NEW-ORLEANS BEE

OFFICIAL STATE PAPER.

BY BULLITT, MAGNE & CO.

[illegible]

[illegible] NATIONAL CONVENTION

FOR PRESIDENT,

WILLIAM H. HARRISON,

OF OHIO.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,

JOHN TYLER,

OF VIRGINIA.

WHIG ELECTORAL TICKET FOR LOUISIANA.

First Congressional District.
JOSEPH LEONARD,
OF ST. MARY PARISH.

Second Congressional District.
BENJAMIN BLANCHARD,
OF ST. MARTIN.

Third Congressional District.
JOSEPH REYNARD,
OF FORT ADAMS ROUGE.

Fourth Congressional District.
MAQUELIN DUPRE,
OF ST. LANDRY.

Fifth Congressional District.
SETH LEWIS,
OF RAPIDES.

FOR CONGRESS.

First Congressional District.
HON. EDWD. D. WHITE.

NEW-ORLEANS:

THURSDAY MORNING, MARCH 12, 1840

TORY AND ABOLITION MOVEMENTS.

In a former article we exposed the system adopted by the tories and abolitionists, to carry the north for VAN BUREN and gull the south into his support. In the slave states the tory press charge GEN. HARRISON with entertaining principles at war with the institutions of slavery. This charge, calumnious and unfounded as it is, is urged with such unblushing effrontery and boldness as to mislead those who have *not the means or the industry to examine into the evidences* of their utter destitution of truth, or the semblance of truth, and to that extent promotes the success of the tory candidate.

The whig press appeal to the *record* to disabuse the public mind upon this agitating question, and lay before the world the *proofs*, positive and irrefragible proofs, of GEN. HARRISON's opposition to the designs and opinions of the fanatics, and of his exertions, both upon the floor of congress and before the people, in their primary assemblies, in defending the constitutional rights of the south from violence or invasion.

Notwithstanding GEN. HARRISON's opinions are known to be hostile to the negrophilists, the southern tory press, with few honorable exceptions, continue to assail and misrepresent him, whilst the abolition papers extract the articles of the southern whig press *to prove that* GEN. HARRISON is NOT an *abolitionist*, and thereby strengthen the coalition between the tories and the abolitionists at the north. That this is one of the designs of the tory press in slave-holding states in thus countenancing the oft repeated and baseless charge of abolition against GEN. HARRISON will be manifest from a perusal of a few extracts from the *Emancipator*, which we lay before our readers.

Read the following extract attentively:

"We hazard no contradiction in saying, that when the convention met there were very few people north of Pennsylvania who expected General Harrison would receive the nomination. For this reason the abolitionists had given themselves less concern about him, and had taken but little pains to ascertain his true position with regard to the slavery question. We knew, indeed, that he had been a zealous supporter of the slave power in the days of the Missouri controversy, and had done what he could to assist in that grand consummation, by which the free principles of the constitution were trampled down, and the slave interest obtained an acknowledged supremacy in the government of the nation. Also that he had assisted in an attempt to violate the sovereign guarantee of the ordinance of '87, older than the constitution itself, by spreading the curse of slavery over the rich valley and beautiful hills of Illinois. But charity said that these were transactions of a long time ago, and that his calm reflections, his residence in Columbia, and the discussions of the last ten years might have altered his views. And so little was known among us of any recent manifestations on the subject, and so little interest was felt, that no industrious a collector of facts as Judge Jay found nothing to insert in the revised edition of his "View," relative to any of General Harrison's friends in Virginia, in 1833, that "it is sound to the core on the subject of slavery. *At the same time, reports, originating no one knew where, and grounded on no one knew what*, were passing current among abolitionists, that Harrison was considered to be favorable to our cause, that he was doubtful the least exceptionable of all the candidates, that he had spoken of slavery, that he had said and done this and that, which led us to hope that his election, that to defeat Henry Clay and get Harrison nominated, would be an abolition triumph, that he would undoubtedly answer all our questions in such a way that abolitionists could consistently vote for him, and so on."

The reports "originating no one knew where, and grounded no one knew what," were taken from the southern tory press, which has been for some time assailing every *whig of prominence*, as an abolitionist—often by way of screening VAN BUREN's odious votes, placing *black people* upon equal footing with the white population. Reports which were circulated by those journals to prejudice the southern mind against the whig cause, and forstall public opinion by impressing upon it erroneous and injurious opinions of whig leaders. But to return to the *Emancipator*.

That abolition organ, after remarking, that "we may remark, however, that so far as we are acquainted, there was not a single known abolitionist present at the Harrisburg convention," goes on to state that "there can be but one conclusion when we see such men as Benjamin Watkins Leigh, of Virginia, so cordially abandoning the man of their choice, and who was eminently the man of their choice on account of his devotion to the interests of slavery."

Again—

"The southern delegates, on the other hand, promptly and without reluctance, gave in their adhesion to Harrison because they were assured that he was 'sound to the core,' in the slaveholders' *sense*, and by uniting in him they run no risk."

The Emancipator, after quoting passages from General Harrison's speech at Vincennes, when in the midst of men supposed to be friendly to the views of the abolitionists, he boldly denounced them uncourse as "pressing issues and unconstitutional," says—

"Those extracts show that, so late as 1835, Gen Harrison retained, with all its bitterness, the spirit of devotion to slavery which had marked his course, when in congress, fifteen years before."

Mark the sneer of the above quotation. General HARRISON was known to have been one of the deadliest foes to the abolitionists pending the Missouri question. One of three members in congress from non slaveholding state, who rallied to the succor of the south, and sacrificed her institutions from annihilation. The venom of the *Emancipator* knows no bounds, when contemplating his patriotic devotion to the constitutional rights of the slaveholding states upon that occasion in connection with his more recent and eloquent defence of their privileges.

We make another quotation from the Emancipator—

"The Richmond Whig, the leading Harrison paper in Virginia, in an article on the same subject, Jan. 17th, refers to Harrison's sentiments uttered to slavery, in 1836, when Illinois presented herself for admission as a state with a virtual recognition of slavery incorporated in her constitution. James Talmadge and Benjamin Morton opposed the admission, but Harrison contended it on the ground of the right of a state to adopt slavery, notwithstanding the ordinance of '87. The Whig also refers to Harrison's support of slavery in Missouri and the Arkansas territory, and mentions the argument by which he attempts to justify his vote on the latter question, where no constitutional grounds could be alleged. He said the south had equal right with the north to the slave territory purchased with the blood and treasure of the nation, and to abolish slavery in Arkansas would shut out southern emigrants. The Whig says that, at that day, caricatures were circulated in Ohio, representing Harrison in the character of a negro-driver, with the whip, full twing a gang of slaves in chains, and chained together. Was this the true index before the north-west like "a mirror, a northern man with southern feelings and a northern man with southern feelings."

Here we see the abolition organ quoting extracts from the whig southern press, to undermine his views of Gen. Harrison's devotion to our rights of the slave holding states. This one of the subjects in hand, up the discussion for the south on the part of the tory journals. The northern tory journals do not mention the slavery question as a challenge. They only upon the subject with the abolitionists to tory scandal on the subject. They consequently keep silent on the subject, and leave their allies of the abolitionist journals to manage the question for them. This is a true picture of the tory tactics upon this vital question. It behoves the south, I hope to—and knowing it, rally to the support of GEN. HARRISON, who espoused them in their extremity. For this support he has been denounced by the tories of the south, and boldly denounced by their whig allies and super fluous by a northern paper.

The Yazoo Map's Whig Convention in Connecticut has resolved in favor of the slave holding states. Their member is contained at home.

The "Sons of the Sunflower" in another part of this paper contains the correspondence between the president of the City bank and the bank committee. It will enable the public to form their own conclusions upon the subject. It is difficult to conceive how a request to subpoena witnesses, made by the committee, should be considered in any other light than as a request to have the witnesses attend, especially when, on application to the legislature, a committee composed of the same gentlemen who fill the present, had reported and been instrumental in passing the act, which gave the president of the bank the power to subpoena witnesses, and which was passed at the same session of the legislature, in which the present bank committee were members. Yet, when the president of the bank, in accordance with the power thus given him by the legislature, requested the committee to subpoena witnesses, the request was treated as a contempt, and the president of the City Bank, in a letter addressed to the chairman, under date, February 15th, 1840, herein annexed, has refused to answer said interrogatory.

Resolved, that the said letter of refusal is not admitted as satisfactory, and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be furnished by the secretary to the said president for his information, to the authority by which said question was propounded by the chairman, and that this response be again called for.

Mr. CONRAD moved to amend said resolution, by striking out the words, "that the said letter of refusal is not admitted as satisfactory."

The yeas and nays on said amendment were called, when Messrs. Conrad, Dickey, Lockett, Pickot and Winchester voted in the affirmative.

And Messrs. Bossier, Downes, Guion, Hoa, Kenner, Morse, and Winn, in the negative.

The amendment was consequently rejected.

The question was then put on the adoption of the preamble and resolution.

The yeas and nays were called, when Messrs. Bossier, Downes, Guion, Hoa, Kenner, Morse, Pichet and Winn voted in the affirmative; and, Messrs. Conrad, Ducros, Lockett and Winchester, in the negative.

Said preamble and resolution were consequently adopted.

NEW ORLEANS, February 25th, 1840.

SIR—I have the honor to communicate to you the following preamble and resolution adopted by the joint committee on banks, at its session last evening.

"Whereas, at the first meeting of the joint committee on banks a resolution was adopted in these words:—"Resolved that all interrogatories which may be agreed upon by a majority of the committee shall be propounded by the chairman as emanating from the committee, and all interrogatories put by individual members of the committee shall be regarded as their own;" and whereas, under the sanction of this resolution, Mr. Winn submitted the following question:—"Have any of the directors of your bank endorsed for each other? If you have, state the amount of such endorsements, and which of them have come under protest?" which he had a right to do under said resolution: And whereas the president of the City Bank, in a letter addressed to the chairman, under date Feb. 18th, 1840, hereto annexed has refused to answer said interrogatory.

Resolved, That the said letter of refusal is not admitted as satisfactory, and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be furnished by the secretary to the said president for his information, to the authority by which said question was propounded by the chairman, and that this response be again called for.

Very respectfully,
Your most obedient servant,
(Signed.) J. WHITEHEAD,
Secretary to the bank committee.

To Samuel J. Peters, Esq.,
President of the City Bank, New Orleans.

CITY BANK,
New Orleans, February 25th, 1840.

To the honorable the joint committee of the senate and house of representatives appointed to examine the banks, &c.

GENTLEMEN—The communication of the secretary of your honorable committee, in reference to the question propounded by Mr. Winn has been received.

At a meeting, on the first meeting of the joint committee on banks, a resolution was adopted in these words:—"Resolved, that all interrogatories which may be agreed upon by a majority of the committee, shall be propounded by the chairman as emanating from the committee, and all interrogatories put by individual members of the committee shall be regarded as their own." Under this resolution, Mr. Winn submitted the following question:—"Have any of the directors of your bank endorsed for each other? If you have, state the amount of such endorsements, and which of them have come under protest?" which he had a right to do under said resolution: And whereas the president of the City Bank, in a letter addressed to the chairman, under date Feb. 18th, 1840, herein annexed has refused to answer said interrogatory.

Resolved, That the said letter of refusal is not admitted as satisfactory, and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be furnished by the secretary to the said president for his information, to the authority by which said question was propounded by the chairman, and that this response be again called for.

Very respectfully,
Your most obedient servant,
(Signed.) J. WHITEHEAD,
Secretary to the bank committee.

To Samuel J. Peters, Esq.,
President of the City Bank, New Orleans.

CITY BANK,
New Orleans, February 18, 1840.

GENTLEMEN—Your communication, containing the following question, which, at a meeting of the joint committee on banks, on the 15th inst., "is proposed by Mr. Winn," has been received.

"Have any of the directors of your bank endorsed for each other? If you have, state the amount of such endorsements, and which of them have come under protest?"

As I do not understand the object of the committee in this question, I am at a loss to know what to propound to the president and directors of the City Bank.

Entertaining the most profound respect for your honorable committee, and being as desirous to give every information as to the character of the City Bank, as any responsable committee could be to receive it, it was with great regret I felt myself compelled, by a sense of duty to the institution over which I preside, to decline propounding the question in an individual member to propound a question which, from the manner of the transmission to me, seemed not to be a question of a majority of the committee. The motives which induced me to decline, I have already explained to your committee now before me, for it distinctly states that the question propounded by Mr. Winn was one that had been disapproved of by you, and that it was transmitted as such by your chairman.

I am now called on by you to answer a question which, I presume, was not intended for me, but for the directors of the City Bank, and which, if I do, I may be guilty of a violation of law, occupying seats at the board: which question you inform me is of a class of those disapproved by you, and which, nevertheless, I am to be the person to have the right to propound, under a general rule adopted by your committee, and that consequently it is assumed that I am bound to answer it.

To this I must respectfully reply that, in my opinion, a rule that leads to such consequences, is not sanctioned by the joint resolution of the senate and house of representatives under which you act; and that the power vested in your honorable committee by said resolution, cannot, by any rule you can adopt, be delegated to one twelfth of your number, and that, too, in a case where a refusal to answer by which you can vest in Mr. Winn a right to do that which a majority of your honorable committee have deliberately decided ought not to have been done. Under these circumstances, in the conscientious performance of what I consider my duty, to declare that until said question shall be approved by your committee as a question which, in the proper sense, the president and directors of the City Bank, by reversing your present decision, I cannot submit it to the board. When you shall have so decided, a prompt and satisfactory reply will be immediately be furnished.

I trust that it is unnecessary for me to add that in communicating this decision, no disrespect is intended to your honorable committee or to the honorable gentleman who propounded the question which has led to this correspondence.

I have the honor to be,
Very respectfully,
Your obedt. servant,
(Signed) SAML. J. PETERS, Pres't.

A meeting of the Committee on Banks took place this day, 10 o'clock, A. M. in the Senate Chamber.

Present—Messrs. Bossier, Conrad, Downes, Ducros, Hoa, Kenner, Lockett, Pichet, Wade and Winchester.

A letter from S. J. Peters, president of the City Bank, dated 6th, inst., containing further reasons for the refusal of said Bank to answer the interrogatory propounded by Mr. Winn was read, when it was moved that the bank committee shall report to both houses of the General Assembly, the letters of Samuel J. Peters, Esq. President of the City Bank, declining to answer a question propounded by Mr. Winn—with copies of the correspondence, and the votes of this committee thereon.

Also the original resolutions of the same subject.

Said resolution was unanimously agreed to.

New Orleans, March 9th, 1840.

I certify that the foregoing eleven pages contain true and correct copies made by me from the original records and documents in my possession as secretary to the Joint Committee appointed by the General Assembly of Louisiana, to investigate the affairs of the Banks.

(Signed) J. WHITEHEAD,
Secretary to the Committee on Banks.

[REPORT.]

Mr HOA said that upon the reading of the foregoing documents reported by the chairman of the committee on banks, it now belonged to the senate to determine by their vote, whether the said committee in following the course pointed out in the act of 1839, had not fulfilled the duties imposed upon them by the legislature.

He would however, and before making any remarks on the merits of the subject, observe that the object for their information, that at one of the first sittings of the committee the question arose to ascertain whether it was necessary, in order that any interrogatory might be propounded, that it should be reported by the majority of the committee, or in other words, if no question could be asked to the banks, unless it was approved by the majority of said committee.

These preliminary steps, continued the mover, were authorized to transmit to the banks interrogatories agreed upon by a majority of the committee,—and also interrogatories not agreed to, or in other words, disapproved of by your committee. That those questions coming under this last description, should be sent as such by the chairman. In said resolution your honorable committee is pleased to declare that, in virtue of this act, Mr. Winn had a right to propound the question alluded to—and that my reasons for refusing to submit it to the board are unanswerable.

I trust it is understood that I have made no objection to the question itself, but merely to the illegal manner in which it may have been proposed to be propounded to the president and directors of the City Bank.

Entertaining the most profound respect for your honorable committee, and being as desirous to give every information as to the character of the City Bank, as any responsable committee could be to receive it, it was with great regret I felt myself compelled, by a sense of duty to the institution over which I preside, to decline propounding the question in an individual member to propound a question which, from the manner of the transmission to me, seemed not to be a question of a majority of the committee. The motives which induced me to decline, I have already explained to your committee now before me, for it distinctly states that the question propounded by Mr. Winn was one that had been disapproved of by you, and that it was transmitted as such by your chairman.

I am now called on by you to answer a question which, I presume, was not intended for me, but for the directors of the City Bank, and which, if I do, I may be guilty of a violation of law, occupying seats at the board: which question you inform me is of a class of those disapproved by you, and which, nevertheless, I am to be the person to have the right to propound, under a general rule adopted by your committee, and that consequently it is assumed that I am bound to answer it.

To this I must respectfully reply that, in my opinion, a rule that leads to such consequences, is not sanctioned by the joint resolution of the senate and house of representatives under which you act; and that the power vested in your honorable committee by said resolution, cannot, by any rule you can adopt, be delegated to one twelfth of your number, and that, too, in a case where a refusal to answer by which you can vest in Mr. Winn a right to do that which a majority of your honorable committee have deliberately decided ought not to have been done. Under these circumstances, in the conscientious performance of what I consider my duty, to declare that until said question shall be approved by your committee as a question which, in the proper sense, the president and directors of the City Bank, by reversing your present decision, I cannot submit it to the board. When you shall have so decided, a prompt and satisfactory reply will be immediately be furnished.

I trust that it is unnecessary for me to add that in communicating this decision, no disrespect is intended to your honorable committee or to the honorable gentleman who propounded the question which has led to this correspondence.

I have the honor to be,
Very respectfully,
Your obedt. servant,
(Signed) SAML. J. PETERS, Pres't.

A meeting of the Committee on Banks took place this day, 10 o'clock, A. M. in the Senate Chamber.

Present—Messrs. Bossier, Conrad, Downes, Ducros, Hoa, Kenner, Lockett, Pichet, Wade and Winchester.

A letter from S. J. Peters, president of the City Bank, dated 6th, inst., containing further reasons for the refusal of said Bank to answer the interrogatory propounded by Mr. Winn was read, when it was moved that the bank committee shall report to both houses of the General Assembly, the letters of Samuel J. Peters, Esq. President of the City Bank, declining to answer a question propounded by Mr. Winn—with copies of the correspondence, and the votes of this committee thereon.

Also the original resolutions of the same subject.

Said resolution was unanimously agreed to.

New Orleans, March 9th, 1840.

I certify that the foregoing eleven pages contain true and correct copies made by me from the original records and documents in my possession as secretary to the Joint Committee appointed by the General Assembly of Louisiana, to investigate the affairs of the Banks.

(Signed) J. WHITEHEAD,
Secretary to the Committee on Banks.

INDIANA.—A Western paper says that a cute Yankey has caught a Van Buren man in the "Hoosier State," and is taking him round as a show. A "levy" a sight and children half price. It is pronounced a first rate speculation.

One of Amos Kent'all's hirelings has been caught smuggling the mail bags on board a New Haven packet.

The price of passage to England in the *Great Western* has been reduced to 120 dollars. It was heretofore 170.

FIRE.

From Friday 10 A. M. to Saturday 7 A. M. we had three alarms of fire, each fire being evidently the work of an incendiary.

One fire was at Mr. Little's house, one at Breen & Conor's carpenters' shop, and another the stable attached to the dwelling of John Watt, esq.

Too much vigilance cannot be given to our very active and efficient fire department for their alacrity, skill, and industry. Neither does a large debt of gratitude to her public spirited citizens, BUTLER, and to his energetic and worthy complex, we cannot easily discharge.—*Natchez Courier, of March 9th.*

LEGISLATURE OF LOUISIANA.

IN SENATE.

Sitting of March 10th, 1840.

THE BANKS QUESTION.

Mr. WINN in the name and behalf of the joint committee on banks, stated that he had been requested by said committee to submit for the consideration of the senate a document consisting in part of the proceedings that had taken place in that committee, and the refusal made by the president of the City Bank, to answer to certain interrogatories put to the chairman, by a member of the committee, in presenting that document, which he introduced under the shape of a partial report, would also beg leave to state, that as a majority of one of the two branches of the legislature had decided that the committee had the power to punish as for a contempt any individual that would refuse to answer any such questions that might be propounded to them, he hoped the members that had thought proper to adopt such a course, would suggest a proper plan to carry into execution the object for which the committee on banks had been called into existence. He plans for himself, was afraid that the committee would be unable to do anything, but if ever might be the opinion of the general assembly on the subject, he would, meanwhile give, call the most particular attention of the senate to the reading of the document reported by the committee:

New Orleans, January 23, 1840.

The joint committee appointed to inquire into the affairs of the banks, in their situation of the banks of the state, or of the state house building.

On the part of the senate were present—Messrs. C. M. Conrad, L. Wade, Wm. Gibson, Mr. A. Kenner, and Hilas M. DUCROS in the chair.

Resolved, That no question shall be propounded unless it be by a majority of the committee.

When Mr. Kenner, Resolved, That any question so offered, be propounded, shall be considered as emanating from the committee, as the majority of the committee present shall decide, if it shall be asked, reported, and shall be answered.

The question of Mr. Ducros being then resumed, the question was put, and the motion was adopted, the yeas and nays being called for, which it appeared that,

Messrs. General, Dunbar, Kenner, Lockett and Winchester, voted in the affirmative.

And the Messrs. Bossier, Conrad, Downes, Hoa, Gibson, Ducros and Wade, voted in the negative—7 ayes.

The motion was then lost, by a majority of 7 nays.

On motion of Mr. Kenner, it was resolved that the chairman of each committee be vice president of the joint committee, and that the chairman of the other shall act.

Mr. GIBSON introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That all interrogatories which may be agreed upon by a majority of the committee, shall be propounded by the chairman, as emanating from the committee, and all interrogatories put by individual members of the committee shall be regarded as their own.

Which resolution was seconded and adopted.

February 10th, 1840.

A meeting of the joint committee was called at the request of several members.

Present on the part of the senate—Messrs. Wade, Bossier, Conrad, Ducros.

On the part of the house—Messrs. Kenner, Lockett and Winchester.

Mr. WINN presented the following resolution, which was seconded and adopted:

Resolved, That a copy of the resolution of the joint committee of this day, for the purpose of calling the attention of the president of the City Bank to the subject of the resolution of the joint committee of the 23d of January, be transmitted to the president of the City Bank, by the chairman of the committee, and that the secretary be directed to inform the president of the City Bank, that the joint committee have adopted a resolution, that the president of the City Bank, be requested to answer the interrogatory, put to him by the committee, in presenting the document, which was transmitted to him by the committee, on the 23d of January last, and that the president be informed that the committee have adopted a resolution, that unless the interrogatory be answered, it will be considered as a contempt, and the president of the City Bank, in a letter addressed to the chairman, under date, February 15th, 1840, herein annexed, has refused to answer said interrogatory.

Resolved, That the said letter of refusal is not admitted as satisfactory, and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be furnished by the secretary to the said president for his information, to the authority by which said question was propounded by the chairman, and that this response be again called for.

Mr. CONRAD moved to amend said resolution, by striking out the words, "that the said letter of refusal is not admitted as satisfactory."

The yeas and nays on said amendment were called, when Messrs. Conrad, Dickey, Lockett, Pichot and Winchester voted in the affirmative.

And Messrs. Bossier, Downes, Guion, Hoa, Kenner, Morse, and Winn, in the negative.

The amendment was consequently rejected.

The question was then put on the adoption of the preamble and resolution.

The yeas and nays were called, when Messrs. Bossier, Downes, Guion, Hoa, Kenner, Morse, Pichot and Winn voted in the affirmative; and, Messrs. Conrad, Ducros, Lockett and Winchester, in the negative.

Said preamble and resolution were consequently adopted.

NEW ORLEANS, February 25th, 1840.

SIR—I have the honor to communicate to you the following preamble and resolution adopted by the joint committee on banks, at its session last evening.

"Whereas, at the first meeting of the joint committee on banks a resolution was adopted in these words:—"Resolved that all interrogatories which may be agreed upon by a majority of the committee shall be propounded by the chairman as emanating from the committee, and all interrogatories put by individual members of the committee shall be regarded as their own;" and whereas, under the sanction of this resolution, Mr. Winn submitted the following question:—"Have any of the directors of your bank endorsed for each other? If you have, state the amount of such endorsements, and which of them have come under protest?" which he had a right to do under said resolution: And whereas the president of the City Bank, in a letter addressed to the chairman, under date Feb. 18th, 1840, herein annexed has refused to answer said interrogatory.

Resolved, That the said letter of refusal is not admitted as satisfactory, and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be furnished by the secretary to the said president for his information, to the authority by which said question was propounded by the chairman, and that this response be again called for.

Very respectfully,
Your most obedient servant,
(Signed.) J. WHITEHEAD,
Secretary to the bank committee.

To Samuel J. Peters, Esq.,
President of the City Bank, New Orleans.

CITY BANK,
New Orleans, February 25th, 1840.

To the honorable the joint committee of the senate and house of representatives appointed to examine the banks, &c.

GENTLEMEN—The communication of the secretary of your honorable committee, in reference to the question propounded by Mr. Winn has been received.

At a meeting, on the first meeting, I have before me. It states that your honorable committee had adopted a resolution by which your chairman was authorized to transmit to the banks interrogatories agreed upon by a majority of the committee,—and also interrogatories not agreed to, or in other words, disapproved of by your committee. That those questions coming under this last description, should be sent as such by the chairman. In said resolution your honorable committee is pleased to declare that, in virtue of this act, Mr. Winn had a right to propound the question alluded to—and that my reasons for refusing to submit it to the board are unanswerable.

I trust it is understood that I have made no objection to the question itself, but merely to the illegal manner in which it may have been proposed to be propounded to the president and directors of the City Bank.

Entertaining the most profound respect for your honorable committee, and being as desirous to give every information as to the character of the City Bank, as any responsable committee could be to receive it, it was with great regret I felt myself compelled, by a sense of duty to the institution over which I preside, to decline propounding the question in an individual member to propound a question which, from the manner of the transmission to me, seemed not to be a question of a majority of the committee. The motives which induced me to decline, I have already explained to your committee now before me, for it distinctly states that the question propounded by Mr. Winn was one that had been disapproved of by you, and that it was transmitted as such by your chairman.

I am now called on by you to answer a question which, I presume, was not intended for me, but for the directors of the City Bank, and which, if I do, I may be guilty of a violation of law, occupying seats at the board: which question you inform me is of a class of those disapproved by you, and which, nevertheless, I am to be the person to have the right to propound, under a general rule adopted by your committee, and that consequently it is assumed that I am bound to answer it.

To this I must respectfully reply that, in my opinion, a rule that leads to such consequences, is not sanctioned by the joint resolution of the senate and house of representatives under which you act; and that the power vested in your honorable committee by said resolution, cannot, by any rule you can adopt, be delegated to one twelfth of your number, and that, too, in a case where a refusal to answer by which you can vest in Mr. Winn a right to do that which a majority of your honorable committee have deliberately decided ought not to have been done. I am therefore, in the conscientious performance of what I consider my duty, to declare that until said question shall be approved by your committee as a question which, in the proper sense, the president and directors of the City Bank, by reversing your present decision, I cannot submit it to the board. When you shall have so decided, a prompt and satisfactory reply will be immediately be furnished.

I trust that it is unnecessary for me to add that in communicating this decision, no disrespect is intended to your honorable committee or to the honorable gentleman who propounded the question which has led to this correspondence.

I have the honor to be,
Very respectfully,
Your obedt. servant,
(Signed) SAML. J. PETERS, Pres't.

A meeting of the Committee on Banks took place this day, 10 o'clock, A. M. in the Senate Chamber.

Present—Messrs. Bossier, Conrad, Downes, Ducros, Hoa, Kenner, Lockett, Pichot, Wade and Winchester.

A letter from S. J. Peters, president of the City Bank, dated 6th, inst., containing further reasons for the refusal of said Bank to answer the interrogatory propounded by Mr. Winn was read, when it was moved that the bank committee shall report to both houses of the General Assembly, the letters of Samuel J. Peters, Esq. President of the City Bank, declining to answer a question propounded by Mr. Winn—with copies of the correspondence, and the votes of this committee thereon.

Also the original resolutions of the same subject.

Said resolution was unanimously agreed to.

New Orleans, March 9th, 1840.

I certify that the foregoing eleven pages contain true and correct copies made by me from the original records and documents in my possession as secretary to the Joint Committee appointed by the General Assembly of Louisiana, to investigate the affairs of the Banks.

(Signed) J. WHITEHEAD,
Secretary to the Committee on Banks.

The committee party must therefore inevitably join the bill—[illegible] It is a matter of not so much importance.

Mr. PRESTON believed the resuscitation of the committee, [illegible] The subject [illegible] Bank. The matter [illegible] system of [illegible] still continued.

But the City Bank refused to answer the interrogatories he had [illegible] Bank, [illegible] Bank, [illegible] Bank,