NEW-ORLEANS BEE.

BY BULLITT, BULLEN & MAGNE.
No. 82 Chartres street.

TRUTH IS OMNIPOTENT AND PUBLIC JUSTICE CERTAIN.

NEW-ORLEANS:
FRIDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 1, 1839.

FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,

HENRY CLAY,
OF KENTUCKY.

Subject to the decision of a National Convention.

INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT

The people of the United States have been frequently charged with an ungovernable disposition of roaming into extremes. We have been gravely lectured about this propensity, by our transatlantic contemporaries, to whose staid and cent per cent view of all subjects, many of the gigantic projects which have been attempted by the young republic, seem altogether chimerical and impracticable. Upon some matters we are told that we manifest a culpable apathy, whilst on others we display an energy and enterprise as incomprehensible as ungrounded. Although it would be unwise to pause in a course pointed out by prudence and foresight, because of its seeming difficulty and vast expense, still, it is the province of wisdom to profit by the suggestions of experience, come they from what quarter they may. Even in times the most auspicious and full of promise, it would be well for the representative to investigate, with the most mathematical exactness, any scheme of magnitude, both as to outlay and the probable income to be derived from it, before involving the fortunes of his state upon its completion. It cannot be doubted that, in some causes, the people of other states, captivated by the high sounding paragraphs which were written and spoken in behalf of favorite measures with imposing titles, have leaped in the dark, and grappled with a giant before counting the cost of the undertaking. And instances are of record, of states being gradually drawn into enterprises of doubtful policy, too far to retreat, before the proper pains were taken, in examining their details. It is, moreover, a fact, that in the reports made by engineers and boards of internal improvement, that the estimated cost of roads and canals is far below the actual expenditures required, and the advantages and profits arising from them, are rather enlarged upon in a spirit of speculation and prophecy than reduced from an elaborate investigation of the whole subject in all its bearings.

Let us for a moment assert to the system of slack water navigation in progress in Kentucky. The first report made to the legislature of that state estimated the cost of such works as were necessary to test the practicability and usefulness of that mode of improvement, so low, as to induce its immediate adoption. The banks of the Licking, Kentucky, and Green rivers were said to contain the richest mineral ores in the world, which only required a few thousand dollars to make available to the state. Kentucky was in a few years to compete with Newcastle in the coal trade, to supply all other states in the production of iron. Such districts as were not encumbered with these elements of riches, were said to be the best arable lands in the country, and upon the completion of the projected improvements, the rivers were to be alingled over with boats and rafts bearing to market the goodly products of all these sources of productive wealth, rewarding the laborer with silken purses filled with "yellow boys" shining through the "interstices thereof." The members of the legislature stimulated by a laudable zeal in promoting the interests of these constituents, and led astray by the comparative insignificance of the cost, as laid down in the report, to the great advantages to be effected, were unwilling to wait the tardy process of experience in establishing the utility of a measure, and committed the state at once in the project to an alarming extent. After years have demonstrated that what was to cost hundreds will require thousands, and millions are needed instead of thousands. And, although it be true that the sources of the rivers in Kentucky abound in the richest ores, and fertile districts of great extent bind their meanderings, so vast will be the expenditures required to slack water them, that no rate of toll which will allow the proprietor a profit on the commodities transported will keep the works in repair, and pay the interest on the cost. Indeed an engineer of great experience and acquainted with the system has frequently told us, that he did not think that one per cent would ever be collected over the necessary outlay for repairs. Furthermore, it is now much doubted, if the locks and dams on those streams will not prove a hinderance rather than a facility to navigation. In this manner the Kentucky got herself hampered in an experiment, to say the least, of doubtful success, to such an extent as to forbid retreat, and tax her resources to the uttermost.

The advantages of a well digested system of internal improvement are too evident to be matters of doubt or hazardous conjecture. If a projected road has any real claim on the legislature, that claim can be established by indubitable proofs, and upon data of unquestionable application. In summing up the cost and profit of a public work, much may be added to the latter in the increased trade which increased facilities always create. But this item, which is always made large enough to fill up any vacuum which may be needed in the estimates, can be arrived at within a degree of certainty necessary to a correct judgement, if adequate pains are taken. The quality of the lands through which a road passes, their susceptibility to certain kinds of agriculture, their means of other access to market, the extent of country and its produce which would naturally use the road, are some of the details which would aid the mind in making up an opinion. When a system, after a full and searching investigation of all the items which go to make up the sum total of its cost and probable revenue, is adopted upon conviction of its policy and advantages, it can be continued and pushed forward with energy and confidence.

We have been induced to throw out these remarks, from any preconceived prejudice against any real system of roads which may claim the consideration of the legislature of Louisiana during its present session, but from a conviction that the adoption of any crude and ill-digested scheme of improvement must be attended with great loss, and cripple her means to such an extent, as to prevent the prosecution of a system which wisdom may mature.

[FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.]
Washington, January 22d, 1839.

The administration party are now a minority in the house of the people. This fact has been admitted by several of the trainbands themselves in debate, and frankly acknowledged by the Globe. The official journal has told its employer, Mr. Van Buren, that the union of the whigs and conservatives have given to the opposition a majority. For once that paper has told the truth. Never was any party so signally beaten. They were defeated on every question from the commencement the voting began in relation to the appointment of the committee of investigation: and the result of the struggle has been most mortifying to the party who trod down all their recent boastings about his, the people's representatives with them; and turns against themselves all the declamation they have lavished about a "factious opposition." It is the administration party in the house, now, who deserve the name of "faction" according to their own idea of the proper application of that term to all who oppose the will of the majority. The position of the SPEAKER is somewhat humiliating. Unless the actively generous nature of his mind be humbled by the contrast between the attitude in which he now stands, and that which he occupied at the opening of the session. Then he was elected by a majority of the representatives of the people to an office only below the dignity of the chief magistracy. Now he stands condemned by a major ity of the same representatives as unworthy of trust. This condemnation was pronounced solemnly, deliberately, unequivocally, after every means, device, strategy, and trick had been resorted to, for the purpose of producing a free, fair, and full expression of opinion.—There can be no mistake about this case. The house of representatives has said plainly to the speaker "WE DISTRUST AND WE WILL NOT TRUST YOU."

A man of sensibility could wind it impossible to remain at a post like the speaker's after this declaration of distrust had been registered against him. But Mr. James K. Polk will hold on. He has about as much feeling to use an expression of Mr. Balie Peyton) as is supposed to exist *in the heel of a negro who runs down a flint hill without getting a stone.*

The committee on defalcations have elected Mr. Hardin of Kentucky their chairman. They will meet in New York by Thursday morning next; and at once begin their enquiries.

The senate to-day after some miscellaneous morning business of little or no importance, and principally of a private character took up the bill to prohibit the giving or accepting, within the District of Columbia, a challenge to fight a duel, and for the punishment of the offence. The penalties are, in case of either of the parties being slain or mortally wounded, against all the surviving parties concerned as principals or accessories who may aid or abet therein, imprisonment in the penitentiary for not exceeding five years. In case no meeting should take place between the parties challenging and accepting a challenge, and it should not terminate fatally, the parties will be held guilty of a misdemeanor, for giving, or offering or accepting the challenge, and punished by the same confinement for a term not exceeding five years. In any species of bodily assault, or for posting or publishing any written charging with cowardice, or any other opprobrious epithet for declining a challenge the punishment shall be confinement to hard labor in the penitentiary for a term not exceeding three years. If the person leaves the District of Columbia for the purpose of evading the provisions of this act, he or they are subject to the same penalties.

There was a proposition made to strike out the last clause, which after a short debate was rejected: and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The remainder of the day was spent in the consideration of private bills.

In the house Mr. Haynes of Ga. moved to go into committee of the whole on the president's message. Mr. Lumbering suggested that the discussion desired on the topics embraced in this document might just as well be brought up when the appropriation bills should be taken under consideration. The house refused to suspend the rules for the purpose of entertaining the motion.

After several unimportant reports from committees were received, the bill from the senate for reducing and graduating the price of the public lands was taken up for reference.

Mr. Shields, of Tennessee, moved to refer it to the committee on public lands.

Mr. Menefee moved to refer it to the select committee, of which he is a member from each state, and raised on the motion of Mr. Robertson of Va. two similar all questions connected with the disposition of the public domain.

On these motions, a debate of considerable interest and animation arose, running frequently into the merits of the bill, and the alterations of the land system, in the course of which Messrs. Shields, Boon, Martin, and Ewing advocated the reference to the standing committee; and Messrs. Menifee, Williams, of N. C. and Lincoln of Mass. advocated the reference to the select committee.

The committee on public lands consists of *six* members from the new states, and only three from the old states: and therefore it may be readily supposed the majority are in favour of these alterations of the land system. The select committee is composed of about 17 members in favor of these schemes and nine against them.

Mr. Montgomery of Alabama moved to lay the bill on the table. A call of the house was ordered. One hundred and ninety-nine members were present.

The vote was ayes 102, nays 97.

So the bill was laid on the table, and the house adjourned.

We have been requested by an officer of the Woodbury, to publish the following communication, originally intended for the Bee, but, which *accidentally* found its way to a neighboring print:—

U. S. GOVERNMENT PACKET WOODBURY, }
S. W. PASS, January 29. }

Gentlemen—Becoming it of importance to our commerce in the Gulf of Mexico, that the merchants should have early information as to the position now taken by the French squadron, I beg you will publish the following statement:—

On Wednesday week last, cast in Paulding of the U. S. ship Levant, made an official call upon Admiral Baudin, the commander in chief of the French forces in the Gulf of Mexico. The admiral informed myself and Lieut. Commdt. of Tampico and Matamoras that, for the present, opened to commerce, and pledged himself that they should not be again closed without timely notice being given. The port of Vera Cruz, I am sorry to say, is again closed. Merchant vessels will be permitted to anchor, but are not suffered under the penalty of confiscation, to land any portion of their cargoes. All portsmouth of Vera Cruz are heretofore blockaded. The city of Vera Cruz is now held by a small Mexican guard. Its inhabitants have, by the order of Santa Ana, abandoned the city, with all their movable effects. The army of Santa Ana is encamped about twelve miles in the interior. There are no active hostilities going on between the belligerent parties, but the very worst fighting prevails. Santa Ana had threatened to destroy the walls of the city, and when I left, had introduced powder for that purpose. I left at Vera Cruz the brig Louisa of N. York, the schooners Amelia and Alexander Washington of New-Orleans. The French had endorsed the papers of the latter, and would doubtless do the same the papers of the other two before they left the port. Your obt'st servt.

J. S. NICHOLAS.
Capt. U. S. government packet Woodbury.

CANADA.

The Montreal Courier, of the 15th, has the following: The magistrates in quarter session at Brockville, on the 2d ultimo, resolved, that from this time all intercourse with the United States should cease, except at the ports of Prescott, Brockville and Gananoque, where passports from the commanding officer will be required. Any persons passing at other than the ports above mentioned, are liable to be arrested.

MR. TALLMADGE.—The re-election of Mr. Tallmadge as U. S. senator from New York, will not take place this winter. The locofocos have taken advantage of the law which makes it inoperative upon both branches of the legislature to elect a senator *separately*, before proceeding to the election on joint Ballot. They are playing the same game by which they succeeded in defeating the election of Rufus King, in 1825, and will probably accomplish their object, as "they have the law on their side." Next year, however, will witness the regeneration of that factious body, the senate, and the locofocos will learn that they have postponed, not prevented a whig *triumph*.

MR. FORREST'S DAMON.—We can give this masterly performance but a *line*—and it needs but a *word* to delineate its beauties:—PERFECTION. It was a stupendous effort of his tragic genius, and from first to last was sustained with originality and justness of conception, force, fire and fervor of execution that gave us every thing to admire, and left us nothing to regret.

MR. FORREST appears to night as Claude Melnotte, in the Lady of Lyons.

By the arrival of the steamboat Ambassador, we are put in possession of Louisville dates to the 24th inclusive. The papers of that day are silent as to the condition of the river.

MISSOURI LEGISLATURE.—On the 20th the two houses were to have gone into an election for U. S. senator.

☞ The legislature of Maryland is discussing the propriety of bringing real estate forward as a basis, equally available with gold, silver and stocks, for banking operations.

THE SWARTWOUT DEFALCATION.

The report of the proceedings of the house of representatives in congress is particularly interesting, as it manifests the last despairing efforts of the locofocos to elude the investigation which a whig committee will institute in the fiscal accounts of public officers. Fortunately for the revenue of the country, and most unhappily for the administration, the whigs, aided by the conservatives, have triumphed in their noble and patriotic attempts, and we shall, probably, in the course of a week or two, have a list of public peculators that will put to shame the petty delinquencies of other callings, kinds of agriculture, their means of other access to market, the extent of country and its produce which would naturally use the road, are some of the details which would aid the mind in making up an opinion. When a system, after a full and searching investigation of all the items which go to make up the sum total of its cost and probable revenue, is adopted upon conviction of its policy and advantages, it can be continued and pushed forward with energy and confidence.

We have been induced to throw out these remarks, from any preconceived prejudice against any real system of roads which may claim the consideration of the legislature of Louisiana during its present session, but from a conviction that the adoption of any crude and ill-digested scheme of improvement must be attended with great loss, and cripple her means to such an extent, as to prevent the prosecution of a system which wisdom may mature.

[FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.]
Washington, January 22d, 1839.

The administration party are now a minority in the house of the people. This fact has been admitted by several of the trainbands themselves in debate, and frankly acknowledged by the Globe. The official journal has told its employer, Mr. VAN BUREN, that the union of the whigs and conservatives have given to the opposition a majority. For once that paper has told the truth. Never was any party so signally beaten. They were defeated on every question from the commencement the voting began in relation to the appointment of the committee of investigation: and the result of the struggle has been most mortifying to the party who trod down all their recent boastings about his, the people's representatives with them; and turns against themselves all the declamation they have lavished about a "factious opposition." It is the administration party in the house, now, who deserve the name of "faction" according to their own idea of the proper application of that term to all who oppose the will of the majority. The position of the SPEAKER is somewhat humiliating. Unless the actively generous nature of his mind be humbled by the contrast between the attitude in which he now stands, and that which he occupied at the opening of the session. Then he was elected by a majority of the representatives of the people to an office only below the dignity of the chief magistracy. Now he stands condemned by a major ity of the same representatives as unworthy of trust. This condemnation was pronounced solemnly, deliberately, unequivocally, after every means, device, strategy, and trick had been resorted to, for the purpose of producing a free, fair, and full expression of opinion.—There can be no mistake about this case. The house of representatives has said plainly to the speaker "WE DISTRUST AND WE WILL NOT TRUST YOU."

A man of sensibility could wind it impossible to remain at a post like the speaker's after this declaration of distrust had been registered against him. But Mr. James K. Polk will hold on. He has about as much feeling to use an expression of Mr. Balie Peyton) as is supposed to exist *in the heel of a negro who runs down a flint hill without getting a stone.*

The committee on defalcations have elected Mr. Hardin of Kentucky their chairman. They will meet in New York by Thursday morning next; and at once begin their enquiries.

The senate to-day after some miscellaneous morning business of little or no importance, and principally of a private character took up the bill to prohibit the giving or accepting, within the District of Columbia, a challenge to fight a duel, and for the punishment of the offence. The penalties are, in case of either of the parties being slain or mortally wounded, against all the surviving parties concerned as principals or accessories who may aid or abet therein, imprisonment in the penitentiary for not exceeding five years. In case no meeting should take place between the parties challenging and accepting a challenge, and it should not terminate fatally, the parties will be held guilty of a misdemeanor, for giving, offering or accepting the challenge, and punished by the same confinement for a term not exceeding five years. In any species of bodily assault, or for posting or publishing any written charging with cowardice, or any other opprobrious epithet for declining a challenge the punishment shall be confinement to hard labor in the penitentiary for a term not exceeding three years. If the person leaves the District of Columbia for the purpose of evading the provisions of this act, he or they are subject to the same penalties.

There was a proposition made to strike out the last clause, which after a short debate was rejected: and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The remainder of the day was spent in the consideration of private bills.

In the house Mr. Haynes of Ga. moved to go into committee of the whole on the president's message. Mr. Lumbering suggested that the discussion desired on the topics embraced in this document might just as well be brought up when the appropriation bills should be taken under consideration. The house refused to suspend the rules for the purpose of entertaining the motion.

After several unimportant reports from committees were received, the bill from the senate for reducing and graduating the price of the public lands was taken up for reference.

Mr. Shields, of Tennessee, moved to refer it to the committee on public lands.

Mr. Menefee moved to refer it to the select committee,

THE MAYOR AND 2D MUNICIPALITY REPORT.

[Continued from the Bee of Thursday, Jan 31.]

In commenting on the first resolution, the mayor is pleased to say, that the comptroller was not removed for an honest difference of opinion on the meaning of a law; that Mr. Calhoun, in his letter, says nothing about the law, but confined himself to say that *he did not feel authorized* to transmit the statement requested until he had referred the subject to the council. It seems plain to the undersigned, that the comptroller meant that he did not think the *law* authorized him to comply with the request of the mayor.

The mayor says, also, that the decision of the first judicial district court seems quite foreign to the question, and he is "unable to discover why the council saw fit to rely upon it in justification of an officer who had not fulfilled his duty."

The court, in that decision, (Mayor vs. Lockett,) says positively, that the laws on which the mayor endeavors to sustain himself in the present controversy, *have been repealed by the act of 8th March, 1836*, and cites the 20th section of said law, which says, "*That each municipality of said city shall have a separate treasury and treasurer, the duties and qualifications of whom shall be defined by the respective councils.*" The judges also alludes to the 20th section, which says, "*All the laws and expenditures must be under the sole control of the councils of the respective municipalities wherein they originate, or are required to be made.*" Who, then, can doubt the correctness of the decision of Judge Buchanan, sustained as it is by enactments so clear and well defined? and can it seriously be presumed, that this decision is foreign to the question that presented itself to the mind of the comptroller, namely, whether, under the law, it was not the duty of the mayor to apply to the council, who had *the sole control of the treasury*, and not apply to the comptroller.

This point, like most of the others requires no argument; it is only necessary to state the facts and let the law to refute this position of the mayor. His honor is at some pains to bring forward the merits of the question that was before the first judicial district court, and that led to the learned decision alluded to. He says, another question was "whether the mayor was bound to execute an order for two thousand five hundred dollars to a member of the council of the second municipality, in payment *of his salary in an office created by the council*, while that alderman was at the same time, notwithstanding the 12th section of the act of 12th February, 1805, &c."

The section the mayor refers to is thus, "No member of the 2nd city council shall be appointed to any *emolument or office*, under the said corporation, *which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased* by the council, during the time for which he shall have been elected."

His clear from this, that if the council appointed one of its members to any emolument or office *created*, or the emoluments or *salary* of which had been increased, *while he was a member of the council*, it was unquestionably an illegal act.

But the mayor seems so unfortunate in "the statement of facts, as he is in nearly all the others that the undersigned are compelled to refute.

Mr. Lockett was not appointed to an office. He *was appointed to a new employment*, the emoluments or *salary* of which had been increased, &c.

The law clearly means to exclude members from creating offices with salaries, and then being elected to fill them, as was done, perhaps, in former times.

His honor certainly displays much ingenuity, in stating the case, so as exactly to make it violate the law. He speaks of the *salary* and of the *office* to which Mr. Lockett was appointed! an office created by the council!! The same resolution that authorized the employment of Mr. Lockett, also employed Messrs Pierce and Rost. These gentlemen, then, according to the mayor's opinion, were made officers of the second municipality, with salaries of two thousand five hundred dollars each.

The law requires all officers of the municipality, before they enter upon their duties, to take an oath of office before the mayor; your committee are not informed whether the mayor required the performance of this duty, of Messrs. Pierce and Rost; but, if so, these gentlemen entered upon the defence of the right of the people of the second municipality to make their own wharves and levees, which the first municipality and the law then mayor denied.

Although, as a general rule, members of the council should not be employed with pecuniary compensation, yet there were peculiar circumstances that rendered the employment of Mr. Lockett, on that occasion, of great importance to the municipality. Those circumstances were well understood by the council and their constituents, as well as by the mayor. The council, who approved of the resolution appointing Mr. Lockett, which, had it been illegal, would have certainly encountered his veto. The intimate knowledge acquired by Mr. Lockett, while a member of the council, of all the facts connected with the important questions involved in the suit of the first municipality vs. the city council, induced the council to secure his professional services; considering, that by so doing, they were consulting the best interests of their constituents, who had at once secured the services of Mr. Lockett out of the council without compensation. After the services of the attorneys were rendered, and the municipality rescued from threatened ruin, by a decision of the supreme court, sustaining the council, they were paid the fees agreed on. The present mayor, thinking differently from his predecessor, with respect to the legality of employing Mr. Lockett, opposed his being paid; notwithstanding, he had faithfully and successfully performed his part of the engagement. The council, with great unanimity, insisted that he should be paid, *and paid him.* The mayor refused to sign the note that he was directed to give to Mr. Lockett, and the council promptly took from him the power of signing any note or the municipality; the mayor remonstrated against that act, as illegal. The district court decided it *was* legal. The mayor, notwithstanding the great unanimity with which the council persisted in paying Mr. Lockett, notwithstanding the people of the second municipality gave their support to the council, regardless of the fact, that while, perhaps for political purposes, this heinous offence of Mr. Lockett occupied so much of the solicitude of certain newspapers beyond the municipality, and always inimitable to its interests, his constituents elected him to the legislature by a larger vote than was ever given to any man before, notwithstanding, we say, all these considerations, the mayor, in his official capacity, has not only unauthorized by the council, but disapproved of by resolution, continue to prosecute Mr. Lockett for the recovery of his fee of two thousand five hundred dollars, and has now reacked the supreme court.

The mayor remarks, that it appears to appear, that *the stamp of authority in Mr. Calhoun was an arbitrary exercise of power*, not intent, I hope, of the 5th March, 1836, and repugnant to the principle on which our institutions are founded. If the council declared any such thing in their first resolution, they it was strangely at all the sarcasm and ridicule that the mayor has so profusely bestowed on it. But it so happens, that the council said nothing that was capable of being so construed, the language of the resolution is plain—"*Resolved*, That in the opinion of the council the removal of John Calhoun from the office of comptroller of the treasury of the second municipality, *because* said comptroller entertained an honest difference of opinion in the construction of a law, &c. &c. was an arbitrary exercise of power, &c. &c. It was the removal from office without sufficient reason, and not the demand for information that was deemed to be an arbitrary exercise of power; and this is so palpable, that the undersigned are astonished that such a sophistical interpretation of the resolution should have been for a moment sanctioned by the chief magistrate of our city.

Apparently believing that such is the meaning, the mayor asks of the council, "would it be an act of arbitrary power in the president of the United States to demand from the secretary of the treasury an account of the financial affairs of the republic? Is it an act of arbitrary power in the governors of the different states, to make the same demand from the proper officer? Do the presidents of all corporations, of all kinds of nature, chartered by the different states, exercise an arbitrary power, when they call on their agents for that information on the finances of the companies over which they preside?"

The undersigned do not hesitate to say that there would be no arbitrary exercise of power in these cases submitted by the mayor, and he had such evidence before him, that such was the opinion of the council, that it is a matter of surprise that he should have propounded such queries. *When the council was informed that the mayor had demanded information from the comptroller, a resolution was immediately and unanimously passed, directing that his demand should be complied with.*

The mayor then proceeds to examine the relative powers of the councils of the municipalities and the law, and concludes by saying that "no provision of the law of 1836 has abrogated the preceding laws in relation to the part which the mayor should take in administering the finances of the city. He also says, the law of 1836 divided the city into three sections, and separated the revenue, in order that it should be applied to the emoluments of those parts in which it was collected, it created three recorders in the place of one, and gave them the right to exercise, *concurrently* with the mayor, the functions of justices of the peace in criminal matters; but thus far only did it change the previous order of things, no power was taken from the executive officer.

The mayor here assumes that the city of New Orleans was divided, by the law of 1836, into three sections, merely for the object of appropriating the revenue of one section to its own improvement. He speaks of comparatively insignificant fact, that the recorder had, concurrently with the mayor, the authority of justices of the peace in *criminal matters*; and that "*thus far only, did it change the previous order of things.*"

Who would imagine, on reading this, that the act of 8th March, 1836, annulled and abolished the ancient corporation of New Orleans, except for liquidating purposes, and that three distinct, and in every essential particular, independent corporations had been created, over which there was to be one mayor with exceedingly limited powers! Almost every important power vested in the mayor, when he was the representative of the same constituents as the council, was taken from him when his relative position was changed; and he became the chief magistrate of three distinct and independent corporations, but in fact the representative of no one. The undersigned will proceed to quote the law which unquestionably sustains their position. Act 8th March, 1836, sec. 2. That each municipality of said city shall be governed, and its affairs administered by a council composed of a recorder, and the alderman elected by the wards within the limits thereof.

Section 4. That each of said municipalities shall possess separate corporate rights, and are hereby declared to be distinct corporations, and shall possess generally all such rights, powers and capacities, as are usually incident to municipal corporations; shall have and hold the same may alter or renew at pleasure; shall be capable of suing and being sued; of acquiring by onerous or gratuitous title, all kinds of property, real, personal or mixed; of enjoying, alienating, mortgaging, and otherwise disposing of the same; and in general shall possess and exercise, within their respective limits, all such powers, rights and privileges as are now possessed and exercised by the corporation of New Orleans.

Section 5, re-asserts, that each of the municipalities shall be governed, and its affairs administered by a recorder and a council, &c.

Section 8, says, that the recorder and aldermen of each municipality shall have all the powers, and perform all the duties previously exercised and performed by the city council; and beside, shall have the exclusive right to appoint all officers, &c.

Section 9, and 9, define the duties and powers of the mayor; he is declared to possess and exercise all powers then vested in him by law, with such *exceptions* as were made in said act of 8th March, and not *incompatible with its provisions.*

Section 11, says: "That each of the aforesaid corporations, shall have the exclusive right to make and enforce all public laws and regulations within their respective limits, and to regulate, and at their own expense to make all improvements to the streets, public squares, wharves, and other public property, the use of which is now common, &c."

Section 15. "That all the real property, of whatever kind or description, and the revenues arising therefrom, now vested in the mayor, aldermen, and inhabitants of New Orleans, shall be vested in the respective municipalities, in which the same is situated.

Section 20, provides for an annual meeting of the three councils, then to form a general council, with the following limited powers:

1. To fix uniform rates of taxation, except on real estate and slaves.

2. To fix the salaries of the mayor, and secretary of the general council.

3. To make uniform regulations with respect to the management and discipline of the city guard or watch.

4. To enact general police regulations. In restricting the powers of the three assembled councils, the law expressly declares: "That all receipts and expenditures must be under the sole control of the councils or the respective municipalities wherein they originate, or are required to be made."

Section 23, says: "That each municipality shall have a separate treasury and treasurer, the duties and qualifications of whom shall be defined by the respective councils."

Act 11th March, 1836, 3d section, provides, that no union of the three corporations, created by the law of 8th March, shall take place without the consent of two thirds of the qualified voters, residing within the limits of the three municipalities."

(To be continued.)

TRADE AND COMMERCE.

IMPORTS.

Liverpool—Per barque William—1250 sacks salt and 50 tons paving stone.

Bordeaux—Per barque Lodoe—Wine and cotton.

Havre—Per ship Caroline—Silks, linens, &c. of all kinds and sundry indoe, to various consignees whose names are not on the manifest.

Liverpool—Per brig Margaret—2301 sacks salt.

Amsterdam—Per brig Pandora—Tin, cheese, oil, wine and indoe.

RECEIPTS FROM THE INTERIOR.

Per ship Martha Ann—from Covington—13 bales cotton to Merrick & Jamison.

Per steamboat Ambassador from Louisville—128 bbls pork A & J Sullivan; 150 do flour J Flamble; 147 hhds tobacco A & J L Sullivan; 850 sheep and sundries owner on board.

Per steamboat Atlantic from Cincinnati—30 bbls sausage, 4 tierces pork, J A Merritt; 4 kegs sausages J A Merritt; 1032 bbls pork, Gaff & Fisher; 21 kegs lard, E Renshaw; 32 bbls hams, 400 bbls 17 half do pork, 199 kegs lard, 201 boxes 1 bbls tobacco, 25 bbls whiskey, sundries on board and order; 1 box mdse Rodman & Gramlin.

Per steamboat Indiana from Louisville—10 3 bbls flour, 703 do pork, 200 kegs lard, 2 tcs hams, 10 bales cotton, 4 bbls whiskey, owners on board; 200 empty bbls B L Adams; 30 bbls tobacco, Starkey & Whittingham; 34 bbls pork, 2 do lard, 13 do whisky, Carman & McMahon; 38 bbls tobacco A & J L Addison Bros; sundries Lapsley & co.

Per steamboat Wm Robinson, jr. from Pittsburgh—21 casks whiskey A Fenner; 15 bbls do, 1 bag, 30 empty bbls, J Lailand; 100 kegs glass C Jamison; 3 0 bbls Chicago butter, Hubbard & Gray; 10 bbls cotton seed, Keyes; sundries on board.

Per steamboat Levant, from Bayou Sara—90 bales cotton A Lesley & co; 115 2 8 do Jones, Ellis & co; 78 Pegrams, Atwood & co; 97 Lanehan & Thompson; 40 Wilkinsons, Parker & co; 3 41 Mees; 31 A Rivards & co; 26 R Rogers; 7 Barbers, Watt & co; 20 Fortons, Bellows & Hopkins; 25 Ross & Hawthorn; 20 Taylor, Gardner & co; 16 W Stewart; 19 Bogan & Lanehan; 10 Fleming & co; 15 W Chase; 14 White & co; 5 W Dickey & co; 6 T Barrow; 10 Hunt, Lanehan & co; Hayle & wife.

Per steamboat Belle Rowena from Rodney—120 bbls cotton Brown, Wells & co; 35 Gayle & Stewart; 92 S W Dickey & co; 5 W Kyle; 5 Dickey & Kyle; 3 H Bainbridge; 18 A Lesley & co; 30 Allen & Trimmier; 25 Chenault & Bell; 10 Chisolm & Bennett, Pernelsburg & co; 13 W Fisher; 15 Taylor, Gardner & co; 14 Pickens & Jones; 10 Cooper & Bradley; 10 Gibbs & Hickey; 9 Brand & Lamb; 5 W Stewart; 1 Gardner & Thompson.

Per steamboat Lady of the Lake from Pittsburgh—7 boxes glassware, N Arnold; 3 do empty bbls Adams & Harwell; 1 chest tea, Jones & co; 1 do and sundries W A Walker; 200 empty bbls Brown & Jones; 1 case dry goods Fair & Co; 1 do do Cochran Grant, Lade & Walker; 38 bbls flour Hadden & Hill; 35 bbls cotton seed, Keyes; 1 box mdse Fair & Co; 1 do do Cochran Grant, Lamberts & Thompson; 250 bbls lime, Lord & Vance & co; 1 box mdse Fair & Co; 1 do do Cochran Grant, Lade & Walker; 36 bbls flour, Lord & Vance; 1 box mdse Fair & Co; 1 do do Cochran Grant, Lade & Walker; 36 Hobson & Gooch; 12 Kirkpatrick & co