

MR. ADAMS.

Extract from a Speech delivered by Mr. Adams in the House of Representatives.

February 5, 1848.

I hold that it is no perjury, that it is no high treason; but the exercise of a sacred right to offer such a petition; and that it is false in morals as it is inhuman to listen to charges on men who, under the countenance of such declarations as I have here quoted, seek to bring this House a redress of grievances. I undertake to prove that the consequences in the free States from this "case," justify them in such a course. And if they do mistake their remedy, this Government should not turn them away, and charge them with high treason and subornation of perjury; but ought to take it upon itself to weigh the considerations which can be urged in their favor, and if there be none but those which are so eloquently set forth in the pamphlet I have quoted, these should be considered. If they have mistaken their remedy, the House should do as the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Marshall) told us he was ready to do, admit the facts, and tell these men that their grievances are not to be remedied by a dissolution of the Union; that there are other remedies within their power, either by obtaining an amendment of the Constitution, or in some other constitutional mode; and that, although Congress cannot grant the prayer of their petition, they will take upon themselves to remove so far as they can, their just causes of complaint.

These sentiments in the pamphlet from which I read, are sentiments of the great patriots and fathers of the Revolution—of Washington, of Jefferson, of Madison, of Monroe. They were the sentiments of Mr. Jefferson throughout his whole life. He proclaimed them in the Declaration of Independence; he had proclaimed them before in the Legislature of his own State; he had even proposed in that Legislature the abolition of slavery. And these sentiments were his sentiments down to the last day of his life. I will not read the eloquent passage so often quoted from his Notes on Virginia—a passage in which he declared that he trembled at the thought of the consequences of an insurrection of the slaves, and admitted that in such a contest "the Almighty had not one quiver which could take sides with the master." I refer those who charge me with crime to the letter itself. In one short passage of the memoirs of his own life, written toward its close, in the seventy-fourth year of his age, and shortly before his death, infusing an earnestness of his movements in favor of a revision of the laws of Virginia, he speaks of a bill proposed by him to be introduced for the abolition of slavery; and he there says—at the close of his life—with eternity perhaps before his eyes:

"The bill on the subject of slaves was a mere digest of the existing laws respecting them, without any intimation of a plan for a future and general emancipation. It was thought better that this should be kept back, and attempted only by way of amendment, whenever the bill should be brought on. The principles of the amendment, however, were agreed on; that is to say, the freedom of all born after a certain day, and deportation at a proper age. But it was found that the public mind would not yet bear the proposition, nor will it even at this day. Yet the day is not distant when it must bear and adopt it, or worse will follow. Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same Government."

Yes, sir, and he adds, "the day is not far distant when this must be done, or worse will follow." These were among last words of Jefferson; and I ask what worse than this was there in the memorial I presented, and which so deeply affected the sensibility of the gentleman from Kentucky, that he charged me with high treason and subornation of perjury for introducing any thing that even equaled towards such a thing? I say it was no crime to present such a petition here. And I hope my colleague (Mr. Cushing) from whose immediate constituents this petition came, will vindicate himself and them from the charge here put forth against both. I say it was no crime. It was only the exercise of a right, although they who exercise it may have mistaken their remedy. I believe their complaints to be just; and I hold that this House, instead of sending them out of doors, and charging them with crimes, is bound to consider their petition, and to return them an answer which will contribute to the removal of their grievances, and reconcile them to the continuance of the Union, which, under a state of irritated feelings, they may have, for a moment, been ready to depart from.

Sir, the dissolution of the Union! high treason! subornation of perjury! Why, sir, what is the whole volume of the proceedings of South Carolina for the last ten years? What are the two resolutions in the pamphlet from which the gentleman from that State (Mr. Rhetts) read to us on this floor? Was that gentleman ever charged with high treason for having prepared such resolutions to be offered here? Was he charged with the commission of perjury in his own person? If there be any foundation for the charges now made against me, then the gentleman from South Carolina is guilty of actual perjury in his own person; for he, like the rest of us, has sworn to support the Constitution. Sir, dissolution of the Union! high treason! subornation of perjury! Why, sir, it is but a few days since one of the gentlemen from Virginia (Mr.

Batts) rose in his place and declared that one of the high officers of the Government—the Secretary of the Navy Department—was of opinion that it is high time the Union should be dissolved, and that he was in favor of it. The member from Arcosac rose instantly and denied it, and then wrote to that high dignitary, calling upon him for his own disclaimer of such a charge; but he showed such the countenance of courtesy to the gentleman from Virginia as the gentleman from Kentucky has shown to me. The high dignitary, it seems, is far above any association with the member from Richmond. Oh, yes! he is very far superior to him; so much so, that he calls upon the Public to disown that any conversation could have been supposed to pass between them. He moves in a higher sphere! [A laugh.] A member of this House, placed here by constituents as respectable as can be found in this country—the man of forty-seven thousand—was a character for too low ever to be found in conversation at all with so elevated a dignitary! [Laughter.] Besides he denies that he entertained the opinion charged upon him! Oh, no! he admits it all. But then it was on conditions! and qualifications! Yes, and what were they? After asserting the high superiority of his personal dignity over a mere common member—but I might have said, and all here will bear me out in saying, a very distinguished member of Congress; but the dignity was very far above him—his associations lay in a higher region. [A laugh.] perhaps above the clouds—perhaps in them. [A loud laugh.] After stating this, he goes on to say:

"I will not pretend to say what Mr. Batts can 'prove,' but I assert, in the most direct and unqualified manner, that he cannot prove the truth of his charge against me, by any witness who is himself a man of truth. I understand that charge to be that I am, or have been, the 'advocate of an immediate dissolution of the Union,' without qualifications or conditions. I have never, at any time of my life, entertained any such opinion or feeling. On the contrary, I have, on all occasions, advocated union upon the true principles of the constitution, and have sought to recommend my own principles, upon the ground that they were conservative of the constitution and the Union. This is well known to you, for with you I have had conversations 'for hours' upon this very subject. You say correctly that I have 'printed and published my opinions upon almost every form of address, essay, pamphlet, and book'; and if any thing can be found in any one of these publications to justify the charge of Mr. Batts, I will surrender the point."

Now we shall see hereafter whether he "surrenders the point" or not. Mr. A. further read as follows:

"I think it almost certain, although I cannot recall any particular occasion on which it occurred, that I have expressed a decided preference for a dissolution of the Union over the establishment of systems of policy which I regarded as fatal to all true liberty. I avow the same opinion now. I would sooner see the Union dissolved than witness the success of this very abolition movement; I would sooner see it dissolved, than witness the establishment of a consolidated government, with all power and all right in the hands of an uncontrolled and irresponsible majority; I would sooner see it dissolved than witness the establishment of any principles which violate its true character and defeat its legitimate objects. These opinions I am very certain that I have often expressed, and I shall often express them hereafter. But, that I am, or ever have been, a disunionist, in any other sense than is here expressed, is utterly untrue."

His "decided preference"—for what? For high treason? [A laugh.] No. For subornation of perjury? No. "For a dissolution of the Union!" [Laughter.] He thinks he has. [Laughter.] Now I say, give me the benefit of that condition, and I will show that the men of Havrehill are the most innocent persons in the world. I am going to prove that the oppressions they suffer come within the very condition on which the honorable Secretary says he should prefer a dissolution of the Union. To be sure they would not be the same. The Secretary says he would sooner witness a dissolution of the Union than witness the success of this very abolition movement. What does he mean? I suppose the Havrehill petition is the "abolition movement." If so, what is its "success?" This must be, its reception by this House. Not the grant of what it prays for—but only that it shall be received. And does this high dignitary—the Secretary of the Navy Department—mean to say that he should prefer a dissolution of the Union to the reception of this petition by this House? Perhaps the member from Arcosac or the gentleman from Kentucky may be of that opinion. But suppose he is not, what does it mean? What is the "abolition movement," as before you now? Suppose it is the abolition of slavery in this District of Columbia—and perhaps the abolition of the slave trade—the recognition of the black republic of Hayti, and the reception of Quasimampo as a foreign Minister—does the Secretary say he would prefer to this the dissolution of the Union? Does the gentleman from Kentucky say that? I do not ask the member from Arcosac—but I ask, does the gentleman from Alabama, who offered the first of these resolutions against me? Does he mean to say that if a petition which has been received by this House, and referred to a standing committee of this House, and on which a report is expected, shall be granted—and in consequence our commerce with Hayti

shall be doubled and quadrupled, and the claims of our citizens on that Government suspended now, on the simple condition of our acknowledgment of Hayti independence—shall be allowed and paid, that will be such a "success of the present abolition movement" that he will instantly go for a dissolution of the Union? Or does it mean more? I charge on the Secretary's answer in infinite language: there is an evasion of the question; he may stretch the terms he has used, or may contract them, when it comes to an explanation. It is not a fair, open, honest-hearted answer to the question put to him. "Are you or are you not for a dissolution of the Union?"

Again: He says he should prefer a dissolution of the Union to the establishment of "a consolidated Government." And what is "a consolidated Government?" Many say that this Government is now a consolidated Government. They are vague terms. They have no specific meaning. And is the Secretary to escape by a vague qualification like this? But he should not enter a dissolution of the Union to the establishment of principles which violate its true character, or its legitimate objects. And again, I ask, what are they? Most assuredly to this Secretary they are one thing, and to you, Mr. Speaker, they are another. What is the "true character" of the Government? What are its "legitimate objects?" Here is a wide range for every member of this House to judge for himself. If one man has a right to say what they are, another man has the same right, under the same common instrument—the Constitution. On this ground, every man in this House, as soon as he, in his opinion, the true and legitimate purposes of this Government are violated, may take steps to dissolve the Union. Here, in this House, is a body of us, who think that a protective tariff is among the "legitimate objects" of this Federal Government; and not only so, but that its establishment is one of the most sacred duties of Congress. We hold that the Constitution is extended over this wide empire for the protection of all our great interests—for the protection, if you please, of the interests of slavery. I do not deny that I admit it. For the protection of the People against the Indian tribes; and my constituents have paid for the million for such protection. We think this Government was established for the protection of commerce, of navigation, of agriculture, of manufactures; and that if you put out of that protection any one class of our citizens, you do, in fact, dissolve the Union, ipso facto. That is my creed, so help me God! Is that the creed of either of the gentlemen before me from Alabama (Mr. Houston and Mr. Payne)? I know no. They may think it is for the protection of the slave trade, Africa or America; but I say it is for the protection of slavery in the States where slavery exists. Yes! I admit that the Government is for that, and I am willing, to the extent of the Constitution, to carry that protection into execution. But I will not, under color of doing this, go for the protection of the slave trade, or for depriving the people of the habeas corpus, or of the trial by jury, or of the freedom of the press. I am not for that; perhaps the gentleman from Kentucky is. That is a difference of opinion. It is a fair subject for discussion in this House, for mutual compromise, for friendly consultation, and mutual accommodation after proper discussion had.

Now I will merely take the platform laid down to us by the Honorable Secretary of the Navy of his purposes, wishes, and opinions, as expressed in private and in public, and claim the benefit of them for these petitioners. I will take his ground, and say that these petitioners are entitled to do the same. I believe the grounds are mistaken by them and by him. I have no fault in the doctrine. I hold that the Secretary is more responsible to his country for the avowals he has made in that letter, than these petitioners are for the language used in their petition. I claim for them the benefit of those opinions, as I do of the pamphlet quoted to us here by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Rhetts). I insist, I demand that this House shall not assume to be the accusers and the judges of my constituents as well as of myself. They have no authority over them. They have no right to charge them, for the exercise of their franchises as freemen, with high treason and subornation of perjury. Me the House has in its power, but not my constituents; and I say it is insolent presumption in any portion of this House to arrogate to itself its supervision over the constituent body. I say further, that, if this charge is to be referred to a select committee, I demand that these petitioners shall be heard before that committee; or, if it is to be sent to a court of justice, they shall be heard before that court, by themselves or their counsel, and with all the benefit of witnesses and of the attendance of all who before this House charge me with any offence in having presented the petition. The gentleman from Kentucky contends that an charge of treason or of subornation of perjury is made against me, because, in his resolutions, he directs that charge against them; but I say that he has no right to bring such a charge against me before they shall have first been proved guilty before the courts of the country.

A YANKEE ARAB—The celebrated Arab chief, who has for several years billeted the French Generals that have been sent to Africa, is accompanied on all his expeditions by a regular dove easter—one Zacheriah Coffin, a veritable descendant of the old Admiral. He sports the Moorish dress, rides a magnificent barb, heads a squadron, lays by the dollars, but refuses to change his religion.

From the F. S. Intelligencer. Oct. 11, 1847.

MR. HENRY'S LETTER.

We return to a consideration of this long-bored appeal to the bad passions of the people, a document which has excited the astonishment of those who looked for either talent or truth in the Confession of Faith of the leader of the Locofoco party.

The second paragraph of the letter is as follows, (and as it is all in one sentence, we would advise the reader to draw a long breath before he starts):— "The exalted motives of patriotism, that called together at this inclement season of the year, at so great a distance from their homes, such a large Convention of Planters, Farmers, and Mechanics—truly representing the great industrial and agricultural classes of our population, and forth by the spontaneous movements of the people in their primary meetings, prompted by the distress and embarrassment brought upon the country by the misrule of the Whig party—that Convention too, in its action, influenced by no leaders, or aspiring politicians, but proceeding under the dictation of their own judgment, and zealously resolved upon the good of their suffering country—all these considerations, united with my ardent devotion to the cause of Democracy, and admiration of its principles, and the deep impression that our common country is bleeding under wrongs inflicted by infatuated party leaders, have determined me to accept the honored banner of my party, and to bear it with my best ability, incompatible as I know it is, with my feeble health, and the retired habits of my life, trusting under Providence, to the justice of our cause, and to the zealous co-operation of every Democrat, who loves his principles for the sake of his country."

"Such a large Convention," so large that 24 only out of 71 counties in the state were represented. "Such a large Convention of Planters, Farmers and Mechanics." This is intended as another compliment, we suppose, but it is equally at the expense of truth. If the people take Mr. Henry's word for it, the Convention was composed entirely of these three classes. We of course do not know the occupations of all the members, but let us take the delegation from this county, and let us do so. We find 2 Lawyers and 1 Law Student, out of ten delegates. Who are the individuals who figure in the Convention? Its President is a Preacher, one of its Vice Presidents a Doctor, its principal orators were Mr. Haywood, Mr. Hybart, Col. Wheeler, Mr. Jones, Mr. Strange, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Wilder, all Lawyers. And yet Mr. Henry, a Lawyer himself, so lowers himself as to fall into what his party appears to regard as a popular prejudice, and casts a slur upon his own profession! "It's an ill bird," &c. says the proverb. For our part, we have no idea of professional men being deemed more unfit for public employments, than any other class. We know many of them who will compare with persons of any other class for all the qualities that make men respectable and valuable. If Mr. Henry, as a Lawyer, is willing to admit his unworthiness, so be it; but we protest against the application of any such grovelling doctrine to any class of the people.

But it seems that the Convention, (or the people, it is not exactly clear which,) were "prompted by the distress and embarrassment brought upon the country by the misrule of the Whig party." This would be a gross deception, if it could deceive any body. Every man in the country, including Mr. Henry, well knows that this "distress and embarrassment" had its origin long before the Whigs had the power to rule or misrule the country. He admits the fact himself, in another part of his letter, where he says, after tracing, in a most deceptive manner, the extension of the credit system, that "in October, 1839, the U. S. Bank led off with another suspension,—all the State Banks followed, and in a few short months, this mass of superincumbent debt, fell with a mighty crash upon the people, under the weight of which they have been groaning, and will continue to groan for years to come." Now here is a distinct admission, that his former assertion, that "the distress and embarrassment were brought upon the country by the misrule of the Whig party," is not true. The Whigs came into power on the 4th of March last, and remained in power only six months—if so long. The Executive then abandoned the Whig Congress, and left it powerless to carry out its measures of relief. But this distress under which the people are groaning, is admitted by Mr. Henry to have existed since 1833, more than a year before the Whigs came into power. The most that can with truth be urged against the Whig party is, that they have not yet been able to stay the torrent of adversity which for eight years past has been bearing down every interest in the country. It had its source in the unlawful and arbitrary removal of the deposits by Gen. Jackson; it was fed by the Specie Circular,—by the creation of hundreds of mushroom Banks by the Locofoco party, to supply the place of the Monster which Jackson killed; by the orders issued to the Pet Banks to lend money freely, so that the United States Bank facilities might not be missed. This "supercumbent mass," as Mr. Henry would so elegantly express it, finally became too strong to be controlled by those who had put it in motion, and it has swept like a cataract over all which stood in its way. He thought, honestly thought, that the accession of a new Executive, with a policy different from that which had brought the evils upon us, would speedily have brought relief; and we still think, that if our President had lived, that object would

have been effected. But we repeat, that to charge this "distress and embarrassment," upon "Whig misrule," is a most gross slander—an unfounded slander. It is worthy of remark here, in passing, that though Mr. Henry says emphatically, that "the cause of truth and fair dealing demand that no concealment should be practised upon the people," yet he has, in the course of a long and laboured history of the causes of the present "distress and embarrassment," entirely concealed from the people all knowledge of the removal of the deposits, of the Specie Circular, of the creation, by his party, of hundreds of banks from 1832 to 1836, of the orders from the Treasury Department to these banks to discount liberally, of the creation of the far greater portion of the States' debts by his party, and of the charter of the United States Bank of Pennsylvania by a Legislature of which a considerable majority of one branch belonged to his party. And yet "the cause of truth and fair dealing demand that no concealment should be practised upon the people!" Verily, truth and fair dealing find but few of their drafts honored by this Locofoco leader.

But to return. Mr. Henry compliments the Convention as being "influenced in its action by no leaders, or aspiring politicians." This looks very like a "stab under the fifth rib" of Mr. Haywood, in return for his refusal to unite in the doings of the Convention, which he considered "ungentlemanly, unchristianlike, and dishonorable;" but which Mr. Henry, hoping to profit thereby, is willing to regard as highly patriotic. But the best part of this long sentence is that in which Mr. Henry professes his "ardent devotion to the cause of Democracy, and admiration of its principles." We do not profess to doubt that devotion and admiration exist at present for the leading trait,—we had almost said the sole trait,—in Mr. Henry's character, is selfishness;—and he is devoted to Democracy because he hopes thereby to induce the Democracy to devote itself to him, and elevate him to the gubernatorial Chair, upon which he has long had his eye fixed. But all men here know that he has not a drop of Democratic blood in his veins, not a particle of Democratic feeling in his politics or his habits. He was an old Federalist—a Federalist of the anti-war stamp; an opponent of the Administration of Madison; and admirer of the principles and character of Alexander Hamilton,—and this not only during his boyhood, but until since the Democracy, aided by the popularity of Gen. Jackson became all powerful. Then and not until then, did Mr. Henry abandon the politics of his youth and his manhood. He professes now to think, that "should the principles of liberty which sustain this glorious Union ever be dangerously assailed, their refuge will be found within the ramparts of the States." And yet, only eight or ten years ago, when those principles were thus assailed by Gen. Jackson, did he take refuge within the ramparts of the States? No; with a bulwark of manner, which, whatever may have been thought of it at the time, calm reflection cannot but condemn, he told the half dozen Nullifiers in our Legislature, "on his own responsibility," that Nullification was TREASON." He was then a Federalist; he is now a Democrat, "dyed in the wool."

In our next, we promise to say a few words respecting Mr. Henry's history of the United States Bank and of the distress and embarrassment of the country. From the National Intelligencer. TRUE PROPHECY. Having met, in the Cincinnati Gazette recently published in this paper a year or two ago, entitled "The Predictions by wise Statesmen of the consequences of the Experiment;" and having the curiosity to re-peruse that article, we were absolutely startled at the life-like delineation which it shows to have been made ten years ago, of the consequences that might be expected to result from a perseverence in the wanton and foolish experiment upon the national prosperity which has brought the country to the condition it is now in. Every day, for four or five years past, we have realized more and more forcibly the truth of these predictions, and now more forcibly than ever. Our readers will bear with us whilst we quote as follows, one or two passages, full of instruction and illustration, from the article to which we refer. When in July, 1832, a bill for rechartering the Bank of the United States, having passed both Houses of Congress, and been sent to the President for his signature, was returned by him to the Senate with his objections, a solemn debate took place upon the question, arising under the Constitution, whether the bill should pass notwithstanding the President's objections; in the course of which debate, the following remarkable passages occur: Mr. EWING, of Ohio, said: "If this institution is really to be prostrated—if it have now received its death blow, and is but to wait and prepare for its final fall—the distress and ruin which it will occasion rests not with the wealthy money-holder, whose funds have found an investment in its stock; but it must come with fatal and unbroken force upon the industry, the enterprise, the public prosperity, and private comforts of the whole extended West. The Bank of the United States must withdraw its issues," &c. And then Mr. E. continued as follows: "But this is no all. You say the morals at the same time you thus rudely shake the prosperity of a people. Their first resort will be

to high-tolerance, and relief laws of Fow, or, in other words, laws to prevent a collection of debts, (for what Legislature can withstand the proposal of a whole people suffering under a general visitation?) or, in other words, laws to prevent a collection of debts, (for what Legislature can withstand the proposal of a whole people suffering under a general visitation?) or, in other words, laws to prevent a collection of debts, (for what Legislature can withstand the proposal of a whole people suffering under a general visitation?) or, in other words, laws to prevent a collection of debts, (for what Legislature can withstand the proposal of a whole people suffering under a general visitation?)

Mr. CLAYTON spoke in the same spirit: "The prediction of Mr. Lowndes in 1819 was fulfilled: that the destruction of the United States Bank would be followed by the establishment of paper money, he firmly believed; he might also say, from his knowledge, that the House would recede." The former must again sell his grain to the country merchant for 80¢ per bushel at a discount of from ten to twenty, or even thirty per cent, in the nearest commercial city," &c. "The loss of confidence among men, the total derangement of that admirable system of exchanges which is now acknowledged to be better than exists in any other country on the globe, overtrading and speculation on false capital in every part of the country, that total fluctuation in the standard of value for money, which, like the unseen pressure, within the efforts of industry, while the sufferer is in utter ignorance of the cause of his destruction; bankruptcies and ruin, at the anticipation of which the least sickness must follow in the long train of evils which are assuredly before us."

The Standard of the 15th, being thereunto emboldened by the five-mile law of the Democratic Mr. Henry, breaks out in a column and a half concerning Gov. Morehead. Said column and a half abound in knowing winks, menacing nods, and cautious innuendoes, intended to set excitement on tip-toe. The old war-hunt does not positively say any thing; but oh, how exuberantly he does insinuate! It was with great difficulty that we could discover the "diamond," so deeply imbedded was it, as is usual with that valuable gem, in truth and fact. But we found that the whole article was calculated and intended to make the vague but horrible impression upon the public mind that an ice house has been fitted up on the grounds belonging to the Governor's house! It makes the cold chills run over us to think about it! He does not break this chilling information suddenly and fully upon the reader's ears; he does not expect that such is the laudable fact; but puts it in the form of a "damnable insinuation," as is the worst of this most accomplished "Democratic" rhetorician.

If what the Standard says be true, that Mr. Henry's "election is as certain as he lives till August"—he should not object to having a small lump of ice convenient,—he'll need it to cool his parched tongue at the close of the canvass, if he wags that member with as little discretion as he handles his pen. Greensboro' Pat.

Banks—Town and Country—Do those who keep up a constant attack on the Banking Institutions of the State, never reflect that the efforts of their conduct are not confined to the Towns, but pervade the whole country? It is a common opinion, that Town people are the only persons who are dependent upon, or benefited by, the Banks. No opinion can be more erroneous, and the country people, to their cost, are fast finding out their mistake.

The Town merchant, who is deprived of his accustomed bank facilities, cannot, in the first place, purchase the produce of the farmer, and, in the second place, he is obliged to call in, as rapidly as possible, the debts due him in the country.

The number of suits on the dockets of the Courts of every county in this quarter of Virginia, is greater than it has been for years; and shows that the principle stated above is now in operation. The merchants in the general, are the direct recipients of bank facilities, but the farmer comes in for a share of those facilities in his transactions with the merchants, and whenever the latter are cut off from the Banks, they are obliged to press the former. Pat. Ind.

PRISONERS AT SANTA FE.—The Legislature of Louisiana have unanimously passed Resolutions, strongly denouncing the conduct of the Mexicans and their Government, and calling upon the United States Government to act forthwith and with all possible energy. The New Orleans papers also give the proceedings of a "numerosous public meeting" of her citizens on the 4th instant—which adopted the strongest Resolutions upon the subject—declaring that the Mexicans "ought not to be regarded as a civilized nation"—and calling upon the United States Government to take speedy steps to redress the manifold and glaring outrages" (which the American citizens have received) —to "do what it ought to do, and not wait the result of a tardy negotiation, which will prolong the suffering of her citizens and probably ensure their destruction." Nat. Reg.

The Senate, Friday, says the National Intelligencer, after a long time passed in Executive Session, rejected the nomination of James N. Barker, as First Comptroller of the Treasury Department. The vote against the confirmation was 23, to 17 in favor of it. This subject disposed of, the Senate adjourned over to Monday.