matter; the original books and documents all stand fair and unaltered, and he could see no ground of imputation against any one. That *some* of these alterations in the abstract which those clerks were making were erroneously made, no one doubted. Mr. Brown stated it in his deposition, and taking all the depositions mentioned, it is explained in the most satisfactory manner. It arose from the rule or principle on which the books have at all times been kept; and the abstracts were taken from the books as kept, and from the entries actually made under Mr. Bradley, and from no intention to do injustice to any one. Mr. Grundy was himself convinced that perfect accuracy could not be arrived at, as to the persons making the extra allowances, from an inspection of the books of the Department. It might be done *possibly* by an examination of the correspondence in each case; but that would be an almost endless labour, and five months would not have been sufficient to examine the necessary letters and documents. He would unite with gentlemen in voting to suspend the printing, but protested against any inference being drawn even to the prejudice of the Department from the transactions which were called in question.

Mr. Clayton said, he wished the gentleman from Tennessee, when he expressed his opinion that others believed no fraud was intended by the erasures, had confined himself to what he knew or had better reason to believe, than he had condescended to name. The other members of the committee would think for themselves, and had not made that gentleman their organ to express any opinion on this subject. He said, he understood the gentleman to say, by way of excuse for these mutilated documents, that in some of the cases, Mr. M'Lean had made the allowances. Sir, an inspection of the evidence will show that, in nearly all, if not in every case, the reverse is the fact. The Select Committee this morning reported on the affairs of the Department, and the depositions and papers to show this, which have all been ordered to be printed, are referred to in, and form a part of, the report. Among these is a communication from Mr. McLean, in which he informs the committee that Mr. Bradley never made an allowance while he was in the office of Postmaster-General. But, sir, there is yet another reason why these documents should not be printed. They are entirely evasive of the resolution of the Senate. In a majority of all the cases of extra compensation set forth in them, they do not state the "additional service" to be performed, and which was the consideration for the allowance. They are now spread on the Secretary's table, and you may see that they do not constitute, without the contracts, even an apology for an answer to the requisition made by the Senate. Generally, they do not give the length of the routes, or of the time in which they were to be performed—but leave you to refer to the contracts themselves which it is not proposed to print. And in one case, where the excuse for the extra allowance is set down to be an increase of expedition by carrying the mail through two hours sooner, the proof, as you will see by the depositions, is, that it was to be carried through only one hour and a half sooner than before the extra-compensation was allowed. The law explicitly directs that the extra allowance shall be regulated by the original contract, and apportioned according to the increase of duty to be performed. To determine the propriety of the allowance, the additional service must be distinctly stated; and as this has not been done in most of the cases, the documents, without reference to the contracts, shewing nothing, are not worth the cost of printing. But it is enough now to say that the Senate will not deliberately give publicity to what they know to be untrue.

Mr. Grundy hoped he had not mistaken the object of the motion now before the Senate. He had thought it was with a view to do justice to Mr. Bradley; so far he was willing to go; but let it be understood that he did not acquiesce in any denunciation of the officers of the Post-office Department. It was true Mr. Barry's name had been erased, and Mr. Bradley's substituted in its place; but the clerks tell us it was a mistake—that it was innocently done. He did not understand that the answer of the Post-master General to the *resolution* of the Senate was evasive; he had not been able to give so full an answer as was desirable, perhaps, but at the next session it might be obtained. He knew that Mr. Bradley was charged with paying money, which he should not have been, but he also knew that it resulted from an innocent mistake of young clerks.

Mr. Chambers, said, he had yielded the floor to afford other Senators an opportunity to explain their views. It was not proper to explain the objects of the memorial. It was now part of his duty to go into the proofs upon the subject, to show that the present Postmaster General has *wilfully* and *corruptly* made an allegation injurious to the reputation of the memorialist; or that *erasures* of Mr. Barry's name, and *interlineations* of Mr. Bradley's, now admitted to have been made at the Department, were made *fraudulently* and *corruptly*. His object required no such course, and therefore he did not pursue it.

Mr. Bradley has stated and sworn, that the extra allowances mentioned in the memorial, were made by Mr. Barry, and had made this fact the foundation of a charge preferred against Mr. Barry to the President of the U. S. Mr. Barry's report, bearing the authority of his official station and his signature, asserts that the extra allowances were made by Mr. Bradley. It therefore charges the statement and affidavit of the memorialist to be false. It is now admitted on all hands, and conclusively proved by an examination of the books of the Department, that the allowances were made by the present Postmaster General, Mr. Barry, and not Mr. Bradley; and that the name of Mr. Barry, originally and properly inserted in the abstract alluded to, has been erased, and the name of Mr. Bradley substituted: and it is therefore conceded, that the representation given by Mr. Bradley is true, and that given by the report of Mr. Barry, the Postmaster General, false. This false report has been ordered by the Senate to be printed. The memorialist asks a suspension of this order. This, sir, said Mr. C. is the history of this singular affair. The question for consideration, is whether the Senate will contribute their aid to circulate a falsehood, and thereby make itself auxiliary to the distribution of a charge, now admitted to be utterly untrue, deeply offensive to the character of a man who has grown grey in useful service to his country, and who has attained an honorable old age in the midst of active life without reproach to his integrity. As a citizen of the same State, he had asked his protection: it had cheerfully been accorded, and he was happy to believe no member of the Senate would withhold a vote now become necessary to preserve an innocent man from an unmerited and unfounded imputation.

The question was then put on suspending the printing, and determined in the affirmative, *nem. con.*

RICHHMOND, THURSDAY, MARCH 10.

THE CONTROVERSY.

The times are "out of joint." They require some little good-humour on the part of the friends of the Administration. We have seen the Telegraph and the Globe engaged in angry war.—We see the Opposition Editors republishing their invectives, and fanning the flame.—We see them flushed with fresh hopes of victory, and acting upon the old Machiavelian maxim of *Divide et impera*.—What is our duty in this state of things? *Bear and forbear*, as long as we can.—We have freely expressed ourselves as to the mischiefs which are to be apprehended from a publication of the Correspondence, and a further prosecution of the Controversy. We have declared our firm conviction upon the proofs at present exhibited, that Mr. Calhoun is mistaken in the supposition of a *plot*, and a "base plot" against him.—We regret that any such correspondence should have taken place between him and the President—And that the memory of Mr. Crawford has failed him, as to one or two of the material circumstances of these by-gone transactions.—But we shall not willingly make any further commentaries upon the Controversy. We shall publish the Strictures of the Telegraph, on the last article we have extracted from the Globe.—We shall lay before our readers any other letters, or important facts, which the case may call out—But, so far as it respects ourselves, we shall forbear to mingle in the contest, as far as we can with propriety. We respectfully recommend the same course to others. We observe, the Globe is withdrawing from the contest: At least it declares, that "Should nothing in the conduct of Mr. Calhoun or his friends, make further strictures on their course and objects necessary, we shall resume, with the utmost pleasure, the discussion of the great principles which guide the President in his political career."—We respectfully hope, that the Telegraph will return to the same system of "armed neutrality."

The one or two slight touches which the U. S. T. has given to ourselves *en passant*, have not escaped our notice. But we shall neither retort nor reply to them. We seek no quarrel with the Editor of the Telegraph—and under the present circumstances of our party, we frankly confess that we would rather shun one. We would much rather pour oil upon the agitated waves, than attempt to lash them into a higher tempest. The kindly offices of the N. Intelligencer, upon this occasion, are, of course, entitled to our most grateful acknowledgments. Instead of playing the honorable part of a mediator, it is doing every thing in its power to foment the strife between the friends of the Administration. The conduct of its Editors reminds us of the ridiculous *Goose* in the farm-yard. She is proud of the crumbs that have just been doled out to her. She struts along with a becoming air of self-importance. She gabbles about with all the noisy impertinence of its race—hissing away, and attempting to make as much mischief as it can among the more decent tenants of the yard.

The course of the Republicans of Virginia fortunately admits of no confusion. The landmarks are laid down, as straight as a ray of light from Heaven. They will rally around Andrew Jackson. They will support his re-election—No question about it! The Correspondent of the Boston Courier may infer, if he pleases, from certain signs at Washington, that there are, "at least, two *new States*, now represented in Congress, in which General Jackson will get no votes"—and he may allude to Virginia as one of them—But he is mistaken. The Boston Palladium may confidently assert that "Mr. Calhoun is to be proposed by his friends in those States (one of them is Virginia) as a Candidate for the Presidency, in opposition to General Jackson." But he is mistaken in his Views, both of Virginia and of Mr. Calhoun. The politician who saw in the breaking down of the Potomac bridge the type of the separation between Virginia and the administration, was one of the false prophets of the day. The piers of the bridge may be swept off by the mountain torrent, but the ties which bind Virginia to A. J. defy a much stronger attack. She remains "unterrified" and unseduced. Although she may differ with him in a few views and measures, she is strongly attached to him as an honest patriot, and as the friend of reform.—She will go *for his re-election*—and this is one of the points which cannot be mistaken.

She will also *go against* Mr. Clay—for reasons, which have been so frequently enumerated, that it is unnecessary to repeat them.—This is another of the established landmarks of our political course.

But Virginia will scarcely bind herself at this time to the car of any man who aspires to be the successor of A. Jackson. She goes not for men, but for principles—not for this or that candidate, but for the great interests of the Constitution. Who is the best calculated to defeat the success of the avowed author of the falsely styled "American System"? Who has the strongest attachments to the true principles of our government—and is the most anxious and the most able to "retract" its measures to the fundamental principles of the Federal Constitution? These are the great elements of the problem, which we shall *hereafter* be called upon to solve. But Virginia is scarcely mad enough at this moment to waste her strength by a premature commitment of her suffrages. We trust, that she will ultimately throw her weight into the scale of the Constitution—and not pematurely sacrifice her great principles to the personal views of any ambitious aspirant. Much is expected from her. It would be affectation to deny that much depends upon the discretion and firmness of her politicians. An honest and an earnest support of all the good measures of the present administration—a frank but a friendly and respectful protest against its errors—a determination to support her principles;—as much harmony as possible among the republican party—a resolution to give no premature committals—the interests of the Constitution, rather than of a Candidate—these are the landmarks which, it is to be hoped, will guide the citizens of Virginia—and, may we not venture to hope, the Republicans of the Union?

THE TURKISH COMMISSIONERS.

We have read, with much curiosity, Mr. Tyler's Speech, upon the appropriation for the Commissioners to Turkey. We hasten to lay it before our readers.—We shall also lay before them, the Speeches of Messrs. Tazewell, Livingston, and Forsyth, as soon as we receive them.

We have read Mr. Tyler's Address with very mingled feelings. We like the *principle* which it lays down. We agree perfectly with Mr. Tyler, that "the post of safety is to stand by the Constitution." All Public Ministers and Agents, who *represent* this Government abroad, ought to pass the ordeal of the Senate, except in the cases specified by the Constitution. We think no temporary expediency; no commercial advantage that may be promised, by any such secret Mission, can compensate for a departure from the Constitution of the Country. We consider this to be the abstract, & the true doctrine upon the subject.—We think, with Mr. T., that no "precedent can justify error" in such a case. We do not plead justification, therefore, for the appointment of Commissioners to the Porte. We think the Administration has erred in the course which it pursued in the present case—No one is more willing than we are, to give every *eclat*, which is due to Mr. Rhind's successful negotiation—conducted as it was with so much address, and consummated without the knowledge, and against all the wishes of the British Merchants and Agents—yet, we are free to confess, that we see no adequate authority for such a mission, in the Constitution of the land. We take it for granted, upon Mr. T's statement and that of others, that it was so conducted, without the knowledge and advice of the Senate; and such is the opinion that we form of it—So far we agree with the Senator from Virginia.

But we cannot equally approve of the *manner* in which he has conveyed his opposition to the measure. A thousand *precedents* will not "*justify* error"—but they may mitigate our indignation. We understand, that in our foreign diplomacy, a distinction has been drawn between civilized and barbarian States. It has rarely occurred, if ever, that our Commissioners to the States of Barbary have been nominated by the President, and confirmed by the Senate. The practice may be wrong; and it is our belief, that it is so—But it has been pursued since the year 1795, by Washington, Jefferson and Madison (as has been asserted on the floor of the Senate,)—and no one can peruse the history of such negotiations in the 13th Chapter of Lyman's "Diplomacy of the U. States," without being sensible of the fact, that they have been conducted, neither with regard to the strict etiquette of civilized nations, nor to the strict letter of our own Constitution. Treaties have even been formed with the States of Barbary, by Agents appointed by our Minister at Lisbon, &c. Some reasons were given too in this Debate for the employment of secret Agents in such transactions—It was said, that our Commissioners to the Porte never could have succeeded, if their mission had been made known to the European Ambassadors; and that it would have been impossible for this mission to have been kept secret, if the nomination with its objects had been communicated to the Senate; that some one out of the 46 Senators would have blabbed the fact; that the mission would have reached the ears of the "privileged spies" at Washington, and its object would have been defeated.—We state these circumstances, not by way of justification, but of mitigation of damages.—They do not excuse, but they clearly palliate the act.

We should have been better pleased, therefore, with Mr. Tyler's amendment, if instead of confining the protest to this single case, he had extended it to all other precedents since the year '95—We should have been better satisfied with his speech, if, while he was firmly protesting against the measure, he had observed a more friendly manner towards the administration—we say the administration, because we have no idea of separating the President of the United States in any such case, from his Secretaries. In England, they may pretend that the "King can do no wrong," and lay the whole blame on his ministers. But we hold the President principally liable—and we also hold his constitutional adviser also to be liable for the bad advice he may give. But we cannot consent to hold up the President so really of a cypher—nor do we believe A. Jackson is so—as to shuffle the Secretary of State "to the top of the pack"—and make him the principal object of animadversion. We think Mr. Tyler's manner is unfortunate—and not so friendly as it might have been—and the more so because it has given some handle to the Opposition papers, to misrepresent himself as well as Virginia.—At this "critical juncture," when we have already so much division in our ranks, what do these prints say? They refer to the speeches of Messrs. Tazewell and Tyler as the signs of further distraction. The Boston Courier, for instance, of the 21, refers to the Sketch of the Debate in the Senate of the 25th ult as furnishing "some ground for conjecture that Virginia is about to withdraw from the Jackson and Van Buren communion." Now, we are confident that Virginia is not withdrawing from Gen. Jackson—for her strength will be firmly with him—let the struggle come when it may—But the Oppositionists are drawing the most erroneous inferences from the speeches in question. Let them, however, "lay not such a flattering unction to their souls."

They may rest assured, that Virginia will not go against the election of Gen. Jackson, nor will her Senators.

We speak the more explicitly upon this subject, because we not only see attempts systematically making to deceive the politicians of other States, about the sentiments of Virginia, and thus to injure the cause of the Administration in those quarters; but we happen to *know*, that an attempt is now on foot, by some of the friends of *H. Clay*, to break down the friends of the Administration *here*—aye, in the Old Dominion herself. Even the Republican Character of the Legislature itself, will probably afford no security against such an attempt. We could lay our fingers upon two or three of the persons who are at the bottom of the design—They are not the friends of Jackson, of Calhoun, or of Mr. Van Buren, but of Mr. Clay himself.

Some little dexterity is necessary to cloak their designs.—They will avail themselves of some general principle, which is dear to the Republicans.—They will try to operate upon some friend or friends of the Administration—to make them "the instruments of division," which may prove fatal to the union of the party, and therefore favorable to the interests of

Mr. Clay. We will speak out, if the occasion demands it—but our confidence is, that the public centinels will be at their posts; and that no specious pretences will blind their judgment, or arrest their activity. In case the attempt should be made, these men will speak out—they will deport themselves as becomes the friends of the Administration—the enemies of all precipitate divisions, and of all party manœuvres.

THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

We lay before our readers a Debate in the Senate of the United States, which is exciting much interest, and much misrepresentation. Mr. Barry has been boldly denounced in private circles as a *forger:* confounding one charge with another, some have gone so far as to say that he was a *defaulter;* that he has put his hands into the public funds—and has sought to conceal a robbery of the Treasury by a falsification of the Documents! Charges so seriously and gravely made must be promptly met. The true character of the transaction must, however, first be explained. The speeches of Messrs. Clayton, Chambers and Holmes state *what the charge is*—and Mr. Grundy's speech, answers and explains it away.—But the vindication of Mr. Barry does not rest here. He has come forward and authorised the following statement to be made in the "Globe:"

"We are authorised to say, that all representations, whether made by men in high places, or in the streets, that there has been any forgery, or any mutilation or alteration of any of the Records, Books, or Documents, in the Post Office Department, are false and slanderous:—and that all intimations of erasures, or alterations in a Report from this Department, after it had been signed by the Postmaster General, are equally false.

"A paper presented by a Clerk does not become a document, till it is adopted by the Postmaster General, or officer who authenticates it. All statements, therefore, wherever made, of the "falsification of a document," or of a fraudulent "mutilation of an original document," in reference to a recent report from this Department, originated in a design to slander."

Mr. Barry here positively denies that there has been any falsification or mutilation of an original document in the office—He goes further—and affirms that the paper in question was presented by a Clerk, and that it was not adopted by the Postmaster General.—Mr. Grundy explains the mistaken principle on which the Clerk was betrayed into an erasure of the Abstract.—We entertain a high opinion of Mr. Barry's integrity and understanding. We firmly believe, therefore, the statement to be true, which he has *authorised* to be made in the face of the nation. But these erasures, if made for the purpose of deception, would admit of no justification—and the Clerk, who had thus made them, (be he who he may) ought to receive, not merely a severe reprimand, but the most summary punishment.—But it is idle to talk of a defalcation; of a robbery of the public money; or of the Post-master General's flagrant violation of his public trusts. Such rumors have originated, either in gross mistake or "in a design to slander."

The following is the explanation which the U. S. Telegraph gives of these erasures:

GENERAL POST OFFICE.

."Our City has for the last few days been filled with rumors upon the subject of some alterations made in the report of the Post-master General, in reply to a call of the Senate, relative to allowances made on contracts. The remarks of Mr. Grundy will be considered a full and satisfactory explanation. The Department being required to state as well the allowances made by Judge McLean as Mr. Barry, the clerk charged with preparing the report, first stated those made by Mr. Bradley after the resignation of Mr. McLean, and before Mr. Barry had entered on the duties of the office, as made by Mr. Barry, without taking into consideration that Mr. Bradley in the mean time had acted as Post-master General. He afterwards erased the name of Mr. Barry, and inserted in his *own statement* (not in the books of the Department, as had been stated,) the name of Mr. Bradley upon such allowances as it appeared to him had been made by Mr. Bradley.

"We have not seen a single individual, however much opposed to the administration, to whom this explanation has been given, who is not fully satisfied therewith, and who does not acquit, not only the head of the Department, but the Clerks also, of all blame. Mr. Bradley, in a memorial to the Senate, complains of a *mutilated document!!* No document has been mutilated: the clerk having discovered, that in the statement prepared by him, he had written the name of Mr. Barry where that of Mr. Bradley, as he supposed, should have been written, erased that of Mr. Barry, and inserted that of Mr. Bradley; not on the books of the Department, but on a statement which the clerk was preparing, under the order of the Senate."

"There is a rumor in the Richmond papers, that Mr. Archer, Representative in Congress from Virginia, is to succeed Mr. Randolph as our Minister to the Court of St. Petersburgh. We have doubts of its authenticity" (*Nat Int*

We have since received no information to confirm the rumour.

The Washington Globe of Saturday also says:

"Gossips are busy in reporting intended changes in the Cabinet. We are entire strangers to any such design."

VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE.

Yesterday, the Judiciary Bill was reported by Mr. Leigh from the Committee of Courts of Justice. Several of the Circuits and terms of Court have been recast—and the amendments for this purrose, proposed by the Committee, were adopted by the House. The blank for the *number* of Circuits was filled with 12—thus making *twenty-four judges.*—Mr. Maxwell made two unavailing motions 1st, to have a separate Sup. Court in the Borough of Norfolk, and 2dly, to remove the Superior Court of the County into the Borough.—On Mr. Leigh's motion, the Superior Court for Spottsylvania, was transferred from the County Courthouse to the town of Fredericksburg—The pockets of the members seemed to be emptied of amendments—and the bill was probably ready for engrossment—but to give one gentleman an opportunity of re-examining the arrangement of one of the circuits, the bill was, on Mr. Leigh's instance, laid upon the table.—It will probably come up to-day for engrossment.

The bill for regulating the tariff of tolls at Mayo's Bridge, was reported by Mr. Burfoot—and an important bill of 66 manuscript pages, was reported by Mr. Morris, from the Committee of Privileges and Elections, entitled, "A bill concerning General Elections in this Commonwealth."

"The Correspondence," &c. have hitherto prevented the appearance of several long articles in our columns, as Benton's powerful *Speech* against the Bank of the United States; Polk's *Report* on the Distribution of the Surplus Revenue, &c. We shall seize the earliest opportunity to lay them before our readers.

☞ We regret, that the Debate on the Petersburg Rail-Road is again omitted for want of room—but we must lay it over for two days longer.

The Fredericksburg papers announce John Mercer Patton, as "a candidate for re-election, in the district composed of the Counties of Spottsylvania, Louisa, Orange and Madison, to the next Congress of the United States."

We are requested to say, that John M. Garnett of Essex, will be a candidate for Congress, in the King & Queen District, lately represented by John Roane, Esq.

VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE.

HOUSE OF DELEGATES.

TUESDAY, March 8.

On motion of Mr. Anderson of Botetourt, the Committee of Roads and Internal Navigation were permitted to sit during the session of the House.

Mr. Leftwich presented a petition from citizens of Bedford County, for a decrease of tolls on Tobacco, on the James River Canal.

The bill concerning the inspection of flour and Indian meal, in the city of Richmond, was read a second time.

Mr. Rutherfoord moved to amend the bill by increasing the compensation to the Inspector, from 1 1-4 cent, to 1 1-2 cent per barrel. After some debate between Messrs. Rutherfoord and Rives of C., the motion was rejected.

Mr. Rutherfoord further moved to amend the bill by striking out the third section, providing that no miller shall make use of more than one brand-mark, for flour manufactured at his mill.

Mr. Miller of Powhatan, urged that the use of several brand-marks by the same miller, injured the general character of the flour. He alluded to the mills of Mr. Chevallie of this city. His best flour had the brand of Gallego's mills, which was a favorite brand in South America. His inferior flour was branded *canal flour,* which gave a character to all flour coming down the Canal, while it was well known that both were manufactured at Gallego's mills. The operation of such practices was highly injurious to the up-country manufacturers. If, on the contrary, the different qualities of flour produced at the same mill, were marked with one brand, and distinguished by No. 1, No. 2, &c. they would not interfere with the interests of others.

Mr. Marshall advocated the motion to amend. The miller received various qualities of wheat, which must, necessarily be assorted. By mixing the whole, he would degrade the quality of his flour, while by assorting, he could make a superfine flour which would stand the climate of South America, and an inferior quality, which would pass inspection as superfine, and suit other markets. But, if forced to brand the two with the same mark, the character of his mill would be destroyed.

Mr. Rives of Campbell, in opposing the motion, read from the General Inspection Law, in which each miller is required to have a distinguishing brand. The law had assumed that inspection was necessary, and this provision could only be injurious where the flour was inferior. The miller ought to be restricted to one brand, to prevent deception. He alluded to the testimony before the committee, in which a dealer in flour declared his knowledge of an instance in which the country brand had been erased, and a city brand put in its place, upon a certain number of barrels, to make up an order. The effect of these practises was to injure the general character of the flour from the upper country.

Mr. Bryce supported the motion. No injury seemed to have resulted from the use of more than one brand. As to the erasure of the brand of the country mill, that was a fraud, and this restriction would not prevent its repetition, because it could be done with one brand as well as two. If the city millers had adopted brands belonging to country mills, it would have been injurious; but the adoption of a brand not known in any part of the State, could injure no one. The city millers had gained their reputation abroad by sending good flour. It appeared, therefore, to him, that this provision of the bill would injure the city millers, while it would not benefit the country millers.

Mr. Garland of N., argued that the effect of using various brands was, that when the miller used other brands than his own, it was as much as to say, "this is not made at my mill." It was made in Virginia; but it was not his. So in marking an inferior quality "*canal flour*"—the natural consequence was, that it depreciated the character of the flour of the upper country, and gave a bad name to all the canal flour. And it also put the farmers of the country to the necessity of bringing their wheat to Richmond, instead of disposing of it in the upper country.

Mr. Rutherfoord observed that the gentleman from Nelson argued as if the use of more than one brand was the particular privilege of the city millers. If there was an advantage in it, why did not the country millers imitate the example? The gentleman from Campbell had quoted the law to show that a distinguishing brand must be used by every miller. Mr. R. supposed that the object was that the manufacturer should be known. And every one knew the manufacturer in the case alluded to, whether the flour was marked *Gallegos,* or *canal flour.* The mill and the miller were perfectly known. If this provision were retained in the bill, the country miller would be injured. The city millers, by the great pains they had taken, had secured the South American market, which was formerly enjoyed by Baltimore. Any change of the brands now known and depended upon, would injure the character of flour from this State. If the character of the city flour was broken down, Baltimore might regain that trade, to the injury of the whole State.

Mr. Miller of P., disagreed with the gentleman from Richmond, as to the supposition that every body knew where the *canal flour* was manufactured. It might be perfectly well known here. But did the people of Norfolk, or New York, or purchasers in South America, know that it was made in Rchmond? Certainly not. It seemed to be thought impolitic to make this provision. But, in his opinion, nothing was impolitic which was just.

Some further conversation took place between Messrs. Bryce, Miller, and Garland, when the motion to amend was rejected. The bill was then ordered to be engrossed.

The following bills were read a second time, and ordered to be engrossed:—Concerning William McDaniel—To amend an act concerning Public Roads, and the establishment of Public Landings—Requiring Accounts of Sales, made under execution, to be returned to the Clerk's Office—Concerning Teakle Savage—Concerning Robert T. Pendleton and Hiram Childs—Further directing the course of administration of personal assets [committed]—To amend several acts, the better to secure the payment of rents, and to prevent the fraudulent acts of Tenants; and to regulate the suing out and prosecuting of writs of replevin—Concerning James G. Blakey and others.

The following bills were read a first time, and ordered to second readings:—To amend the law relating to Commissioners of the Revenue—Relinquishing a Tract of Land to Frances Maria Tracy—To provide against the abuse of the Bridges across the Potomac and Shenandoah Rivers, at Harper's Ferry—Concerning the appointment of Agents for the Kanawha Road and River, and the Blue Ridge Canal—Concerning the Water Works in the City of Richmond.

The joint Order of the Day was then proceeded in, for the election of a Superintendant of the Penitentiary Institution.—Mr. Rutherfoord nominated Samuel P. Parsons.

In the House, Samuel P. Parsons received 81 votes
In the Senate, 29

Total 110

The House then proceeded to the election of an Agent of the Penitentiary.—Mr. Garland of N. nominated Thos. Nelson, who received in the House 86
in the Senate 27

113

FEES OF CLERKS OF COURTS.

The *Order of the Day being the bill concerning* the Fees of Clerks of Courts, was announced—and, on motion of Mr. Gallaher, the Committee of the Whole was discharged from its further consideration.

On motion of Mr. Gallaher, the bill was then taken up.

Mr. Terrill moved the indefinite postponement of the bill, on the ground, that the effect contemplated by this bill, would be produced by the bill which had already been passed, in relation to the tenure of the Clerks' Offices.

Mr. Knox opposed the motion. The people had suffered great evils from the exorbitant fees exacted by the Clerks of Courts, which rendered this bill very important.

Mr. Terrill made a few additional remarks. The subject could better be decided at the next session, than at so late a period of the present.

Mr. Goode argued, that this was, of all times, the best to decide this question, as the Clerks of Courts were about to be appointed under the new tenure. If this bill were to be brought up next year, it would be echoed from every side, that the Legislature had encouraged those officers, to accept their offices, at certain rates of compensation, and that any change would operate unfairly upon them.

Mr. Campbell of Brooke should record his vote for the indefinite postponement. The reduction proposed by this bill was so great, that in many instances it would prove very injurious. In the small counties, if that reduction were made, they would be unable to obtain Clerks. If the fees in the large counties were excessive, a bill might be framed, applying to them.

Mr. Moore hoped the postponement would not take place. In most of the counties of the State, the fees of Clerks were oppressive, and he could not assent to sacrifice the bill, because it might be inconvenient to some of the small counties. The bill was now open to amendment, and modifications might be made, in regard to the small counties.

Mr. Campbell said, that if the friends of the bill would modify it, so as not to deprive the small counties of their clerks, he should not be opposed to it.

Mr. Gallaher suggested that the bill could be so modified as to confine its operation to the larger counties.

Mr. Chichester hoped the bill might pass in its present form, that the fees might be uniform throughout the State.

Mr. Terrill withdrew his motion to postpone and moved that the bill be recommitted. This motion having been opposed by Mr. Knox, and supported by Messrs. Terrill and Witcher, was agreed to by a vote of 58 to 52.

Mr. Goode moved that the bill be committed to a Committee of the whole house *instanter.* If it were to be commenced with *de novo,* it might as well be abandoned. This motion was opposed by Messrs. Gibson, Terrill and Poindexter, and suppported by Messrs Miller of P. and Knox.

The question was then put on committing the bill to a Committee of the whole House, which was agreed to, and the bill was taken up in Committee of the Whole, Mr. Miller of P. in the chair.

Sundry amendments were then adopted, and at a late hour, on motion of Mr. Knox, the Committee rose, and reported progress; and, on motion of Mr. Leigh, the bill and amendments were laid on the table.

JUDICIARY SYSTEM.

Mr. Leigh, from the Committee of Courts of Justice, reported the bill to establish Superior Courts of Law and Equity in the counties and certain corporations of this Commonwealth. [This is the great magnet of the session. It is the bill for organizing Superior Courts of Law and Chancery in each county of the Commonwealth. The committee have now returned it with the details of the circuits and terms of courts elaborately arranged.]

INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. Garland of Nelson, from the Committee on Roads and Internal Navigation, reported a bill making further provision for the Kanawha Turnpike to the Big Sandy River—and a bill to incorporate the Lynchburg and New River Rail Road Company.

Mr. G. from the same committee, also reported the following interesting bill:

A Bill providing the means of ascertaining the best mode of uniting the Eastern and Western Waters.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly, That Commissioners be, and they are hereby appointed for the following purposes, to wit: 1. It shall be their duty during the present year to examine James River from Richmond to Covington, and make an estimate of the probable cost of continuing the Canal from Maiden's Adventure to Lynchburg; the probable cost of improving the river between these points by Locks and Dams; the probable cost of a Rail-road from Richmond to Lynchburg—2. To make a similar examination and estimate for the distance between Lynchburg and Covington—3. To examine the country between James River and New River for the purpose of ascertaining the best route for a canal or rail-road between such points on those rivers as they may determine, and to make an estimate of the probable cost thereof; and 4. To examine New River from its point of union with the said canal or rail-road with a view to its improvement by each of the above modes, and to make an estimate of the probable cost thereof; and in the performance of the foregoing duties, the commissioners may cause such surveys to be made as they may think necessary. The examinations and estimates of the said commissioners shall be made with the utmost practicable care and accuracy, having due regard to durability and to a proper accommodation of the trade. And it shall be the duty of the said commissioners to make a full and minute report of their proceedings and estimates, to be laid before the next Legislature, recommending such improvements for the purposes aforesaid, and on such modes of construction as from their enquiries they may deem most expedient, all circumstances duly considered, stating the advantage and disadvantages, the commercial benefits, the probable revenue, and every consideration by which their decision may be influenced.

Be it further enacted, That in order to enable the commissioners aforesaid, to come to a correct decision, it shall be lawful for them to collect information as to the several modes of improvement above mentioned, by personal examination and inquiry, in whatever quarter they may think proper; and they may require the services of the Principal Engineer, at such times and on such occasions as they may deem expedient.

On motion of Mr. Moore, the House adjourned.

YESTERDAY—A message was received from the Senate, informing that they insist in their two first amendments to the bill concerning slaves, free negroes and mulattoes, disagreed to by the House of Delegates. On motion of Mr. Witcher, the bill and amendments were laid on the table.

Che following bills were read a second time, and ordered to be engrossed—concerning the appointment of Agents for the Kanawha Road and River, and the Blue Ridge Canal—to provide against abuse of the bridges across the Shenandoah and Potomac Rivers, at Harper's ferry—releasing to Frances Maria Tracy the Commonwealth's title to a tract of land—concerning the Water Works in the City of Richmond—authorizing an increase of the Capital Stock of the Rappahannock Company.

The following bills were read a first time, and ordered to a second reading—authorizing Michael Zeigler and Hopkins Nolin to erect a dam across Pig River—defining the powers of the Board of Directors, and fixing the duties of the officers of the Penitentiary—to amend an act concerning the inspection of fish—to amend an act to incorporate the Petersburg Rail Road Company—concerning the seniority of Justices of the Peace—forming a new county out of parts of Shenandoah and Rockingham—reducing into one the several acts concerning pilots, and regulating their fees—to reduce the shipping duty on tobacco [read a second time, and committed]—to authorize a suitable building as a shelter to merchandize on the lower bank of the Basin at the City of Richmond [read a 2d time and committed]—to incorporate the Fredericksburg Aqueduct Company—requiring indexes of records [read a 2d and committed]—concerning Thomas Hall and Raphael Holt, [read a 2d time and committed]—to incorporate the Richmond, Petersburg, Norfolk and Philadelphia Steam Boat Company—concerning the executors of William H. Perkins, deceased—changing the time of holding the County Courts of Grayson, Russell, Lee, Tazewell, Scott & Washington Counties [read a 2d. time and committed]—to amend an act authorizing a lottery and the sale of certain lots in the town of Portsmouth—to authorize a separate election at the cross roads in the County of Albemarle, [read a 2d time and committed.]

Mr. Goode, from the Select Committee on that subject, reported a bill to abolish the Board of Public Works.

SALARY OF THE GOVERNOR

Mr. Rutherfoord submitted the following resolution: *Resolved*, That leave be given to bring in a bill allowing compensation to the Governor for his services as President of the James River Company, and of the Board of Public Works.

Mr. Rutherfoord, said in submitting this resolution, that he had understood, since the former discussion of the salary of the Governor, there were several gentlemen who would be in favor of giving compensation to the Governor for his services as President of the James River Company and as President of the Board of Public Works, while many of his constituents, who, living in Richmond, knew the expense of living, were desirous that the compensation of the Governor should be increased. As he did not enter upon his duties for some weeks, the proposed bill could, if it were the will of the House, be introduced, and carried through before the period arrived. He did not wish to give to the Governor an exorbitant salary; but *to enable him to meet strangers with that hospitality which became his station, instead of shrinking from them, because his salary would not authorize it*. The duties of the offices, to which the resolution alluded, were independent of those of Governor, and for their performance a compensation ought to be given.

Mr. Miller of P. said that the duties of the Governor, as President of the James River Company, and as President of the Board of Public Works were very arduous and had much increased in late years, yet for their performance he received no compensation. There were other reasons why the salary of the Governor should be increased. Under the new constitution the number of his counsellors had been decreased, and the nature of their duties changed in such a manner as to increase and render much more arduous those of the Governor.

Mr. Wood of F. hoped that the resolution would not prevail. The Governor had accepted the office with its present salary, which he saw no reason for increasing. He presumed the only object was to encourage the drinking of a greater quantity of Champaign. He understood that the Governor had already expended half his salary in giving parties; and he supposed that this increase was to enable him to give a few more, which were probably to be given to the gentlemen of Richmond.

The question was then taken, and the resolution adopted by a vote of Ayes 58, noes 41.

Messrs. Rutherford, Miller of P., Anderson of B., Maxwell, Wilson, Keller, Jacobs, Mason of L. Chichester and Crockett, were appointed a Committee to bring in a bill.

JUDICIARY SYSTEM.

On motion of Mr. Leigh, the Judiciary Bill was taken up, and the amendments of the committee of Courts of Justice being under consideration, they were severally agreed to.

Mr. Leigh stated that the committee had been in favor of filling the blank in the first section of the bill with the word "twelve," (the number of the circuits,) and moved that the blank be thus filled.

Mr. Claiborne, after some introductory remarks, moved to fill the blank with the word "ten" Mr C. supported this motion at considerable length, and endeavored to illustrate that the business of the courts could be done by ten judges and ten chancellors. He then laid a scheme which he had framed upon the table for the inspection of the members.

Mr. Morris had hoped that the principle of this bill had been finally settled in the previous debates. If the proposition of the gentleman from Greensville prevailed, he believed the principle of the bill was at an end, and he had almost said the administration of justice also.

Mr. Leigh, in reply to the remarks of Mr. Claiborne supported the motion to create twelve circuits, and went at length into an argument on the subject. He argued that it would not be just to the trans-Alleghany counties to enlarge their circuits. He believed that the plan proposed could not be made to work, and hoped that the House would fill the blank with the word twelve.

Mr. Claiborne defended his motion at some length and explained his objects.

On motion of Mr. Witcher, the ayes and noes were ordered.

Mr. Goode was one of those who at first thought that ten circuits would be sufficient; but he became convinced, when he endeavored to work out the position in the Committee of Courts of Justice, that less than twelve circuits could not meet the objects they had in view. He examined the plan submitted by Mr. Claiborne, and declared that its adoption would produce great inconveniences, some of which he explained.

Mr. Witcher supported Mr. Claiborne's motion, to whom Mr. Leigh briefly replied.

Mr. Campbell of Brooke explained his vote. He had on a former occasion, stated that the western Counties could be reduced to three circuits. This had been done, but in regard to the plan of dividing the state into ten circuits, he had patiently examined the subject, and became convinced that the business of the state could not be done as it ought to be done with less than twelve circuits. He should therefore give his vote for the motion to fill the blank with *twelve*.

The question being then taken on Mr. Leigh's motion, it was decided in the affirmative by the following vote:

AYES—Messrs Banks, (Speaker) Drummond, Wood of Albemarle, Terrill, Garland of Amherst, Kenney, M'Cue, Henshaw, Anderson of Botetourt, Campbell of Brooke, Shell, Christian Spurlock, Rives of Campbell, Clay, Watkins, Burfoot, Broadus, Gibson, Wilson, Jones, Wright, James, Marshall, Payne, Castleman, Wood of Frederick, Perrin, Bryce, Erskine, Green, Easley, Dunn, Carskadon, Morris, Seymour, Davisson, Williams of Harrison, Leigh, Atkinson, Semple, Lucas, Gallaher, Summers, Hoop, Pollard, of K. Wm. Leland, Lawson, Powell and Mason of Loudoun Poindexter, Hodgins, Knox, Goode, Preston, Helms O'Ferrall, Cohoon, Garland of Nelson, Murdaugh, Upshur, Blackwell, Hiner, Miller of Powhatan, Venable, Sheild, Tyler, Moore, Lewis, Williams of Senandoah, Harris, Gatewood, Hamilton, Moncure, Newton, Crockett, Maxwell, Rutherfoord.—78.

NAYS—Messrs. Booker, Campbell of Bedford, Leftwich, Gholson, Yancey, Taylor, Chichester, Powell of Franklin, Holland, King, Hail, Claiborne, Dyer, Pollard, of K. & Q. Ewing, Hays, Caldwell, Newman, Watts, Billingsly, Vawter, Jacobs, Davis of Orange, Adams, Witcher, Swanson, Baxter, Zinn, Hart, M'Mahon, Alexander, Kilgore, Goodwyn, Crump, Gillaspie, M'Coy, Keller, Jackson —38.

Mr. Maxwell offered an amendment, the effect of which was to establish a Superior Court in the Borough of Norfolk. This motion was discussed at great length, by Messrs. Murdaugh and Maxwell.

The question was then taken on the amendment; which was rejected—ayes 45; noes 49.

Mr. Maxwell made another motion to amend, by which the Superior Court of the County should be held at the Court House of Norfolk Borough; which was rejected.

Various amendments reported by the committee, relative to the arrangements of the circuits, were adopted.

On motion of Mr. Leigh the bill was so amended, as to provide for the holding of the Superior Court at the Court House of Fredericksburg, instead of the Court House of the County of Spottsylvania, after the motion had been discussed by Messrs. Leigh, Poiedexter, Hamilton, Williams of S., and Terrill.

On motion of Mr. Leigh, the bill was laid upon the table.

Mr. Burfoot, from the Seclect Committee, reported a bill regulating the tolls for passing over Mayo's bridge, which was read and ordered to a second reading.

Mr. Morris, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported a bill concerning General Elections in this Commonwealth, which was read by its title, passed to a second reading, and ordered to be printed

On motion of Mr. Morris, the same committee was discharged from the further consideration of sundry petitions relative to the General Elections

On motion of Mr. Atkinson, the House adjourned.

FOR THE ENQUIRER.

INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF ROADS & INTERNAL NAVIGATION.

In their Report to the Legislature, the committee state the total Canal Debt on Jan. 1st, 1830, of the State of New York, to be only $7,706,913. And that the nett surplus revenue of the canals for the last three years, which "could be applied to extinguish the debt" created by that state, being what remained after payment of interest on loans and all other expenses, to be as follows, viz:

For 1828	$134,292 65
1829	209,083 00
1830	249,691 00

The committee do not inform us upon what authority their statement is founded, whether from the Report of the N. York Canal Commissioners, or from mere private and unofficial information. There is, however, so wide a discrepancy between their statement and that which was appended by P. P. Barbour, Esq. to his speech delivered in Congress in March last, on the Buffalo & New Orleans Road Bill, and said to have been drawn from an official Report of the Canal Commissioners of New York, that much room is afforded for suspecting that the committee, by some means or other, have been led into error.

To afford an opportunity of comparison and satisfactory explanation, I send you herewith a copy of Mr. Barbour's statement:

"APPENDIX.

"Since delivering the foregoing Speech, a report of the Canal Commissioners of New York, in relation to their great Erie & Champlain Canals, has been received, from which the following facts and statements are derived:

"Whole amount expended in 1826, consisting of interest on the original cost, superintendence, repairs, &c.	$1,121,388 96
Credit by whole revenue derived from canals during the same year,	715,245 89
Balance against canals	$406,143 07
1827—Whole amount expended, as above,	$993,436 59
Whole revenue from canals	846,651 73
Balance against canals	$146,784 86
1828—Upon same principles, a balance of expenses over the revenue from the canals.	
Balance against canals	$92,369 81
1829—Upon same principles, as balance of expenses over and above the revenue for this year	
Balance against canals	$110,623 51

"It appears from that report, that the whole amount of the debt, which the commissioners thought justly chargeable to the canals at the close of the year 1826, was $10,272,316 76; and that this debt, instead of having been reduced by the tolls on the canals, has increased each year, so that on the 1st of January, 1830, it amounted to 11,398,796 22. Add the deficits for the four years, with interest on them, makes the whole debt chargeable to the canals on the 1st January, 1830, $12,237,399 70."

"The Report adds, that supposing the canals to have increased the duty on salt 33 1-3 per cent., and to have added two or three per cent. to the duties on sales at auction, still regarding them in the most favorable light in which any reasonable calculation can place them, the canals have done nothing towards the extinguishment of their debt, together with the moneys expended upon them for superintendence and repairs. That with respect to the tolls on the descending trade, they cannot be advantageously increased, and they only estimate every increase which can be made of the tolls on the ascending trade at $35,000."

March 2nd, 1831. AN OBSERVER.

FOR THE ENQUIRER.

CLAIMS OF VIRGINIA ON THE U. STATES.

The nature of the claims of Virginia on the United States, on account of our debt contracted during the Revolution, has not been understood by many of those who have not examined the subject *minutely. Indeed, it is difficult to gain access to the various documents (dispersed as they are among the public offices at Richmond and Washington) in order to investigate the subject thoroughly.* It seems, that on the settlement *of the accounts of* the States, there was allowed to Virginia the sum of $19,085,981 51. This was the general balance struck in favor of this State, as due from the United States. Balances were found due likewise to each of the other states The aggregate of these balances amounted to $77,666,678— which was charged to the States respectively, according to their federal numbers. The proportion charged to Virginia was $15,388,444. In the act of 1790, providing for funding the state debts, $21,500,000 was allowed for the payment of the supposed aggregate of the debts of the states. This sum was set apart for the purpose of paying those debts which the states had contracted on their own account, and was separte and distinct from the general accounts of expenditure between the States. Of this amount, $3,500,900 was allowed for the debts of Virginia. It seems, that only 2,934,443 of the $3,500,000 was actually applied to the payment of the state debt of Virginia; so that $565,557 remained, of which Virginia did not avail herself. The amount thus actually applied to the payment of the state debt of Virginia, viz: $2,934,443, and the proportion charged to this state of the general aggregate of balances on account of the federal debt proper, viz: $15,383,444, making together $18,317,887, would seem to be the proper amount to be deducted from the general balance of $19,085,981 51, due from the United States to Virginia. This leaves $768,094 51 as the sum due to Virginia on account of these transactions. It is said, however, that Virginia was charged with other sums, so as to reduce this amount, and to leave a nominal balance due from her. It is difficult to conceive what proper charges could have been made against Virginia after the general balance of $19,085,981 51, was ascertained and admitted. This was the amount credited to this State on the first general settlement, and which of course was due from the United States. —But, the payments which which Virginia has made on account of her revolutionary debt since her settlement with the United States, and for which she now asks to be remunerated, (had they been included) would have swelled the balance in her favor to more than $1 000,000, on the final and proper adjustment of the accounts. There can be no doubt that the United States are bound to pay and will pay to Virginia the whole expenses of the Illinois regiment. The obligation to do this, is explicitly recognized in the articles of cession of the North Western Territory—the country which was conquered by the heroism of Gen'l Clarke and his regiment. Your correspondent cannot believe that the United States will hesitate long to do ample justice to Virginia with regard to these claims, unless the liberal munificence and sacrifices of this State, have failed to make any impression on our sister States. With regard to the outstanding and unsettled revolutionary claims against this State, it is understood that the Legislature do not make any provision concerning them in the act touching the claim on the United States. X.

COMMUNICATED.

TASSELLS.

When I heard that Tassells was hung, I flattered myself with being able to open a newspaper occasionally without being confronted with his omnious name, in glaring capitals. I indulged, as I find, a vain hope, and make no apology now for using this favorite caption, requesting you to publish the following anecdote, which I have heard repeatedly in private circles, but have never seen it in print. It is an instance of quick and pungent replication.

When the trial of Tassels was pending in Hall Superior Court, his Counsel raised the objection that the Court had not jurisdiction of the case, and being overruled by Judge Clayton, rather tauntingly observed *"that it did not matter, he would carry the case up to the Supreme Court."*—To which the Judge, in a tone of fervency, quickly rejoined—*"You may, for aught I know, Mr take your case to the Supreme Court,* BUT IF THIS JURY FIND HIM GUILTY, I PLEDGE YOU MY HONOR YOU WILL NEVER CARRY THE INDIAN THERE!" And so it turned out. F. L.

By the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia:

A PROCLAMATION:

WHEREAS the General Assembly at its present Session, on the 5th March, 1831, have passed an Act, entitled, "An Act concerning the general elections, for the current year," in the words following, to wit:

"Whereas doubts may arise in the minds of the good people of this Commonwealth, whether the general elections should not be held in the month of April, of the present year, as heretofore; for removal whereof,

"*Be it enacted*, that an election for members of the General Assembly and for members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, shall not be held in the month of April of this year, but in such other month as shall be provided for by act of the General Assembly to be passed at its present session

"*Be it further enacted*, That the Governor be, and he is hereby authorised and required to take the most effectual means by proclamation or otherwise to make known throughout the Commonwealth the existence of this act with as little delay as possible."

Now, therefore, I, John Floyd, Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, in order to give effect to the foregoing act of General Assembly, have caused this proclamation to be issued and published.

Given under my hand as Governor, and under the Seal of the Commonwealth, at Richmond, this 8th day of March, 1831.

[Seal.]

March 10 100—w4w JOHN FLOYD.

BIGGER'S OFFICE.

$30,000, 15,000, and 10,000,

AND NO BLANKS.

NEW YORK LOTTERY, NO 5, EXTRA.

To be drawn in the city of New York, on Thursday, 17th March, 1831.

1	Prize of	$30 000 is	$30,000
1	do.	15 000	15,000
1	do.	10,000	10,000
1	do.	5,000	5,006
1	do.	2 000	2,000
1	do.	1,706	1,706
10	do.	1,000	10,000
10	do.	500	5,000

Tickets $10, halves 5, quarters 2 50. Orders meet the most prompt attention from

March 10. 100—3t THOS. B. BIGGER,