence,) with some surprize and much regret, the propositions made by Mr. Jefferson to Mr. Eppes, not on the 24th June, 1811, [as quoted by the Madisonian,] but in June, 1813, after war was declared, and every politician was uneasy about raising the funds for conducting it. In this condition of the public mind, the judgment had scarcely full play. Who does not believe that if this illustrious man were now among us, with all the lights which have been since cast upon the subject, with a strict reference to the Constitutional question, he would be the first to condemn the scheme! Even Mr. Jefferson himself, in another letter to Mr. Eppes of November 1813, when making similar propositions for the issue of a Government paper, confesses that he had to "pretermit the Constitutional question on the authority of Congress."

We bow at all times too with a reverential feeling to the memory of Mr. Madison. But after he had proposed to establish a National *University* out of the public lots in Washington—after he had relinquished his Constitutional objections to a National Bank, (both of which measures we found it our duty to combat,) it can scarcely be expected that we should consider his opinions as infallible. Does the author of the Madisonian article himself subscribe to all his Constitutional opinions? We are satisfied that he does not.

The scheme of Gen. Jackson's Message of 1830 is not exactly in point. Though liable to "serious objections," as we then declared, yet it did not, as Mr. Tyler's scheme, propose to issue paper for the purposes of general circulation. On the contrary, it proposed to leave to the States "the means of furnishing the local paper currency through their own Banks." General Jackson, indeed, styled it "a Bank"—"making it a branch of the Treasury Department"—and proposed to endow it with the function of receiving individual" as well as "public deposites," upon which it might "*sell bills of exchange* to private individuals at a moderate premium." But it is a question whether such an institution can be called a Bank—and whether such a scheme, though worthy of the most serious doubts, and liable to grave objections, on the score of expediency, can be considered as unconstitutional—But if *his* scheme carries serious doubts with it, how strong are the objections to Mr. Tyler's? If *this* can be called a Bank, surely the present one is still more strongly entitled to that appellation.—General Jackson's project admits of private deposites, and the sale of bills of Exchange. Both of these features are liable to serious objections. But it does not propose to *buy* bills of Exchange to *discount* such bills—in other words, it does not propose to *make loans*, by way of purchasing bills of Exchange. In this respect, it essentially differs from Mr. Tyler's plan. Still less did it propose to issue notes, or bills of credit, which were denied to Congress by the Convention who framed the Constitution. So far from it, that the message disclaims the idea altogether. But Mr. Tyler's scheme not only receives deposites, discounts bills of Exchange on the faith of its own funds as well as of private deposites—but aims above all at the unconstitutional power of issuing Treasury Notes, not to pay debts or borrow money, but to furnish a *Government paper*, or a paper money for common circulation. We hold this power to be against the Constitution—as asked for in the Convention, under the style and title of "bills issued on the credit of the U. S."—but asked for in vain; and positively refused, upon the ground, that it would be *paper money*, and that the Government ought not to supply it. We say nothing more by way of defining a *bill of credit*. But we must add, that we did touch that point in [illegible]—and that we have not, therefore, "passed [illegible]tion of a bill of credit."

[illegible]ian concludes by charging us with a [illegible] if it be a trick, we confess at once it [illegible] thy of ourselves." But where is the [illegible]arging the authorship of the Finance [illegible] Webster? Does the Madisonian deny [illegible]onsist in ascribing the scheme to [illegible] is the measure of the President, [illegible]binet? And yet we do honestly [illegible] subtle mind of Mr. Webster, [illegible] scope of experience on the [illegible] Mr. Tyler or his cabinet can [illegible] been very difficult, if not impos[illegible] have sanctioned such a scheme.—

T[illegible] "leaves no clemency for the Presi[illegible] at our heads—It even "invites our *denunciations* on him and him alone." The Madisonian mistakes the spirit, which we feel on this subject. We wish to pour no denunciations on Mr. Tyler's head. We know the subject itself is complicated in itself—and that Mr Tyler is not practised in banking, as we see from his mistake on *discounting* upon bills of exchange.—We know also, that Mr. Tyler is entitled to much forbearance, on his own account. He has "rendered the State much service." He has somewhat abated, though he has not altogether extinguished, that spirit of proscription, and that thirst for office, which would have swept away every Democrat, and thrown open the spoils to the ravenous and now discomfitted wolves. We can never forget, too, without the most sincere gratitude, the services he has rendered to the Constitution, in arresting by his two memorable Vetoes the establishment of a National Bank at the Extra session. We would treat him, therefore, with all courtesy and respect. We will support his measures, where we can—and oppose those which we disapprove, in a firm, but conciliatory spirit. But we do dread that dark Genius, whose errors are equal to his powers, who darkens the counsels of the Cabinet.

☞ The Communication of *A Friend to the Specie Standard*, addressed to the members of the General Assembly, on the Resumption of the Banks, is unavoidably postponed till Tuesday.

FARMERS' BANK OF VIRGINIA.

Wm. H. Macfarland.
Samuel Marx.
James Dunlop.
James Bosher.
Sublett McGruder.*

BANK OF VIRGINIA.

The Stockholders have been in session several days. It is understood that they have been overhauling, or preparing to overhaul the general management of the Institution. A Committee of three Stockholders—other than Directors—was appointed at the mother Bank and each of the branches, to examine thoroughly the condition of the whole.

The following gentlemen were appointed Directors at the mother Bank:

John Brockenbrough,	1556
J. Womble,	2757
C. Warwick,	2750
H. W. Moncure,	2092*
Wm. Mitchell,	1280*

There was something like an opposition to some of the members, and 1267 votes were cast upon General Pegram.—*Yesterday's R. Whig.*

* New Directors.

☞ The Executive lists have not been received in time for this day's Enquirer.

FOR THE ENQUIRER.

NEW COUNTY.

We have fallen upon degenerate times indeed, when the honors due to the names of the virtuous and patriotic men of the Revolution, are to be given by partizans, to living aspirants to political elevation—when modern Whigs would cast into oblivion the Whigs of the Revolution—when the names of Bland, Carrington, Gibbon and many others who labored, fought and bled for Independence, are set aside and forgotten by modern Whigs, for their crack demagogue, Henry Clay. Thus do modern Whigs show their affinity to the Whigs and patriots of better days—thus do they show their great veneration for the patriots and principles of the Revolution. Where too is the name of Pleasants, a Governor who is no longer among the sons of men? Where is the name of Roane, (Spencer Roane) who devoted the best days of his life to the support of the undying principles of Virginia? Shall such men be passed over in a moment of party phrenzy, and to help on the waning cause of an ambitious aspirant? Shall the name of Clay be foisted upon us—not the name of that other Clay of Virginia—not the Clay of the British Parliament, about which the Delegate from Rappahannock, like the witch of Macbeth, palters, not in a double, but in a triple sense—but the name of Henry Clay, the champion of the Tariff, the champion of Biddle's Bank, the champion of Internal Improvements, the burlesquer of all the strict State Right principles of Virginia, and the political champion and Presidential candidate of the Whigs—the man for whom they were to make political capital by the adoption of his very name—and to make the delusive impression in other States, that he is the favorite candidate of the Old Dominion!

I do trust, for the honor of Virginia, the Senate will strike the word Clay from this bill for a new county, and insert, in lieu thereof, the name of some patriot of other days; or some place associated with revolutionary deeds—Eutaw, or some other—or some man who is better entitled to the distinction, than Henry Clay of Kentucky. Why should the name be left to the Legislature at all? Why not let the people name their own county. It is hoped that hereafter, the name will be made a part of the memorial asking for the new county.

Do Mr. Clay's partisans in the House vainly imagine, that they can do him any service, in his contemplated race for the Presidency, by putting upon him this honor, stripped from the memory of the virtuous dead? What has this great champion of Biddle's bank ever done, that his name should be preferred to those I have mentioned? Let him wait. No man's life is known until he is dead. FRANCISCO.

CULPEPER.

Whereas, we approve of Republicans meeting together from different parts of the State, interchanging sentiments, and concerting measures for the coming Spring campaign; and believing that such meetings tend to strengthen the bonds of fraternal affection between Republicans, and promote the sacred cause in which we are engaged—the cause, as we believe of our Laws, Constitution and Liberties—Under the influence of such feelings and sentiments, a numerous and highly intelligent portion of the Democracy of Culpeper, assembled at Stevensburg, on the 1st day of January, 1842, for the purpose of nominating Delegates to represent them in the Convention to be holden in the city of Richmond, on the 2nd day of February next.

The meeting was organized by appointing W. H. Hansbrough, Chairman, and Robert Stringfellow, Secretary. Whereupon, the following gentlemen were appointed Delegates to said Convention: Addison A. Hudson, Captain Thomas Humphreys, Capt. George Wallis, Thomas Gibson, Richard Waggoner, and Thomas Ritchie. And then the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

1. *Resolved*, That without presuming to dictate to any, we greet our Republican friends in other parts of our beloved country, with the kindness and affection of brothers, and earnestly recommend to them to hold similar meetings for the above purpose.

2. *Resolved*, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the Richmond Enquirer.

(Signed,) W. H. HANSBROUGH, *Ch'n.*
ROBERT STRINGFELLOW, *Sec'y.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENQUIRER.

In an article which appeared in your paper of the 23d of December, you have very justly praised the masterly style and arguments of the late report of our distinguished Secretary of the Navy, and thus ingenuously joined the general acclamation which has been expressed in all parts of the Union in favor of the report. There is a closing sentence, however, to that article, which seems to counteract every word of commendation that precedes it. To this I wish to recall your attention, and am assured, if you review your remarks in comparison with the report of the Secretary, and detect an error, you will readily correct the unfavorable impression which your widely circulated and influential paper may have spread abroad. I have not the paper near me from which to quote the sentence to which I allude; but in it, if I rightly remember, you signify that the Secretary cannot expect any response from the people, or any co operation from Congress favorable to a plan so magnificent and extravagant, which proposes to increase our Navy to half that of Great Britain at an *annual expense* of Twenty Five Millions of Dollars. Similar remarks upon the Report of the Secretary of the Navy were made, on Monday last, by Mr. Weller of Ohio, and Mr. C. H. Williams of Tennessee. These gentlemen, it is well known, never made such remarks from any actual inspection of the Report, or with the vain hope of affecting in the least any member of Congress: but solely to influence, through Congress, their constituents, which I trust, could never be done by such perversions of a printed document. The speeches of demagogues of any party can do little good or evil; but the influence of the press is great, and increasing every day. Upon the press, even members of Congress are often dependent for the sentiments of the people by which they are guided—Hence the importance, in part of your opinion, however carelessly expressed upon any legislative topic. That the Secretary of the Navy *did not* expect to increase the Navy immediately, or for several years, to half that of Great Britain, or to have a larger sum at his disposal annually, than eight or nine millions, which is less than the sum usually appropriated to the War Department, you will be easily convinced, I think, by a few extracts from the Report itself. The Secretary, after marshalling the most unanswerable arguments in favor of the Navy, as the chief means of national defence, proceeds to say, [page 381,] "If these views be not altogether deceptive, the policy of increasing our Navy, without further delay, is obvious. *How far* it shall be increased, the wisdom of Congress will decide. Looking to it as the chief, if not the only adequate defence of our country against those wars of incursions from which so much evil is to be apprehended, I respectfully suggest that we cannot safely *stop short of* half the naval force of the strongest maritime power in the world."—"With less than this, our fleets would serve only to swell the triumphs and feed the cupidity of our enemy. It is better to have none at all than to have less than enough. I am aware that this great increase of our naval power *cannot be effected in any short time.* I propose it only as the object at which our policy ought *to aim*, and toward the attainment of which your measures ought to be steadily directed. An annual appropriation, *as liberal as the means of the Treasury will allow, will, in a few years*, accomplish all that is desirable." What can be more explicit than this? How can the prospective spirit of the Secretary's propositions be misunderstood? That it is necessary to increase our effective naval force, is evident to every reflecting mind. If a Navy is good for any thing, it should be able to act as a van guard against the sudden incursions of any maritime power, and stand ready to enforce our just demands upon the powerful nations to whose arrogance and aggressions on our extended and alluring coast of more than four thousand miles, and our wide-spread commerce are constantly liable.—To be convinced of this, shall we wait till the terrors of war are brought to our firesides, till our commercial cities are pillaged, and the enemy have penetrated to the capitol and again burnt it to the ground? Shall we wait, and be counting parsimoniously the pennies which a proper naval defence would cost, till the enemy have not only brought a loss upon us of over one hundred and fifty millions of dollars, as in the last war, but of five hundred millions of dollars, as they could do in the first year of a war, before we could get ready to contend with them? It was the noble boast of the Spartans, that their wives had never seen the face of an enemy: so should it be our boast. We have no rival nations upon the Western continent, whom we need even watch with suspicion; and if we have a sufficient navy to keep off invading fleets, the peaceful industry and prosperity of our countrymen may never be interrupted. What if France in 1836 had chosen the proffered alternative of war, instead of answering the just demands so nobly made by our President for the rights and honor of the country? We should have then found to our shame, that we had no power to sustain those demands for the rights and honors of our country! What if our difficulties with Great Britain, in relation to the Boundary Question, the McLeod case, and other matters had involved us in a war with that mistress of the ocean, were we ready for her? What if the new difficulty in relation to the Creole affair, together with the Boundary questions, should involve us, as they may even very soon, in a war with our parent and rival country, could we pretend to meet the first fleet of steamers, line-ships, and small craft, all officered by men better acquainted with our harbors than many of our own naval corps, which she would send over against us, to say nothing of protection at the same time to the five hundred millions dollars worth of our property afloat upon the seas? I doubt not, that we might in a year or two be prepared to meet, and bravely repel the enemy as we have done before; but the preparations would be made under every disadvantage, with double the usual expense, and while the enemy, in the mean time, would be destroying and taking enough of our property to sustain an efficient navy for a century. The whole interests of the country, even for these times of peace, demand an increase of our Navy. The traders in the East Indies, at China, in Polynesia, and along the North-West coast, have been long complaining, that our Navy does not keep pace with the rapid advance of our commerce. Many of them seldom, if ever, see the cheering power of their country represented at places where they have established places of trade, and where protection is most needed. It may seem presumption in me to urge this subject further upon your attention, after referring to the able report of the Secretary, which is so full of sufficient reasons to the same purpose, but I feel a deep interest in the subject. I have felt with many others, how all-important the Navy is for our national defence; and that, for several years, it has been, not only insufficient, but almost paralysed by neglect. Hitherto, the blame has been laid upon the Secretaries; but now, we have a Secretary who comes to us like a skilful physician, familiar with the powers and liabilities of his patient, and ambitious to restore the defect. He bids us stretch forth the almost withered arm of our country, that he may strengthen and develope it in fair proportion to our other members. Then, in some future time, it will save us more than a thousand fold the expense of developing and sustaining it, and at all times, and all places, it will be an ornament and an honor to us.—Must he now be told, that, although some attention has been needed for a long time to our "right arm of defence," the country really cannot afford to pay for the desired improvements? Shall the country, now grown into full stature, and with immensely accumulated resources, restrict its necessities to the allowances of boyhood? The Secretary, in his table of estimates, only asks for about three millions more than the appropriation of last year; and what is that to seventeen millions of people, possessed of the richest country and the most prosperous commerce in the world? But, in another view, this additional appropriation for the increase of the Navy would be, in a great degree, merely nominal. It would be given to educate and train up an additional number of our gallant sons of the land to an honorable profession; rescue many more orphan and distressed boys from the haunts of dissipation and crime, to serve their country; and support many more of our hardy tars upon their chosen element. A part, also, of this appropriation, would go to the Western and other producers of beef, pork, flour and ship stores; to our manufactories and cotton-growers, for clothing, sails, and cordage; and portions, besides, to encourage all kinds of industry. The Secretary in fact asks for little more in order to accomplish his magnificent prospective plan for the improvement of the navy and the honor of the country than this, that the people should take the means, which he asks, out of one pocket and have it put into another equally their own. We are told on one side and the other, that this cannot be done, that the people will not allow it, however feasible and commendable the plan of its disposal. Have the people been asked? Have they considered the subject in its important bearings upon every interest of the country, without regard to party influence? If they have so considered it, or may be persuaded to consider it in this manner, they will unanimously second the propositions of the Secretary with a cordial approval. For yourself, Sir, if you are now convinced upon a further examination of the Navy report, that your first impression of the Secretary's purposes was wrong, I trust you will do all in your power to counteract the evil, and lend your aid to sustain the noble measures, so universally praised, which our able and earnest Secretary of the Navy has urged upon Congress. J. H. B.

☞ We have no "first impressions" to correct—no "evil to counteract." We never thought, we never said, that the Secretary proposed *immediately* to build up a Navy, half as large as that of Great Britain—We quoted his own words, and then showed how magnificent was the scheme to which he ultimately aimed. The very distinction taken by J. H. B. we drew on Tuesday last.

We protest against the epithets he is pleased to apply to those staunch and able Democrats, Messrs. Weller and Williams. They are no Demagogues—and no gratuitous charge ought to be made against them, of perverting a public document. Our Correspondent writes well; and with these exceptions, we cheerfully give him a place in our paper.—[*Enquirer.*

LEGISLATURE OF VIRGINIA.

HOUSE OF DELEGATES.

Thursday, Jan. 6, 1842.

RESOLUTIONS.

Resolutions were offered by the following gentlemen and adopted by the House:—By Mr. SMITH of M. & J., that the Committee of Propositions and Grievances inquire into the propriety of changing the place of holding the precinct election on Reedy Creek, in Jackson—By Mr. TOLER, that the Committee of Agriculture inquire into the expediency of reviving the inspection of Tobacco at Lynch's Warehouse, in the town of Lynchburg—By Mr. M'ILHANEY, that the Committee of Agriculture inquire into the expediency of permitting farmers residing on or near public highways to entertain drovers of live stock without being required to procure licence to keep private entertainment.

PETITIONS.

Petitions were presented by the following gentlemen and appropriately referred:

By Mr. EDGINGTON, of 500 citizens of Ohio county, for an appropriation in aid of opening and clearing out the road from Wheeling to Clarksburg; by the same, of Daniel Zane and Ebenezer Zane, for the repeal of so much of the act of January 6th, 1836, as includes Zane's Island, within the judicial jurisdiction of the city of Wheeling.

REPEAL OF THE BANKRUPT LAW.

Mr. BROWN of Preston moved to take up his resolution instructing our Senators in Congress to vote for a repeal of the General Bankrupt Law. Upon this motion a long debate arose in which Messrs. CRUTCHFIELD, BROWN of P., HUNTER, CAPERTON, YERBY, MAYO, DORMAN, and STROTHER participated. (We shall publish the debate on Tuesday.) At 3 o'clock, before the question was brought to a vote, Mr. BROWN moved an adjournment, which was carried by a vote of 62 to 57.

Friday, Jan. 7, 1842.

PETITIONS.

Petitions were presented by the following gentlemen and appropriately referred:—By Mr. RAMEY of citizens of Loudoun, for the passage of an act to prevent hawkers and pedlars from trading under the same licence, &c.—By Mr. CRAWFORD, of the New Market Academy, for a law authorizing them to appropriate certain funds to the erection of a new building—By Mr. WALLACE of K. G., of Wm. Cleary of the District of Columbia, for a law authorizing him to employ slaves and free negroes from Maryland in his fishery in Prince William. [In presenting this petition, Mr. W. said:—Sir, I intend nothing more than an act of courtesy to the petitioner. Though equally interested with him in such an amendment as he desires, I am satisfied it would not meet with the approval of my constituents and I shall therefore feel it my duty to vote against it.] By Mr. GRIMES, of the trustees of the Pocahontas Academy for an act of incorporation—By Mr. THOMAS, two petitions of citizens of Fairfax for a change of the toll on the Little River Turnpike Road.

Several resolutions were adopted, which will be given hereafter.

REPEAL OF THE BANKRUPT LAW.

Mr. BROWN of Preston, called up his motion to take up the resolution on this subject. Mr. B. was proceeding to discuss the motion, when he was called to order by Mr. HUNTER, on the ground that the merits of the question were not open to debate. The SPEAKER reiterated his decision of yesterday, that the motion to take up incidentally involved the merits of the resolution. From this decision, Mr. HUNTER appealed.

Mr. BAYLY moved to lay the question on the appeal on the table, and, after debate, the motion was decided in the affirmative by a vote of 63 to 57. After Mr. BROWN of Preston, had addressed the House at some length, Mr. CRUTCHFIELD moved the previous question. This the House refused to sustain, by the following vote:

Ayes—Messrs. Southall, (Speaker,) Rives, Kinney, Baldwin, Mayse, Wingfield, Mitchell, Hunter, Newkirk, Moore, Toler, Nowlin, Apperson, Cardwell, Broadus, Irving, Brown of Elizabeth City and Warwick, Semple, Thomas, Foster, M'Laughlin, Woods, Early, French, Erskine, Vance, Pugh, M'Rae, Griggs, Kennedy, Wallace of King George, Edmonds, Clendenin, Taylor of Loudoun, Ramey, M'Ilhaney, Smith of Mason and Jackson, Morgan, Caperton, Davis of Montgomery, and Pulaski, Orrick, Harrell, Taylor of Norfolk Borough, Watts, Yerby, Fitzgerald, Edgington, Cheatham, Keen, Williams, Dey, Elliott, Strother, Daniel, Dorman, Leyburn, Urquhart, Crutchfield, Ford, Mayo, and Jackson—61.

Noes—Messrs. Bayly, Ailworth, Holloway, Harvie, Davis of Amherst, Cox of Braxton and Lewis, Jones of Brooke, Riddick, Harrison of Brunswick, Jones of Buckingham, Haskins, Samuel, Cox of Chesterfield, Vaughan, Scott of Fauquier, Payne, Deskins, Wood, Byrd, Robins, Guerrant, Carroll, Spencer, Clark, Watkins, Mullen, Kincheloe, Armstrong, Bowden, Moler, Smith of Kanawha, Davis of King & Queen, Dabney, Woodard, Holladay, Marshall, Banks, Martin of Marshall, Diggs, Boyd, Scott of M., Ligon, Etheridge, Smith of N., Hiden, M'Pherson, Wallace of P., Grimes, Hopkins, Brown of P., Wilson, Heath, Brawner, M'Cauley, Shipman, Smith of R., Cowan, Quillen, Gatewood, Crawford, Tate, Warren, Walker, Bowen, Martin of T., Buck, Goodson, Leftwich—69.

The discussion was then continued by several members—Messrs. HOPKINS, HUNTER and HOLLADAY. The motion to take up was rejected as follows:

Ayes—Messrs. Bayly, Ailworth, Holloway, Harvie, Cox of B. & L., Jones of B., Riddick, Harrison of B., Jones of B., Haskins, Samuel, Cox of C., Vaughan, Scott of F., Deskins, Wood, Byrd, French, Guerrant, Carroll, Spencer, Clark, Watkins, Kincheloe, Armstrong, Davis of K. & Q., Dabney, Woodard, Clendenin, Holladay, Marshall, Banks, Martin of M., Diggs, Boyd, Scott of M., Morgan, Harrison, Ligon, Smith of N., Hiden, M'Pherson, Hiner, Wallace of P., Grimes, Hopkins, Brown of P., Wilson, Heath, Brawner, M'Cauley, Shipman, Smith of R., Cowan, Quillen, Gatewood, Crawford, Tate, Warren, Walker, Bowen, Martin of T., Buck, Goodson, Leftwich—65.

Noes—Messrs. Southall, (Speaker,) Rives, Davis of A., Kinney, Baldwin, Mayse, Wingfield, Mitchell, Hunter, Newkirk, Moore, Toler, Nowlin, Apperson, Cardwell, Broadus, Irving, Brown of Elizabeth City & Warwick, Thomas, Foster, M'Laughlin, Payne, Woods, Early, Robins, Er