character, and of the principles of the sect to which he belonged, has been wholly misunderstood. It dwindles into the mere purchase of an article he was desirous of obtaining, but which he could not obtain without such purchase.

Graham, in his history of the United States, remarks, that in the settlement of Maryland, the emigrants, "aware that the first settlers in Virginia had given ambrage to the Indians, by *occupying their territory without demanding their permission*," determined to "unite the new with the ancient race of inhabitants by the reciprocal ties of equity and good will."

The same author, in speaking of the Dutch, observes, "their first settlement was effected apparently without any equitable remuneration to the Indians."

Chalmers, the accurate and laborious annalist, thus states the general principle:

"The American emigrants settled in a region, which was regarded by them as a territory of the English empire, because it had been first discovered and first occupied, by virtue of commissions from the great seal of England. The valididity of this title had been recognised by the approbation and practice of the European world. And it had been confirmed by the law of nations, which sternly disregarded the possession of the Aborigines, because they had not been admitted into the society of nations."

"Afterwards," says Douglas, "in place of prior discovery, pre-emption of the Indian natives and occupancy was deemed a more just and equitable title."

Gookin, the friend of the Indians, in the quaint style of his day, observes, "if any should object, that it is not necessary the English should grant them (the Indians) land, forasmuch as it was all their native country and property, before the English came into America; the answer is ready. First, that the English claim right to their (the Indians') land, by patent from our King."

Among the proceedings of the Massachusetts government, is the following, in 1633.

"It is enacted and decreed by this court and the authority thereof, that what lands any of the Indians have possessed and *improved, by subduing the same*, they have a just right unto, according to that in Genesis 1, 28, 29."—This is the very doctrine of the elementary writers, that the Indians may be rightfully confined to the land they need."

"In America," says Robertson, "every Indian is either an immediate vassal of the Crown, or depends upon some other subject, to whom the district, in which he resides, has been granted, for a limited time, under the denomination of an *encomienda*"

It were a useless waste of time and labor to multiply these quotations. They abound in every history of the discovery and settlement of the Western Continent. The subject will be closed by a brief review of the judicial decisions and authoritative declarations, which bear upon this question.

After a very able historical summary and an elaborate enquiry into the general doctrine of the rights resulting from discovery and settlement, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Johnson *vs.* McIntosh, thus state the acknowledged principles. "The United States, then, have unequivocally acceded to that great and broad rule, by which its civilized inhabitants now hold this country.—They hold and assert in themselves the title, by which it was acquired. They maintain, as all others have maintained, that discovery gave an exclusive right to extinguish the Indian title of occupancy, either by purchase or *conquest;* and gave also a right to such a degree of sovereignty, as the circumstances of the people would allow them to exercise."

"The British Government, which was then our government, and whose rights have passed to the United States, asserted a title to all lands occupied by Indians, within the chartered limits of the British Colonies. It asserted also a limited sovereignty over them, and the exclusive right of extinguishing the title, which occupancy gave them."

It has already been shewn, that this "title of occupancy" was *extinguished*, at the earlier periods of the history of the country, by the single act of possession, and might, agreeably to the received principles, be so extinguished now, if the civilized governments were disposed, within their respective limits, to adopt this summary process. But they have yielded to better counsels. Public law has been meliorated by public opinion, and Indian title, whatever this may be, is now acquired by Indian negotiation and consent.

It is not difficult, however, to suppose that cases may arise in which a resort to the antiquated practice might become necessary. If a tribe, in possession of a large and fertile district of country, were to dwindle down to a few individuals, utterly unable to cultivate or occupy "their hunting grounds," and if these persons should pertinaciously refuse to yield any portion of them, the *extinguishment* of their title at the will of the civilized government, would be as defensible as was the original occupation and apportionment of our country. And more so. For heretofore the game, upon which the Indians principally depend for subsistence, has receded before the advancing settlements, and retired, with the nomadic tribes who pursue them, into the deeper recesses of the forests. Thus leaving a district destitute of the proper food of the Indians, and therefore useless to them. And this process has kept pace with the progress of our settlements, and with the demand for unappropriated territory. The Indians have been generally willing to relinquish, whenever the government has been desirous to purchase, and the consideration paid and secured, if properly applied by them, would probably be more valuable than any product they could receive from the ceded districts. Should, however, the case at any time arise, when, as Vattel expresses it, individuals, thus situated, must be "confined within narrower limits," it is to be hoped that every necessary arrangement will be made for their immediate comfort and future security. That, ample possessions will be assigned to them; and the means of subsistence secured, in the mode to which they have been accustomed. That their wants will be liberally supplied, and themselves reclaimed from barbarous institutions, and a life of privations and misery, to the blessings of intelligence and religion, and to all the advantages of civilization.

It is believed, that the settlements in Auslasia, have within the present generation, been commenced upon the original principles already discussed. There is no evidence of any prior or contemporaneous arrangement with the natives, for the voluntary extinguishment of their title. But possession was taken without asking their consent, and that great continent may hereafter exhibit, as this country now exhibits, a memorable example of the benefits of maritime discovery, and of the principles, which, in modern ages, it has introduced.

"For a long succession of years," says the Supreme Court of New York, "we have exercised an entire supremacy over all the tribes within the State, and have regulated by law their internal concerns, their contracts and their property."

The American Commissioners at Ghent, in their answer to the extraordinary propositions of the British Commissioners concerning the Indians, living within the United States, very pertinently remark, "if the United States had now asserted that the Indians, within their boundaries, who had acknowledged the United States as their only protectors, were their subjects, living only at *sufferance* on their lands, far from being the first in making that assertion, they would only have followed the example, uniformly and universally asserted in substance, and frequently avowed in terms, by the British Government itself."

The justice of these observations is confirmed by the whole tenor of colonial history.—The treaty of Utrecht provides, that "the subjects of France inhabiting Canada, and others, shall hereafter give no hindrance or molestation to the Five nations or cantons of Indians, *subject to the dominion of Great Britain*, nor to the other nations of America, who are friends of that alliance. In like manner, the subjects of Great Britain shall behave themselves peaceably towards the Americans, *subjects* or friends to France," &c.

"But it is to be distinctly and exactly settled by Commissioners, who are and ought to be accounted the *subjects* and friends of Britain or France." These *subjects, friends and allies*, like the allies of the Imperial Republic of antiquity, enjoyed such a portion of political power, as "circumstances allowed."

The memorial, delivered by the British King's Ministers, June 7, 1755, to the Duke de Mirepoix relative to the French construction of this article in the Treaty, contains one of the "frequent avowals," of the principle laid down by the Commissioners.

"The words of this Treaty are clear and precise, i. e. The five Nations or Cantons are subject to the dominion of Great Britain; which, by the received exposition of all treaties, must relate to the country as well as to the persons of the inhabitants; it is what France has acknowledged in the most solemn manner; she had well weighed the importance of this acknowledgement at the time of singing this treaty, and Great Britain can never give it up."

The proclamation of the King of Great Britain in 1763 is evidently confirmatory of the general views. It declares it to be the "royal will and pleasure, for the present, to reserve under our sovereignty, protection and dominion, for the use of the said Indians, all the lands, territories, &c." It grants, and professes to grant nothing to the Indians, but restrains British subjects for purchasing or taking possession of Indian lands. It merely reserves, and that too for the present, the land in the occupation of the Indians for their use; leaving its subsequent disposition, and the course of the British crown in relation to it, to be determined by subsequent events. It establishes nothing permanently, and relinquishes nothing eventually, but changes the practice of taking possession without the knowledge of the legal government, which had before prevailed. A practice, which had alineated the affections of the Indians, and caused them to rally round the French standard; and thus enable the French, with inferior resources and numbers in America, to contend with their rivals for supremacy, during a century of actual war and of warlike peace. After the great prize was won upon the heights of Abraham, and the treaty of Paris had transferred the dominion of Canada to Great Britain, the British government sincerely attempted to concliate the Indians. Almost the first in their series of measures, was this proclamation. While it proceeded upon the general assumption of jurisdiction and title, it still "reserved for the present" the territories occupied by the Indians. But it parted with no rights claimed or exercised by the crown. These remained, after the proclamation, as they existed before, and to be ascertained independently of that instrument.

This branch of the subject shall be losed by extracts from the statutes of three different governments, all of which but one, are of comparatively recent date, whose obligation has not been questioned and whose absorbing authority cannot be.

The first is a section of an Act of the British Parliament, of the thirty first of George third, passed August eleventh, 1803.

"That from and after the passing of this Act, all offences committed within any of the Indian territories, or parts of America, not within the limits of either of the said Provinces of Lower or Upper Cannda, or of any civil government of the United States of America, shall be, and shall be deemed to be offences of the same nature, and shall be tried in same manner, and subject to the same punishment, as if the same had been committed within the Provinces of Lower or Upper Canada."

The second is a statute of New York, passed ——.

"The several courts of justice, organized under the constitution and laws of this State, possess the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of trying and punishing, in the manner prescribed by law, all persons as well Indians as others, for offences and crimes; committed within the boundaries of this State, excepting only such as are exclusively cognizable by the courts, deriving their jurisdiction under the laws and constitution of the United States."

And this statute was passed, and is in force while the following articles of the treaty of 1794, with the Indians upon whom it operates have never been abrogated by any arrangement with them. Their territories have indeed been reduced by subsequent cessions, but the conventional recognitions of their political situation, remain unannulled, nor has there been any change, which could give jurisdiction over them, except "the change of their condition."

The 5th Article provides that "the Six Nations each of them will forever allow to the people of the United States a free passage through their lands, and the free use of the harbors and rivers adjoining and within their respective tracts of land, for the passing and securing of vessels and boats, and liberty to land their cargoes, when necessary for their safety."

Art. 7. "Lest the firm peace and friendship, now established, should be interrupted by the misconduct of individuals, the United States and Six Nations agree, that for injuries done by individuals on either side, no private revenge or retaliation shall take place; but instead thereof, complaint shall be made by the party injured to the other; by the Six Nations or any of them to the President of the United States, or the Superintendent appointed by him; and by the Superintendent, or other person appointed by the President, to the principle Chiefs of the Six Nations, or of the nation, to which the offender belongs; and such prudent measures shall be then pursued, as shall be necessary to preserve our peace and friendship unbroken, until the legislature (or great council) of the U. States shall make other equitable provision for the purpose."

It may be remarked, that this "other equitable provision" does not affect the previous process, which is to be pursued in all cases.—The treaty merely authorizes Congress, in the event of that process being unsuccessful, to provide some other mode of redressing the injury. In all other respects, the parties seem to be equal.

The following are the existing provisions of the Act of Congress of March 3, 1817.

"That if any Indian or other person or persons shall, within the United States, and within any town, district or territory belonging to any nation or nations, tribe or tribes of Indians, commit any crime or misdemeanor which, if committed in any place or district of country, under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, would by the law of the United States, be puhished with death or any other punishment, every such offender, on being thereof convicted, shall suffer the like punishment, as is provided by the laws of the United States for the like offences, if committed within any place or district, under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States." "Provided, that nothing in this Act shall be so construed, as to affect any treaty, now in force, between the United States and any Indian nation, or to extend to any offence, committed by one Indian against another, within any Indian boundary."

It will be recollected that the present enquiry is, into the right of jurisdiction of civilized communities over barbarous tribes in contact with them, and not into the operation of any conventional engagements, which may extend or contract this right. That question will be considered hereafter.

With this remark in view, is it not clear, that the authority which could enact such a statute, could enact any statute upon this subject. Could extend its whole penal code over the Indian territories, and include within the sphere of its operation all persons obnoxious to its penalties. This statute is in fact a practical assertion of unlimited sovereignty, so far as respects the natural rights of the parties. By the repeal of the proviso, it would become precisely what the British and New York statutes, already quoted, now are.

The annexed sections of an Act of the Colony of New York, passed in 1,700, will shew the opinions then entertained of their jurisdiction.

Whereas divers Jesuits, Priests and Popish Missionaries have of late come, and for some time have had their residence in the remote parts of this province, and other his Majesty's adjacent Colonies, who, by their wicked and subtle insinuations industriously labor to debauch, seduce, and withdraw the Indians, from their due obedience unto his most Sacred Majesty, and to excite and stir them up to sedition, rebellion and upon hostility against his Majesty's Government: For prevention therof, Be it enacted by his Excellency the Governor, Council and Representatives, in General Assembly, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, that all and every Jesuit and Seminary Priest, Missionary, or other spirtual or ecclesiastical person, made or ordained by any authority, power or jurisdiction derived challenged or pretended from the Pope or See of Rome, now residing within this province or any part thereof, shall depart from and out of the same, at or before the first day of November next, in this present year, one thousand seven hundred.

"And be it further enacted, &c. That it and every Jesuit, Seminary Priest, Missionary, or other spiritual or ecclesiastical person, made or ordained by any authority, power or jurisdiction derived, challenged or pretended from the Pope or See of *Rome*, or that shall profess himself, or otherwise appear to be such, by Preaching, and by teaching of others to say any Popish prayers, by celebrating mass, granting of absolutions, or using any other of the Popish ceremonies and rites of worship, by what name, title or degree soever such person shall be called or known, who shall continue, abide, remain, or come into this Province, or any part thereof, after the first day of November aforesaid, shall be deemed and accounted an Incendiary and Disturber of the public peace and safety, and an enemy to the true Christian religion, and shall be adjudged to suffer perpetual imprisonment; and if any person, being so sentenced and actually imprisoned, shall break prison and make his escape, and be afterwards re-taken, he shall suffer such Pains of Death, Penalties and Forfeitures, as in case of Felony."

The romance of Indian history has produced impressions, not less injurious than erroneous. Zealous but enthusiastic men, have surveyed the condition of the Indians, and have depicted it, as it never did exist, and never can exist while the integrity of their institutions is preserved. Their life is essentially one of exposure, of want, & of suffering. When the veil, that had covered them for ages, was withdrawn, and they became known to the civilized nations of the world, they were found, broke into petty communities, and in a state of perpetual hostilities. War was their business and their passion. Not to subdue, but to exterminate. Not to assert claims rejected, nor to procure satisfaction for injuries committed;—but to gratify that thirst for blood, which seems implanted in every Indian breast. There was no point of Union between them and the strangers arriving among them. Their habits feelings and opinions, and all that constitute moral and physical varieties in the human race, were essentially different, and after the lapse of two centuries, are yet different.—There were no seeds of improvement sown, which, could vegetate. No elements of civilization were in existence, to be moved and combined by some master spirit. A vast region of country, fitted to support millions of human beings, was unoccupied or only occupied by solitary hunters and warriors, who pursued their game or their enemies, over districts now crowded with inhabitants, and abounding with all that renders life desirable.

The remarks of Chief Justice Marshall upon this subject, in the case of Johnson and McIntosh already cited, are so just and justly expressed, that they cannot be considered out of place in this discussion.

"Although we do not mean to engage in the defence of those principles, which Europeans have applied to Indian title, they may, we think, find some excuse in the character and habits of the people, whose rights have been wrested from them."

We may here observe, that if the doctrine laid down by the Supreme Court at their last term in the Cherokee case, that all that was claimed by the British government was "the exclusive right of purchasing such lands as the natives were willing to sell,' be correct, the "principle" needs no defence; nor could any "rights be wrested "from the Indians by its practical assertion.

"The title by conquest," continues the Chief Justice, "is acquired and maintained by force. The conqueror prescribes its limits.—Humanity, however, acting on public opinion, has established as a general rule, that the conquered shall not be wantonly oppressed; and that their condition shall remain as eligible, as is compatible with the objects of the conquest. Most usually, they are incorporated with the victorious nation, and become subjects or citizens of the government, with which they are connected. The new and old members of the society mingle with each other; the distinction between them is gradually lost and they make one people. When this incorporation is practicable, humanity demands, and a wise policy requires, that the rights of the conquered to property should remain unimpared; that the new subjects should be governed as equitably as the old; and that confidence in their security should gradually banish the painful sense of being seperated from their ancient connexions, and united by force to strangers.

When the conquest is complete, and the conqured inhabitants can be blendid with the conquerors, or safely governed as a distinct people, public sentiment, which not even the conqueror can disregard, imposes these restraints upon him; and he cannot neglect them without injury to his fame and hazard to his power.

But the tribes of Indians, inhabiting this country, were fierce savages whose occupation was war, and whose subsistence was drawn chiefly from the forest: To leave them in possession of their country was to leave the country a wilderness, to govern them as a distinct people was impossible, because they were as brave and as high spirited as they were fierce, and were ready to repel by arms every attempt on their independence.

What was the inevitable consequence of this state of things? The Europeans were under the necessity either of abandoning the country, and relinquishing their pompous claims to it, or of enforcing those claims by the sword, and by the adoption of principles adapted to the condition of a people, with whom it was impossible to mix, and who could not be governed as a distinct society; or of remaining in their neighborhood, and exposing themselves and their families to the perpetual hazard of being massacred.

Frequent and bloody wars, in which the whites were not always the aggressors, unavoidably ensued. European policy, numbers and skill prevailed. As the white population advanced, that of the Indians necessarily receded. The country in the immediate neighborhood of agriculturists, became unfit for them. The game fled into thicker and more unbroken forests, and the Indians followed.—The soil, to which the Crown originally claimed title, being no longer occupied by its ancient inhabitants, was parcelled out according to the will of the sovereign power, and taken possession of by persons who claimed immediately of the crown, or immediately through its grantees or deputies.

That law which regulates, and ought to regulate in general, the relation between the conqueror and the conquered, was incapable of application to a people under such circumstances. The resort to some new and different rule, better adapted to the actual state of things, was unavoidable. Every rule, which can be suggested, will be found to be attended with great difficulty."

This quotation contains a candid and able summary of the circumstances, in which these parties were placed, and of the causes, which led to the New System of intercommunication that was adopted. There are here no speculations upon abstract rights, but the question is considered as a practical one, in the investigation of which new circumstances required new principles of action. The case is fairly put. Were the Europeans to abandon their enterprize and return, or were they to remain, and *subdue the earth*, and establish the lasting foundations of happiness for themselves and their posterity? History has recorded their choice, and the prosperity of the new world attests its wisdom. But if they were to remain there was no medium between their own destruction, and the entire subjugation of the aboriginal race. They did as all others would have done, with similar circumstances They acquired an ascendency which has continued to the present day, and must continue till these races are amalgamated, or till they become co-equals in arts and intelligence.

[*To be concluded.*]

MARTIN VAN BUREN.

The following correspondence is published in the New York Courier and Enquirer, and in the New York Standard. We lay it before our readers as a subject in which very general interest has been expressed:—

NEW YORK, Feb. 1, 1832.

SIR: The undersigned, a committee appointed at a numerous meeting of your fellow citizens, have the honor of transmitting to you a copy of their proceedings and resolutions, unanimously entered into, and growing out of the rejection by the Senate of the United States, of your nomination as Minister Plenipotentiary to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

While they rejoice that an opportunity is presented to them to reiterate an expression of their personal regard and of their unequivocal confidence in your patriotism and probity, and a renewed assurance of the estimation in which they hold your capability to the proper discharge of the most important trusts, they regret the circumstances calling for this communication, and deplore the departure from that dignified course which should have influenced, and which in the instance of your rejection, was disregarded by the Senate of the United States:—However, Sir, they feel assured that this general and voluntary expression of the opinions of citizens who best know your worth, will be properly appreciated by you, and when thousands throughout this vast country shall, as a measure of justice, reiterate those opinions, the occurrence will leave no other impression than that the arrow has fallen far from its mark, and that the object at which it was aimed stands unscathed and unhurt. With our best wishes for your health and happiness and our earnest prayer for your safe and speedy return to the land of your fathers,

Permit us, respectfully, to subscribe ourselves, your friends and fellow-citizens,

Walter Bowne,	John Targee,
Benjamin Bailey,	Gideon Lee,
Samuel A. Talcott,	Wm. P. Hallett,
Abraham Bloodgood,	D. B. Tallmadge,
Saul Alley,	John Lovett,
Preserved Fish,	Elisha Tibbits,
James Campbell,	Elrad Holmes,
Asa Mann,	Wm. M. Price,
Thos. J. Woodruff,	Montgomery Rankin,
Erastus Barnes,	Alexander M. Muir,
F. B. Cutting,	Henry Hone,
Chas. Henry Hall,	Con's. W. Lawrence.

"LONDON, February 24th, 1832.

Gentlemen—I have been honored with your kind letter of the first instant, communicating to me the sentiments of a public meeting of my Fellow Citizens on the subject of the rejection by the Senate of my nomination as Minister to this country.

Having always observed, on the part of the Republicans of the city of New York, a frank and fearless independence of opinion, and a disinterested regard to truth and justice in their estimate and support of public men, have looked to their approbation with solre tude as atericrion of conduct, and have ciil- ceived the testimonials of respect with which they have occasionally honored me, with correspondent satisfaction, but never with such deep felt sensibility as in the present instance. Severed for the first time from my country and friends, and placed in a conspicuous situation among strangers, in a foreign land, advantage has been taken of my position to level at me a shaft intended to wound me to the quick, and to humiliate me in the eyes of the Government and nation with whom I was to treat, and to whom I was, as yet, but little known.—Thanks to the generous and warm-hearted promptness of my Fellow Citizens of N. York, the same moment that brought me the poisoned shaft of my enemies, brought also the missive of my friends "with healing on its wings." When you inform your constituents of this circumstance, they will at once perceive how well timed and effectual has been the assurance of sympathy, esteem and confidence, and how deeply it must have sunk into my heart.

In testifying to my public conduct, they are pleased to speak with eulogium of me, as contributing while in the Cabinet, to the success of the present administration; that signal success, I feel called upon to declare, is pre eminently due to the political sagacity, unwearying industry, and upright straight forward policy of our present venerated chief. All the humble merit I can claim is, that of having exerted myself to the utmost to execute his patriotic and single-hearted views, and of having sacrificed all personal considerations to ensure their success, when threatened with extraneous embarrassments. That my exertions were arduous, painful, and incessant, I may without vanity, assert: whether my sacrifices have not been repaid with unmerited detraction and reproach, I leave to my countrymen to determine. Still I shall ever regard my situation in that Cabinet, as one of the most fortunate events of my life, placing me as it did in close and familiar relation with one who has well been described by Mr. Jefferson as 'possessing more of the Roman in his character than any man living,' and whose administration will be looked to, in future times, as a golden era in our history. To have served under such a Chief, at such a time, and to have won his confidence and esteem, is a sufficient glory, and of that, thank God, my enemies cannot deprive me.

Of the peculiar act of hostility to which I am happily indebted for the present expression of feelings on the part of my republican fellow citizens, it is not, perhaps, proper, and I would think, not necessary, that I should say much. The courtesy due to the highest of our Legislative bodies, obliges us to presume that the reasons assigned by the majority for their decision were sincere; if so, I console myself with the persuasion that public sentiment of which I have an earnest before me, is likely to determine the futility of those reasons, and the injustice of that decision.

Allow me, gentlemen, in conclusion, to thank you heartily for the expression of individual feelings with which you have accompanied the resolutions of your constituents. Enjoying a personal acquaintance with every one of you, and knowing how much of private worth and public respectability you represent, I feel flattered and gratified to receive such sympathy at such hands; and, situated as I am, I cannot but look forward with heart-cheering anticipation to the welcome with which you promise to greet my return to my native land.

A few weeks residence here will be required to place the affairs of the legation in a proper train, as well as to settle my own private concerns; after which I propose to avail myself of the only opportunity that will probably ever be afforded me to visit a few of the most interesting points of the Continent. After that I shall make the best of my way home, where I hope to arrive early in the summer. I shall then be able more adequately to express in person, my deep, my affectionate sense of the vigilance and protecting kindness of my fellow citizens, and of the honest zeal with which they have stepped forward to vindicate me from assaults during my absence. In the mean time, with a proud and grateful feeling of sincerity, I leave my character in their keeping.

I remain, gentlemen, with the highest respect,

Your servant and friend,
M. VAN BUREN."

TWENTY-SECOND CONGRESS,

SECOND SESSION.

Saturday April 7, 1832.

In the *Senate*, yesterday, a resolution was adopted changing the hour of meeting, for the remainder of the session, from 12 to 11 o'clock, from and after the 16th inst. The Appropriation Bill was taken up, and Mr. Kane spoke about two hours, without concluding, in reply to the speech of Mr. Sprague on the British Colonial Trade arrangement.—The Senate then adjourned to Monday.

The *House of Representatives*, at an early hour went into Committee of the whole on the state of the Union, upon the bill making appropriations for certain internal improvements for the year 1832. A lengthy discussion ensued, when, at half after four o'clock, the Committee rose, obtained leave to sit again, and the House ajourned.

Monday April 9, 1832.

The *Senate* did not sit on Saturday.

In the *House of representatives*, Mr. Pearce resumed and concluded the remarks which he commenced on Thursday and continued on Friday, against the report of the Committee on the Judiciary, asking to be discharged from the further consideration of the affidavit of a Mr. McClintoch, a removed inspector, alleging charges against the Collector of the Customs for the port of Wiscasset, Maine. The further discussion of the subject was arrested by a call for the orders of the day. Mr. Howard, from the Committee on Commerce, reported a bill to enforce quarantine regulations, which was *passed*. Numerous private bills were considered in Committee of the Whole, reported to the House, and, with one exception, directed to be engrossed.

Tuesday April 10, 1832.

In the *Senate*, yesterday, the bill supplementary to the acts for the relief of the surviving officers and soldiers of the Revolution was taken up, and an amendment was offered and discussed, extending the provisions of the bill to those officers and soldiers who fought under General Wayne, Clarke, Harmar Hamtramck, and St. Clair, in the Indian wars, in the Northwestern Territory after the revolution. At one o'clock the bill was laid on the table, and the general appropriation bill was taken up. Mr. Kane spoke two hours in conclusion of the remarks upon the British Colonial Trade arrangement, and Mr. Holmes followed him and spoke without concluding, till the usual hour of adjournment. Mr. Webster gave notice that he should call up the Apportionment Bill on Wednesday, if the Senate should then be full.

In the *House of Representatives*, Mr. Kavanagh presented sundry depositions negativing the charges brought by Mr. McClintoch, the dismissed Inspector, against the Collector of the Port of Wiscasset, Maine, which were read. Mr. Drayton, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill for the establishment of a Military Board for the administration and government of the Ordnance Department, which was read twice. Mr. Archer, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported a bill providing for a deficit of appropriation therein named, to provide for the vaccination of the Indian tribes as a preventive of small pox, and fourteen private bills were *passed*. The House resumed, in committee, the consideration of the general pension bill. Messrs. Choate, Dearborn, Sutherland, Bell and Johnston, of Virginia, addressed the Committee, when, at the usual hour for adjourning, the Committee rose and obtained leave to sit again. The House then adjourned.

Wednesday, April, 11, 1832.

In the Senate, yesterday, Mr. Grundy, from the Com. on the Post Offices and Post Roads reported the bill for the establishment of certain post routes and the discontinuance of others, with many amendments, which were read after which they were laid on the table. The Appropriation Bill was taken up, and Mr. Holmes continued his speech thereon for two hours and a half, when not having concluded, he gave way to a motion to adjourn.

In the House of Representatives, Mr. Clay, from the Committee on Public Lands, reported a bill establishing a Land District in the Territory of Arkansas. Mr. W. R. Davis, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported a bill altering the time of holding the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana. Mr. Storrs addressed the House until the expiration of the hour allotted to morning business, in opposition to the report of the Committee on the Judiciary asking to be discharged from the further consideration of the charges made against the Collector of the port of Wiscasset, Maine, by Mr. McClintoch, the late Inspector. The House went into Committee of the Whole on various bills (14 in number) in relation to the District of Columbia, which, with one exception, were reported to the House, when an adjournment took place.

FROM THE RALEIGH, N. C. STAR.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[*COPY*]

Washington City, Feb. 20, 1832.

SIR: I have this moment received a letter from Messrs. Lawrence and Lemay, editors of the North Carolina Star, informing me that you are the author of a publication which appeared in that paper of the 10th instant, under the signature of A. B. Under an impression that you may have been misled by the remarks of Governor Forsyth, in the Senate of the United States, on the nomination of Martin Van Buren, I cannot doubt for a moment, but that you will, on a persual of the correspondence which has passed between that gentleman and myself, promptly repair the injury which your publication is so well calculated to inflict on my charaeter. I therefore confidently call on you for a retraction of those charges.

With respect, yours, &c.
JNO. BRANCH.

To General R. M. SAUNDERS, Raleigh, N. C.

P. S. I have enclosed this letter to my friend, Governor Iredell, through whom I hope to receive your answer.

JNO. B.

[*COPY.*]

Nashville, March 20, 1832.

SIR: Your letter of the 20th ult. was duly forwarded to me by your friend. My answer to which has been delayed from causes not important to state.

At the time of writing the communication for the Star, of which you complain, I had not seen "the remarks of Governor Forsyth, in the Senate of the United States, on the nomination of Martin Van Buren;" but my impressions were produced by the printed speech of Governor Poindexter.

From the conversation as detailed by him, and the relation in which you then stood to the President, (supposing you to have been the person referred to,) I did consider the conversation of that character which forbid its disclosure for the purpose for which it was afterwards used. It was under this impression that I penned the article in the Star, and in this point of view that I intended to reprehend your conduct. I am now satisfied that the conversation, though private, was not confidential, and I am free to say that I consider you above disclosing that which you might deem in any way secret, or of giving information in any matter which you would not be willing to avow to the world.

I have the honor to be, &c.
R. M. SAUNDERS.

Hon. John Branch, Washington City.

☞ Not having seen Governor Iredell, I forwarded this to the care of my friend, Mr. Mangum.

I delivered this to Governor Branch, 24th of March, 1832.

W. P. MANGUM.

[COPY.]

Washington City March 28, 1832.

SIR: I have received your letter from Nashville, N. Carolina, dated the 20th instant.—You have retracted the offensive charge, which you had thought proper to make against me in the Raleigh Star, of a breach of confidence, and of course, your explanation is so far satisfactory as to relieve me from the necessity of resorting to another mode of redress, which might otherwise have been imposed on me.—But, in accepting your explanation, I cannot pass by the manner in which you have chosen to make it, unnoticed. Without commenting on certain expressions which might be susceptible of an offensive construction, I am constrained to say, that its entire contents bear the character of justice reluctantly yielded—far more so than I had a right to expect from one, between whom and myself there had previously existed friendly relations, and who must now at least, be conscious of the injustice he has done me. Nor can I conclude without expressing my surprise, considering our previous relations, that you should so hastily, and on such slight suspicions as those stated in your note, attempt to inflict so deep a wound on my character.—You must feel that you would not have thus acted towards me a few short months past, and since that, I am conscious of no change that could have affected your then feelings, except that I bear, by no demerit of my own, altered relations towards those who wield that branch of the General Government which has the dispensation of its patronage—the power of bestowing offices and rewards. At the time to which I refer, my favorable countenance might at least, in some degree, have been considered as a passport to the devout worshippers at the shrine of power. But now, from the attitude in which I am placed, they may suppose that a more ready admission may be obtained by the immolation of my character. How far this change in my relations towards those who control the power of rewarding, may have so greatly changed your conduct towards me, as that you should, in so short a time, pass from that

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc4925_scm13073-0354.jpg