# THE BEE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED DAILY BY
JEROME BAYON.

*Days of publication during the summer:*
TUESDAY, THURSDAY & SATURDAY.

SATURDAY MORNING, AUGUST 11, 1832.


REPUBLICAN TICKET.
FOR PRESIDENT,

## ANDREW JACKSON.

"Gen. Jackson is a clear headed, strong minded man, and his mind is the Roman mind in the days of its purity."—JEFFERSON.

"Towards that distinguished captain who has added so much glory on this country, whose renowned achievements so great a portion of its most precious property, I never can have any other feelings than those of the most profound respect, and of the tenderest kindness."—HENRY CLAY.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,

## MARTIN VAN BUREN,

OF NEW-YORK.

FOR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS,

*First District*—JOHN B. PLAUCHE.
*Second District*—THOMAS W. SCOTT.
*Third District*—FRASIMOND LANDRY.
*Fourth District*—ALEXANDER MOUTON.
*Fifth District*—PLACIDE BOSSIER.

FOR GOVERNOR,

## J. B. DAWSON.

### WELL DONE, OLD KENTUCKY!

The steamboat *Chattahoochie*, Captain Hall, arrived in this port, yesterday morning, from Louisville, where she left on the 2d of August. Mr. Breathit (he ascertained) majority over Mr. Buckner was about 1,400. The *Focus*, the Clay paper at Louisville, of the 2d, speaks of Mr. Breathit as the "governor elect," and kindly proffers him some advice. The captain also informs us that it was considered by both parties at Louisville that Mr. Taylor, the Clay candidate for lieutenant governor, was also elected, but by a smaller majority than that of Mr. Breathit. Thus end Mr. Clay's hopes of Kentucky as well as of the presidency.

The above intelligence is confirmed by the Nashville papers, and it is also to be seen by an article which we copy from the Frankfort *Argus* of the 16th, that the opposition clergy despair.

"We will not be surprised at any thing, we are now prepared for any thing, even to be hoodwinked."

The other Clay papers are already beginning to amuse themselves with the hopes they dare not indulge. The defeat has been produced by local causes, by peculiar prejudices, and will unquestionably prove these persons to be wrong in their estimate of Mr. Clay's strength. If a vote is given to Jackson, we shall still be told, we exclaim that Kentucky is true to her favorite son. The only question is, the majority against him. We only wish the next time he will surely be elected, and we shall be amusing that respectable newspapers which are now on the credulity of their readers.

Mr. [illegible] is elected in Kentucky. His partizans in New York [illegible] tickets, one ticket, but have pledged themselves to support the anti-masonic party. In Pennsylvania a Clay ticket had been nominated, the convention [illegible] for the purpose of withdrawing the anti-masonic ticket. Both tickets are now in New-York and Pennsylvania. Clay is altogether out of the question. What do the anti-masonic Clay men of Louisiana think of electing Mr. Wirt to the presidency—a man who has denounced them and the whole fraternity with being stained with the blood of Morgan?

Yesterday's western mail brought the intelligence of the army of general Atkinson, after a forced march of three days, overtook the retreating Indians upon the Mississippi, which they gained a battle of about three hours, killing about [illegible] Indians, women and children [illegible] prisoners, and about one hundred and [illegible] were either killed or drowned in attempting to swim the river. Black Hawk, it seems, was a [illegible] of those who escaped. Several other unimportant [illegible] are recorded with a degree of minuteness [illegible] not bear repetition.

[illegible] Dougherty, Henry and Posey, as well as their [illegible] mentioned in the manuscript letters.

[illegible] Philip, who had been committed by his [illegible] mayor for further examination, upon the charge of having murdered Mrs. *Fugot*, has confessed [illegible] does no one else, and assigns as the [illegible] sufficient food and [illegible] otherwise. The urgent [illegible] by a mob [illegible] Mr. Hall, [illegible] sequence [illegible]

[illegible] with which the mulatto man Philip killed Mrs. [illegible] according to the *Mercantile*, was 4 or 5 inches in [illegible] 7, 22 [illegible] 5, 32 = 18½,—a tolerably sized [illegible] at any rate. It is no wonder that Phil broke in her [illegible] with it. But we strongly suspect, with Farmer, [illegible] in the play, that this is only one of our Tim's stories.

[illegible] respectable merchant to his [illegible]

"MATANZAS, August 9, 1832.

"The [illegible] *William S. Turner*, Mayhew, master, [illegible] of New York whence she sailed [illegible] The captain reports that [illegible] N. Lat. 40, 35, W., he was boarded [illegible] the *Montezuma* [illegible] Veracruz, and described [illegible] considerable quantity of other articles of merchandise [illegible] desk and papers belonging [illegible] of their apparel; they [illegible] contents of which he did not [illegible] rested in the strongest terms [illegible] silenced by offensive and [illegible] threatened with confinement and the halter. They ordered no explanation of their motives, and [illegible] manifested as little concern for the consequences [illegible] hardness [illegible]

[illegible] Lieut. Commd't. JOSIAH TATTNALL, [illegible] the Wm. A. Tucker [illegible] to the owners of the unprovoked outrage [illegible] Lieut. T. [illegible] immediately [illegible] Mont'ezuma, with a view [illegible] new [illegible] I sincerely [illegible] may overtake them, [illegible] who may wilfully [illegible] upon [illegible] of the men.

"The last mail brought [illegible] state of Durango in favor of gen. Pedraza.

"It is reported that a battle has taken place near San Luis de Potosi between general Montezuma and the government troops, and that the former obtained a signal victory."

Another letter, from Vera Cruz, under date of August [illegible] gives the following [illegible] of the posture of political affairs in the republic of Mexico:

"General Santa Anna is now at Orizaba, at the head of a division of about 4000 men, well armed, and in perfect health. The distance of Orizaba from this place is reckoned 30 leagues. The ministerial troops, commanded by the master of war, [illegible] are in the vicinity of the same place with an inferior force, having been obliged to send a detachment of 600 or 800 men on to Puebla, to keep in the [illegible]. Santa Anna is shortly expected to make an attack. In the vicinity of Mexico about 2600 men, from different villages, have pronounced in favor of the latter, who supports no other cause but that of Pedraza, the constitutional president. Two-thirds of the states of the republic have also declared themselves in the same manner. Daily improvements are taking place in Mexico, among others they have arrested Santa Anna's own sister. The crisis is fast approaching,—things can no longer wear the same aspect, and peace must soon be restored to the republic. At Tampico all is quiet. Moctezuma has had a rencontre in the state of San Luis de Potosi with the government forces, which he has defeated, and he is now actually marching on Mexico at the head of 6000 men; his army having previously been increased by troops sent from the state of Zacatecas."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BEE.

Sir, According to the promise I made, I have begun a continuation of my remarks upon the editorial article published in the Argus of Saturday the 18th, advocating the opening of a canal for ships from the bend above the city to a point below. The English turn, [illegible] may intention to endeavour to elucidate some parts of my former observations; consider the subject in several new lights; show conclusively the absurdity of the Argus's project; and expose many evils, which would result from its consummation. My task is no parodoxical one. On opening the Argus of the 25th, I found thirteen answers to my letters published in your valuable paper.

I have now to defend the views I then took of the subject, and to refute the arguments the Argus brings in support of the positions he had attempted to establish. In doing this the bounds of a newspaper confine me to the points which have already been in part discussed, and I beg your indulgence, if I fly less regularly to give my own ideas than I have taken. I must allow full scope to my humanity, and travel freely over the ground I have so carefully sketched.

The Argus says that, by a more diligent perusal of his remarks, it will be seen that he has anticipated all my arguments. This I have done, but find, on the contrary, even including his last article, that several of my objections are still left unanswered. From the head above, it remains as yet, a mystery. First, I objected that the filling up of the upper suburb, and why? because, that it would be, in case such a canal was dug, to far from the regular course of our shipping to have the least effect on it. Secondly, I objected that the canal would bring the centre of business further up, yet than the suburb St. Mary, and thus cut off the hopes of future prosperity entertained by the suburb Lafayette. Thirdly, That it would save only a few days, during which vessels coming up to the city, and, consequently, (at least in a commercial point of view) be of no great advantage. With the Argus's own premises and conclusions, these are very obvious, and it is necessary to put into my argument to impress them upon the minds of your readers. The assertions I make are founded upon facts within his knowledge, if not yours, and every intelligent member of our community is enough acquainted with the causes which have brought the commerce of our city to a stand, that the ruin of property, I prophesy, will be the results I predict should it be in vitiated.

The injury which would be done to the lower part of the city, should the work be begun between the months of the proposed canal, be filled in by allowing, will first have sufficiently shown. The Argus has seized this securely a quibble upon words. It seems that I stated it was *to be filled in*, when it should take place, while, on the contrary, he spoke of it merely as a *supposition*, evidently more favorable to my argument, which go to show the necessity of the canal. Now this does not take from the force of what is essential to be considered in what I shall state, that he brought forward as an objection, as a fact, that it is to be the consequence. I noticed the possibility of this, but mentioned it as an important objection to the canal. I *stated* the place, the risk to be run is very great, and my the judgements of such weight as they should incline us to incur it. This reason I will answer still for I conclude.

But the Argus proposes *remedies* to the *supposed* evils, as he chooses to call them, which would accrue from the adoption of the plan. He would have the canal one and a half miles long, should it be dug from the point opposite the vegetable market, joining the one from above, and four others communicating the Mississippi with the bayous Marent, Gentilly, Duprec and Terre aux Bœufs. He supposes that to open these would prevent the filling up of the river, and our commerce from going entirely through the other. But are these remedies competent to the benefit to be derived equal to the damage threatened, and would they be worth the trouble and expense? Before, however, we discuss these inquiries let me remind the reader that these canals, are suggested for the interest only of the upper part, and to save it from the ruin which its anticipated would come upon it from the effects of the canal from above. This settled I continue.

In considering the question of the competency of the remedies proposed several things are to be remarked:—One of the main objects of all this labour, all those canals a communication without below, is to "*keep the river where it goes*." And will the present ratio of the increase of the lower suburbs be augmented one little by the continuance of the river to follow its present channel? The question is almost too simple to be asked. The lower suburbs are to get nothing more than they do now by the changes, which immense riches is to flow through them in the upper part. Second: The opening of these four canals on this side cannot prevent the river from filling up, for their entrance, as the Argus acknowledges, must be guarded by locks, because the fall from the river to lake Borgne is at least 15 or 16 feet. The current of the river, thus checked would, consequently, not run through them, and nothing would hinder the alluvion from collecting between this and the English turn. Thirdly: Even should the river "remain where it now is," would not the route by the ship canal from above be preferred to that by the river, as being shorter, straighter, and otherwise as commodious? There can be no doubt of it. Fourthly: The canal from opposite the vegetable market would be entirely useless for the same reasons. The other canal would not be preferred as the most direct course; besides none would quit it to enter this one as they would then have to pay double toll. And, moreover, it would be impossible for two such canals, since they would be the results of different views. Two companies with different views must be found to undertake them, consequently they must be separate in their whole length: the one from above from its localities, still continuing to have the superiority.

Let us now examine whether the benefit to be derived from these changes, is equal to the damage threatened. First: Instead of making up for the loss the upper canal would occasion to the lower suburbs, the communications recommended between the river and lake Borgne, would demolish the advantages they now enjoy. For, in their present situation they may turn the buyers above mentioned exclusively to their own profit, while, if they are obliged to join them with the river the upper part will fully share in the passage and all its concomitant advantages. Secondly: It is not to be forgotten the greatest object which the Argus thinks [illegible] by his arguments is the stopping of the *increase of the batture*. This he designates as the cause of the extinction of the wharves, a cause of the expenditure of the sands yearly for repairing them, a course of the loss of property to our neighbors across the river, and a cause of the general depreciation in value of property in the rear and lower parts of the city. Now, in my last article, I have shown, that the formation of the batture, instead of destroying, assisted in stopping up and supporting the wharves; how in time it will cease entirely to collect; and, as to the loss, and depreciation in value, of property, he speaks of, how insignificant it is in comparison to the effects the digging of these canals would have. The deduction on the increasing value of the lots in the rear and lower parts of the city by the accumulation of the batture is caused by the river being thrown further back from the river, and the gradual increments of gain to purchasers of batture lots. The [illegible] of the Argus would no doubt effectually prevent this, but let the other consequences of opening it be maturely weighted. Are they not to be dreaded?

The question respecting the *expense* of this great undertaking now comes in. What would it cost to open all the canals and bayous to keep them in a state of repair, and is the execution of the plan worth the trouble, the expense, fatiguing and taking care of it. On one side, the proprietors of Livaudais suburb might, freely put in thousands towards the one opposite their property with the certainty of adding hundreds of thousands to what it is worth to-day. The city proper and lower suburbs, would soon become a wilderness, and all this to the profit of those immediately interested in the opening of the canal. It would cost them about [illegible] dollars, and far from giving them any trouble [illegible] would [illegible] deeper and deeper, wider and [illegible] And the poor people below, what would become of them in attempting to stop this? They would pay 300,000 to dig a canal from opposite the vegetable market to below the English turn, which would be still more liable to filling up than the river, and besides this, $300,000 each for the other four canals. These sums added together make 1,100,000 dollars for the share of the expense only. It would cost them thousands yearly to clear and repair these canals, the current flowing through them. Irony and they are after all to gain nothing—to lose the commerce coming from up the Mississippi, that great source of the riches and grandeur of New Orleans, which would go out by the canal above, and all that is brought to region for it, of course, would come up by the shine route. But it is useless to enter into details. I will say instead, *ruin, distruction, devastation!*

I think I might now lay down my pen, and say without presumption that I have thoroughly the equity, the folly, the absurdity, the wickedness of the plan of the Argus. Driven from all his other positions, his last resorts is to one which for a while would seem to give his laying his childish project before the public. The river, he is peculiarly of opinion, if it does not effect it before, will break through its bounds, by the force of the current at the bend above, and pursue the course of the projected canal. In my former article I gave my opinion in contradiction to this, and, if he wants proof that the object of nature is only to carry away a portion of the point on the other side, and thus straighten the course of the river, let him observe that the bowlder and decrease of the shore on the other side, as well as the increase the batture on this, descends a few feet lower and lower every year. If, my words not convince him, he knows [illegible] of the current of Big Mingo, [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] as it would in this case. Why the [illegible] the [illegible] place, [illegible] more strong than the [illegible] continued to do so for [illegible] years. The idea then is that [illegible] and [illegible] if there is real danger, should the bounds be taken measures to prevent, than to assist the [illegible] would doubtless direct the [illegible] guides. How much better [illegible] the whole length of the [illegible] on the point should be [illegible] the river, by the [illegible] Thirdly: Letter is far more to have [illegible] to be [illegible] than actually to [illegible] labour and expenses to carry [illegible] which [illegible] A few words in [illegible] Article [illegible] that private individuals [illegible] 6, 7 of the civil code and [illegible] not. Otherwise and by laws [illegible] the private enterprise [illegible] to its neighbour [illegible] contrary [illegible] discussion [illegible] ever, can he show [illegible] interest [illegible] with those of the [illegible] Which [illegible] Fourthly: [illegible] the [illegible] Fifthly: [illegible] the [illegible] I feel the weight of my adversary [illegible] in this discussion. If he will adopt a motto