NEW-ORLEANS BEE.

OFFICIAL STATE PAPER.

BY BULLITT, MAGNE & CO.
At No. 81 Chartres street.

CITY PAPER, PUBLISHED DAILY, *per annum, in advance*, $12
COUNTRY PAPER, PUBLISHED TRI-WEEKLY, $10

"Truth is omnipotent, and Public Justice certain."

WHIG
NOMINATION OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION
FOR PRESIDENT,
WILLIAM H. HARRISON,
OF OHIO.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
JOHN TYLER,
OF VIRGINIA.

LOUISIANA ELECTORAL TICKET.
At Large—WILLIAM DEBUYS, New Orleans.
1st do LGEUFROY BARRAS, Lafourche.
2d do JOSEPH BERNARD, East Baton Rouge;
3th do JACQUES DUPRE, St. Landry;
4th do SETH LEWIS, Rapides.

FOR CONGRESS—FIRST DISTRICT,
Hon. EDWD. D. WHITE.

NEW-ORLEANS:
TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 17, 1840

MORE PROFFS.

The Albany correspondent of the N. Y. *Express*, charges that after the election, last November, when it was ascertained that a majority of whigs had been returned to both branches of the legislature, the prominent members of the Van Buren party and the leading abolitionists in various parts of the state had frequent communications both verbally and in writing, which resulted in a coalition to send GERRIT SMITH, the most violent abolitionist in New York, to the Senate of the U. S. The fact was notorious at Albany. The administration party promised the abolitionists, "Specifically and directly, that if they could procure seven votes in the House and four in the Senate for MR. SMITH, he should be elected senator."

This is another proof of the coalition of the northern locofocos and fanatics. By this arrangement, it was thought that a few of the whigs, supposed to entertain anti-slavery opinions, might be brought over to the support of the VAN BUREN ABOLITION candidate. It is known that the administration party voted for GERRIT SMITH in mass, but fortunately there could be no whigs to aid this nefarious conspiracy. The whigs in the N. Y. Legislature clung to their principles; they voted for Talmadge, who now adorns the Senate Chamber of the U. S. contending for the rights of the people against the usurpations and tyranny of VAN BUREN.

The unanimity with which the locofocos in the Legislature of New York supported *Gerrit Smith* for the senate, taken in connection with the intrigues which produced his nomination, should awaken southerners to the deep game that VAN BUREN and his partizans are playing. The denunciations of the administration press in the south against GEN. HARRISON as an abolitionist *are not re-copied* by the northern locofoco papers; whilst the *defence* of General HARRISON by the southern whig press, *is* caught up by the abolition journals of the north to confirm the opposition of the fanatics to his election.

The northern whig press, such as the *Courier and Enquirer*, *Evening Star*, *Express*, *Gazette*, &c, is as violent against abolition as the south is. Such is not the case with the administration papers at the north. The leading Van Buren journals in Philadelphia and New York are favorable to the abolitionists—for instance the N. Y. *Post* and the *Pennsylvania*. Put those things together, and it will be clearly seen which par y is implicated in the designs of the abolitionists. Besides, the *votes*, the VOTES of GEN. HARRISON and his speeches, prove him to be sound to the core upon this question. And we defy any administration journal, to show a single instance, in which Mr. VAN BUREN as legislator was ever called upon to vote upon the subject of slavery, that he did not record his name in favor of the abolitionists. We defy them to the proof. The journals of the New York legislature and of Congress are accessible to them, and if ever Mr. VAN BUREN did give a vote in favor of the domestic institutions of the south, that vote can be proven by the record.

The people have been too long humbugged by empty professions. They want *proof*—*facts*—not words Mr. VAN BUREN has voted upon slave questions before now, and we have the record showing that his votes were in opposition to southern rights, upon the Missouri and other questions; and if he has ever given a single vote in favor of southern institutions, why do not the administration journals produce the evidence of it? Give us the proofs.

FOR THE NEW ORLEANS BEE.

Messrs. Editors:—

Of late the public hereabout have frequently had brought before them, in many versions, that fabrication, better known as the "petticoat slander," but I have seen none served up with more effrontery than that in a loco-foco paper of this morning.——I do not know what weight the assertions of that paper may have in this community in general, but the article in question is so totally unfounded in fact, that, I think it impossible to deceive. But for the benefit of those prints so laudably engaged in circulating that interesting story, permit me to state some *facts* with which I am well acquainted; and some others that I can substantiate by abundance of evidence at home.

The story was first brought to light at a Democratic Convention, at Columbus, on the 8th January, 1838, by that young lion of the party, *Maj. William Allen*, and I believe was generally supposed to be a jest—a piece of pleasantry—a specimen of democratic *small talk*, got up to amuse the audience, who were mostly strangers to the speaker and those he was traducing. But the long-eared ones of the party commenced braying it forth, first in doubt, then in favor, and finally, where they know nothing of the parties implicated, men were found that could swear the story was true! Having now been ratified, it was passed currently amongst the democratic party, and was the theme of their discourse by day and dreams by night. But, Messrs. Editors, we all know they made a poor *shift* of it in Ohio.

At home, where it was known to be utterly destitute of truth, it was rebuked on the spot, and I presume the inventor has found out, long since, that the ladies of Chillicothe know how to reward the man who could so ungentlemanly and indecorously produce them. Chillicothians do not regard the slander as resting upon Gent. Harrison, but upon the ladies of their town, and the author was brought to account immediately by Gent. W. S. Murphy, and to final judgment, before the people, at the pending October election.

The statement published this morning in the Tree American is strictly correct, to which may be added, that in the summer of 1836, several of our old citizens, in a publication in the Scioto Gazette, over their own signatures, entirely refuted the falsehood. *Their card never was disproved, nor, that I can assure you, is its truth seriously questioned.* Messrs. Editors, I have but little party feeling to gratify in making this statement, but it is truly mortifying to see the matrons of my native town, (amongst whom was my mother) and their fair daughters, so wantonly, ungallantly and indecently basing it before the public. It is certainly a shifting evidence of a weak cause, when falsehood takes the place of fact, and reason becomes smothered in ratification. But, as whigs, let us rejoice to see the story circulate, for it will do more effectual than the jobbers of the axe in olden time, and add to our ranks thereafter. A CHILLICOTHEAN.

New-Orleans, 14th March, 1840.

SLANDER REFUTED.

For some months past the following story has been going the rounds of the loco-foco papers, and heralded forth by the world as truth:——

Daniel Webster's opinion of William Henry Harrison.—Mr. Webster, when asked in Philadelphia if he would be pleased at the same ticket with General Harrison, replied, "I cannot be *guilty* of any act that shall, in the remotest degree, tend to the elevation of a man to the presidency who is *justly* the scorn and *ridicule of his foes*, and the pity and *contempt of his friends*."

We never doubted for a moment but that the story was basely false in every particular, and we now have the pleasure of transferring to our columns from the *National Intelligencer*, the following *authorized* denial:——

The preceding paragraph has been extensively circulated in the Administration prints. We are authorized to say, as we now do most emphatically, that there is no foundation whatever for the assertion in the story, or any thing imputing Mr. Webster's opinions to be favorable to the statement in UNQUALIFIEDLY FALSE.—*Nat. Intel.*

Mr. HAY arrived in this city yesterday, and will deliver a course of lectures upon the laws of storms, during the week.

ALEXANDRIA.

The duchess of [illegible] has been [illegible] services of this [illegible] a series of [illegible] Alexandria [illegible] on Wednesday evening last, at 8 o'clock, [illegible] Mr. Hay arrived in this city yesterday, and will deliver a course of lectures upon the laws of storms, during the week.

ALEXANDRIA.

The duchess of [illegible] has been [illegible] services of this [illegible] a series of [illegible] Alexandria [illegible] on Wednesday evening last, at 8 o'clock, [illegible] Mr. Hay arrived in this city yesterday, and will deliver a course of lectures upon the laws of storms, during the week.

From information received we are authorized to state that GEORGE A. WAGGAMAN, Esq., is a candidate for the state senate, from the Parish of Jefferson.

☞ We are requested by the mate of the steamer *Cincinnati* to contradict the statement from the *Baton Rouge Gazette*, published in yesterday's Bee, relative to his having inhumanely passed a little negro boy in the river, with the reply "The captain is asleep and I have no business to take you in." We are assured personally by the mate, that the statement is entirely false: that he was not on deck at the time, and knew nothing of the occurrence, until some time afterwards. The mate has authority to stop the boat, and would undoubtedly have done so, had he been present when the circumstance referred to took place.

The following letter from the U. S. consul at VERA CRUZ, confirms the intelligence received at New York by the *Tallot*, of an engagement between two British vessels of war and a number of Chinese armed junks:

CONSULATE OF U. S. AMERICA, VERA CRUZ, } March 6, 1840.

SIR—Awaiting the departure of the barque Neverfine, Capt. Mahon, for Mobile, I profit by the occasion to communicate that advices are received at this place from "Hong-kong China, via Manilan, to the 8th November last, and which informed that an action had taken place, near the "bogue," Canton river, between two of H. B. majesty's ships the frigate Volage and sloop Hyacinth, opposed by a force of about thirty Chinese war junks, in which six of the latter were sunk and seven thousand lives lost.

It is alleged that the engagement was provoked by the Chinese admiral, who showed great personal bravery in the action, but which was brought to a close in the short space of half an hour.

The foreigners who had taken refuge at Macao, have been compelled to quit that place.

I am, sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
M. BURROUGH.

The Editor of the N. O. Bee.

MEXICO.

The *Courier* of last evening published the following extract of a letter received by the Mexican Consul in New Orleans, from General Arista, the commander of the central forces on the Rio Grande:

"*H. Q. Cadereita, Feb. 14, 1840.*

"On the 20th of this month, it shall commence a combined movement on the Rio Grand, with 2000 men and 10 pieces of artillery; leaving 1000 men to cover Tampico, and 1000 more to garrison Matamoros. I received this news to be spread in the country adjoining Texas, on your side, in order that the emigration may be suspended. Under my command are 3000 General Canalizo, are now mustered 4000 soldiers. Matamoros and Tampico are strongly fortified; and we are not only prepared to receive, but actually intend to go in pursuit of the enemies of our country."

BANKRUPT LAWS.—Petitions are flowing in upon congress, praying the passage of a general bankrupt law. The people in the northern and middle states seem to be unanimous in favor of the measure.

The proprietors of the Nashville papers have determined to adopt the cash system wholly and unconditionally. On the first day of July next, the names of all subscribers who have not paid in advance will be striken from the lists.

LEGISLATURE OF LOUISIANA.

IN SENATE.

SITTING OF MARCH 16, 1840.

Present the hon. F. Garcia, President.

Mr. DERBIGNY, agreeably to previous notice introduced a bill amendatory of the several acts relative to the ports of Orleans, approved March 26th, 1834,—which after the rules being dispensed with, was read a second and third time, was adopted, and passed.

Mr. SCOTT of Baton Rouge, in the name of the senator from Lafourche, to whom a leave of absence was granted, moved to take up the bill to incorporate the Roman Catholic church of St Elizabeth, on the left bank of bayou Lafourche, in the parish of Ascension. But on the reading and adoption of the 1st section, said bill was laid over the table, pursuant to a rule of the senate.

The following bills were adopted at their second readings and passed; viz:

1st. An act to divorce Joseph Roup and Elizabeth Toquay of the parish of Iberville.

2d. An act for the better organization of the militia of the state.

3d. A resolution relative to the improvement of the mouth of bayou Lafourche.

4th. A resolution fixing the adjournment *sine die* of the legislature for the 1st. of April next. The senate amended this resolution by fixing the adjournment for the 28th instant.

5th. An act to authorize the persons therein named to build a bridge over bayou Roundaway, in the parish of Madison.

6th. An act to incorporate the town of Unionville in the parish of Ascension.

The senate concurred in the amendment of the lower house, authorizing a transfer and appropriation to Franklin Academy, and for other purposes. The amendment granted $3,900 to the Minden Academy instead of $1,500.

At the request of Mr. Fredeau, the senate took up the amendments of the house to the bill, entitled "an act to create additional precincts of election in the parish of Point Coupee and for other purposes." Two of the amendments were concurred in, and the balance were rejected.

The bill reported by the committee on banks, to amend the charters of the banks of this state, which had been made the official order of the day for to day, was postponed until to-morrow at 11 o'clock A. M.

The senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, March 16, 1840.

Mr. GUION obtained leave of absence for Mr. Thibodeaux; also for Mr. Morse, at the last of the session.

Mr. KENNER's motion fixing a day for adjournment, came up.

Mr. KENNER moved to fix the period for the first day in April.

The motion was put to the vote and carried.

Mr. PRESTON moved an additional section, that the house should meet at 10 o'clock, P. M., for the purpose of transacting local business.

Mr. DAVIDSON moved to lay it on the table. The motion was carried.

Mr. PRESTON introduced, by leave, a bill to create a register of marriages in the parish of Jefferson.

Mr. BOUDOUSQUIE moved that the house take up the resolution for the appointment of a joint committee to memorialize congress on the necessity of protecting the interests of the sugar planters by increasing the present duty on sugar.

Mr. BOUDOUSQUIE modified his resolution so as to confine the duties of the committee to a consideration of the subject, with power to report to the house, and to draft a memorial to congress, if necessary.

A general discussion on the merits of the protective system ensued. Mr. PRESTON thought, that if the subject was brought before congress, the whole question of revenue would, and the duty now existing on foreign sugars might be taken off.—He consequently better refrain from

Mr. BOUDOUSQUIE said the present duty of 2½ cents was not a protection. It was a simple expression of opinion, but the gentleman from Lafayette had misled discussion, and he felt bound to answer. Mr. Conrad stated that the sugar duty was a tariff duty. There was always a distinction between sugar and other articles. Sugar had been taxed for revenue, but not for protection. The duty created on most lighter articles than the tariff. The gentleman had taken a wrong view of the matter.

Mr. BAILIF asked whether the house was to be precluded from taking the subject into consideration;—adopting the report of the committee was another thing. The house could adopt or reject as it pleased. It would be a strange principle if the house were compelled to adopt the report of every committee.

Mr. BAILIF moved to lay the resolution indefinitely on the table. The motion did not carry—the ayes and nays—ayes, 12—nays, 22.

Mr. WARMOUTH explained his position. He was opposed to the resolution, because it was premature. It was not a question of the subject. He showed that the meaning of the resolution was such that every member of the house could vote for it. It merely appointed a committee to consider the *propriety* of adopting certain measures. The wording of the resolution was altogether conditional.

Mr. BAILIF would not vote for the resolution on principle. He had a ways regarded protective duties as unconstitutional, but would still vote for the resolution. The duty laid on sugar in 1812-16, was a revenue duty. We had then just escaped from the yoke of the British monarchy, sugar was then a luxury, and the government taxed it three cents for the purpose of revenue, in order to pay the debt. This was admitted by all parties. The duty was then taken off. We had immediate capital in the culture of this article on the faith of this constitutional law. Unfortunately, in 1821, Louisiana was divided on the side of the tariff, and in 1828, the 1 gislature solemnly resolved themselves to be a tariff state. We so-called our constitutional duty was the unconstitutional protective duty. The former duty was very low and we are suffering. Although an anti tariff man, he would feel himself bound for this cane sullied law. He thought a memorial would be abortive if the revenue was deficient; the duty was constitutional and might be levied. In visiting the public lands by congress was intended to keep down the population and retard the growth of the west. Why cannot congress abolish the land speculation and secure the settlers? The duty on sugar is a proper exposition of these subjects would produce a good result.

Mr. C. M. CONRAD was opposed to the gentleman who last spoke. How have we been able to retain this duty? Not by associating with the anti-tariff party, but by arraying ourselves with the friends of the tariff. If we adopt the principles of the gentleman, we must join heart and hand with Mr. Calhoun and his confederacy; and then will we have the Northern capital on us. Cannot the North tell us that immense capital has been invested in their manufactories, and they have been equally injured with ourselves by the removal of protective duties. According to the gentleman's opinion, the duty ought to have ceased 3 years ago, when there was a surplus revenue. The prodigal administration has now rendered the revenue deficient, instead of a surplus. And if the Messrs Van Buren are returned, in two or three years we shall have a surplus revenue, and what then will become of the sugar interest. He differed *toto cœlo*, with the gentleman. He approved the resolution but on very different principles.

Mr. BOUDOUSQUIE regretted this discussion. He had not wished to elicit it. Mr. B. made a few remarks on the importance of the sugar interest and the depreciated condition, in consequence of the low rate of protection. All the small planters were compelled to give up the cultivation of the cane, and turn their attention to the cotton crop.

Mr. BAILIF moved to lay the resolution indefinitely on the table. The motion was carried.

Mr. GUION offered an additional section, appropriating $5,000 for the improvement of the navigation of Bayou Lafourche. On a motion, the motion was lost—ayes 19—nays 20.

Mr. GUION moved to reconsider the vote, and the