NEW-ORLEANS BEE

SPECIAL JOURNAL OF THE STATE'S
GENERAL GOVERNMENT.

BY M. MOORE AND A. CO.

FOR GOVERNOR
HENRY JOHNSON,
OF CONCORDIA.

NEW-ORLEANS
FRIDAY MORNING, OCT. 8, 1841.

MR. WEBSTER'S LETTER.

It has rarely been our lot to witness a more signal rebuke than that committed by the editor of the *National*, when he requested Mr. Webster to furnish for publication a copy of the letter addressed to him on the 25th August, to the Massachusetts committee of the Whig National Convention, and in reply to their letter, that the President had vetoed the bank bill, not upon constitutional grounds, or from motives of expediency, but from a humble spirit and desire to conform to the wishes of the people, as expressed by their constituted agents. Mr. Webster, with his usual courtesy, declined to comply with the request of the editor of the *National*, but in a letter addressed to the committee, assigned his reasons for declining to furnish the letter for publication. Mr. Webster's letter is one of the most able, conclusive and unanswerable documents that has been written in the United States. It is a perfect refutation of the charges of inconsistency, which have been made against him, by the partizans of the President, and a triumphant vindication of his own character. It is a letter which will be read with interest by every man, who has the welfare of his country at heart, and will be preserved as a valuable contribution to the political history of the times. We have not room to-day to publish it, but shall do so to-morrow.

THE LATE FIRE.

It appears from the date of the letter, that it was written a short time previous to the passage of the second bank bill, and was designed to prove upon the gentleman to whom it was addressed, the propriety of the course which he was then pursuing, and the impolicy of the opposite course, to which it was supposed he was inclined. Mr. Webster could not, consistently with the delicacy of his situation, write a single word, calculated to influence the President's conduct, in the whole current of legislation which he occupied? Those who have not perused the letter will scarcely credit the fact, when we assure them that Mr. Berrien, fearlessly defied from the floor of the Senate, the constitutional power of the voluntary resignation of the cabinet, because for the purpose of compelling the President to act in accordance with the views of Congress, should go home and leave the leading object of the session unaccomplished. Little more, and certainly nothing less can be deduced from this singular document.

Nor does the language of the Secretary of State in the most flexible of senators, sustain in the slightest degree the construction made by him in the letter of the 25th Sept. that the cabinet resigned in a body, in voluntary resignation of the cabinet. Consider for a moment the circumstances of the case. Mr. Webster, any of the statements of the retiring members? No! Does he say that Mr. TYLER explained his views to Messrs. Ewing, Bates and Bell, as well as to himself—that he and Mr. EWING explained to the president their opposition to some of the measures—that the executive desired him to recommence the measures to be altered; and Congress was to refrain from passage of the cabinet at his special instance, and interest, or thought that the bank was the only object that could induce the cabinet to resign? Does he say that he and Mr. EWING explained to the president their opposition to some of the measures—that the executive desired him to recommence the measures to be altered; and Congress was to refrain from passage until a bill prepared by the President, framed by a portion of the cabinet at his special instance, and interest, or thought that the bank was the only object that could induce the cabinet to resign? Does he say that Mr. TYLER explained his views to Messrs. Ewing, Bates and Bell, as well as to himself—