From the Washington (Geo.) News.

Comments on Dr. T. Fort's Political Doctrine.

To every intelligent man, the positions taken by Dr. Fort, in his declarations of political doctrines respecting the powers of the Federal government, must have appeared extraordinary, and, at the same time, destitute of foundation; and by every republican those doctrines must be considered as having a direct tendency to the establishment of a consolidated empire and a monarchical form of government. All the reasoning and arguments of Dr. Fort are bottomed entirely on the practices of the monarchical governments of Europe, and not on the spirit and principles of the public institutions of the United States, which have no analogy, nor can be compared to those of other countries. Were the doctrines of Dr. Fort to find advocates among the people of this confederation of independent and sovereign states, the decline and fall of civil, political, and religious liberty, would inevitably be anticipated.

Dr. Fort assimilates the government of the United States to those of Europe, and argues upon this assimilation, that the treaty making power of the United States can, it expedient, *dispose* of part of their territories. As we said before, there is no analogy between the governments of Europe and that of the United States—We request our readers to keep the position in mind while perusing our comments. We acknowledge that it has been the practice of European governments to cede, transfer, or sell parts of their dominions; but we must bear it in mind that the form of those governments is monarchical and that though divided into provinces, principalities or counties, the European nations are consolidated empires. As we mentioned when, they can *dispose* of part of their dominions without destroying the consolidation of the remaining parts. These states, independent and sovereign, have associated themselves for mutual support, and for the promotion of their happiness and wealth. These states are not a consolidated empire; consequently the general government, founded by the consent of sovereign and independent States, cannot *dispose* of part of the territorial any of the states, without destroying the compact by which they united themselves for certain purposes. Dr. Fort refers to the practices of European Governments. Without variety we can say, that we know the history of nations as well as Dr Fort. We know very well, that Flanders, Belgium, the countries bordering the right bank of the Rhine, many provinces of France, as Normandy, Britanny, Franche-Comte, Artois, Alsace, &c have frequently changed masters. We know very well, that Louisiana was settled by the French, ceded to Spain, and retroceded to France and by this power sold to the United States. We know very well, that Florida belonged originally to Spain, was ceded to Great Britain, retroceded to Spain and sold by this Letter power to the United States. Because all the countries mentioned above have been *disposed* of by their masters, can it be contended that the United States have power to *dispose* of a part of the confederated States in like manner? If the United States have the power to *dispose* of part of the confederated states, they have the power, of course, to *dispose* of the whole. We will request Dr Fort to say, what would be the consequences resulting from a *disposition*, by the General Government, of the confederated states, to *His Majesty* King George the Fourth. If Dr. Fort had confined himself exclusively to the territores of the United States, namely, Arkansas, Florida, and Michigan, there might have been some excuse for the boldness of his propositions, but he includes the States forming the confederation. In Europe the governments are not controlled by any federative compact, except Switzerland. In this country the general government is controlled by the federal compact. Hence it follows, that in Europe, a province can be ceded to a foreign power, without destroying the integrity of the government or ceding a part of its dominions; while here, should the general government cede one of the States to a foreign power, the federal compact would virtually be dissolved, and the union would be consolidated as said and, because no nation can cede what does not belong to it. The governments of Europe possess the ownership of their dominions; they can, therefore, when it is expedient, cede a part of those dominions for the benefit and preservation of the remaining parts. This has been a constant practice in Europe, which originated in wars prompted by the ambition of princes. To show the fallacy of the positions taken by Dr. Fort, and all his arguments in support of them, we will ask the question, should Great Britain, France, Spain, or any other power of Europe, change or destroy their existing forms of government, would not these nations remain still consolidated empires? And we will ask this other question, should the United States abolish the existing federal government, would not the twenty-four states be independent, and sovereign, separately, as England, France, or Spain? Change the governments of the European nations, and those nations still remain consolidated empires. Dissolve the federal compact, and the states become independent of each other. History comes again to our support. When the government of England was changed from a monarchy to a commonwealth by Cromwell, England remained consolidated. When the government of France was changed from a monarchy to a republic, and from a republic to an empire, by Napoleon, France under all these changes remained consolidated. And when the Germanic confederation was dissolved by France, did Germany remain consolidated and one body? No! The Germanic body was formed of independent and sovereign States, for their mutual support, the Emperor of Germany being the head of that body. The moment the head was removed, all the compact dissolved, and the states forming this confederation, became independent of each other, and Napoleon formed again another confederation of which he was the head, and who it was dissolved upon by the removal of the protector, as Napoleon was styled.

We will take the subject under another point of view. By the Constitution of the United States, the general government has not the power to cede the smallest portion of the territories of the States. A treaty by which a cession should be made, would be unconstitutional, consequently null and void, and not binding on the states. Tenders that the states are sovereign and independent, except in such powers which they have delegated to the general government for their mutual good, it is provided in the federal constitution, that "no state shall enter into any agreement or compact with another state, or with a foreign power, or engage in war unless actually invaded." Will this provision in the constitution? As the admission of the sovereignty and independence of the states could not be questioned by the Framers of the constitution, we shall assume sovereign and independent states they could enter into compacts with each other, and with foreign powers, it was found expedient that the sovereign power of engaging in war, and forming treaties with foreign nations, should be delegated to the general government, and taken from the states—

Hence will ask Dr. Fort, if at a dissolution of the federal compact, the power would return to the states of engaging in war which compelled us to do, and entering into compacts with foreign nations? Would it not be a violation of the constitution, were the general government to cede to a foreign power a state of the confederation, which by this same instrument is acknowledged to be sovereign and independent? The Constitution further declares, that "the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." Dr Fort by bringing this clause to bear, thinks the power to lay particular stress on the word *dispose*. The framers of the Constitution did not intend that this word should be taken in a literal sense. Fact can be seen in the debates of the convention, that the power intended to be conveyed to the general government, was nothing more nor less, than the power to dispose of the territory of the United States into proper sovereignties, with a government for each, as would be found more convenient, and to admit into the union, on the footing of the other states, those territories. This we so clear, that it requires no further elucidation. The Constitution says also, that "the United States shall guarantee every State of this Union a republican form of government." Now we will ask again Dr. Fort, how can the United States guarantee to a state of the union a republican form of government, if the general government have the power to cede that state to either England, France or Spain? Can Dr. Fort reconcile his positions and his arguments with this provision of the federal constitution.

Dr. Fort exults at this argument, that as the United States purchased Louisiana and Florida, they can now if found expedient, sell either to a foreign power. We have asserted and proved, that the general government had not the power to cede a territory of the United States, and much less to cede a state of the Union, as is Louisiana. The Constitution declares, "that new states may be admitted into the Union." When Louisiana was admitted into the Union, she acquired the same rights, the same sovereignty, and the same independence of the other states. A contract was formed between her and the other states, which no power on earth can cancel. Louisiana was purchased, but to secure ostensibly the blessings of liberty to her, but because it was the interest of all the other states that this outlet of the West should belong to the union.—The United States purchased Louisiana admitted her into the Union on an equal footing with them, and have insured to her the blessings of a free government. Now is it said, because we purchased Louisiana we have the power to sell that state to a foreign power! We will ask Dr Fort if after giving freedom to a slave, that freedom can be recalled, and the free man made a slave again? What applies to individuals, is applicable to nations, for the laws of nations are nothing more nor less, than the laws of nature. Nations have the same powers and the same rights as Massachusetts and Virginia; and whatever affects these two states must affect the former. The position of Dr Fort is fallacious, and his arguments in favor of them insubstantial.

Dr Fort again exults at an argument he produces, which is founded on the claim of England to a certain portion of Maine. Dr Fort did not state the case fairly. The difference between the United States and Great Britain in regard to this subject, is entirely foreign to the power claimed by the Doctor for the general government to cede any portion of the United States. Dr. Fort knows, or ought to know, the origin of the controversy. If he does not, we can inform him, that it originated in the treaty of peace between Great Britain and the United States of 1783, the northern boundaries of the United States have never been well ascertained. The United States claim several islands in the Bay of Passamaquoddy, and the Island of Grand Menan in the Bay of Fundy, which Great Britain claims also as being within the limits of Nova Scotia. By the treaty of Ghent commissioners were to be appointed by both Governments to decide on the respective claims of the two countries mentioned in the treaty of peace of 1783. By the same treaty, of Ghent, commissioners were to be appointed to ascertain and determine the boundary of the United States, from the source of the river St. Croix, to the river Cataraquay, in conformity to the treaty of 1783. Commissioners have been appointed by both governments agreeably to the treaty of Ghent, and nothing desirable has yet been done. It will be seen by the above statement, that the difference between Great Britain and the United States cannot have the most distant connexion with the subject of Dr. Fort's essay. This difference grew out of the treaty of 1783 and if by establishing a true boundary between the United States and the possessions of Great Britain in America, Maine should loose some part of her territory, assured y there will be nothing but justice that she should be deprived of it, and given to the rightful owner. If the United States succeeded to the claims in the Bays of Fundy and Passamaquoddy, assuredly Great Britain will have to allow and acknowledge the claim of the United States to be just.

The Editor of the Charleston City Gazette has thought proper to assign the reasons why the friends of Mr. Crawford should not praise Mr. Adams or Gen. Jackson. On this the power to dispose of the territory of the United States into a number of sovereignties, with a government for each, as would be found more convenient, and to admit into the union, on the footing of the other states, those territories. This we so clear, that it requires no further elucidation. The Constitution says also, that "the United States shall guarantee every State of this Union a republican form of government." Now we will ask again Dr. Fort, how can the United States guarantee to a state of the union a republican form of government, if the general government have the power to cede that state to either England, France or Spain? Can Dr. Fort reconcile his positions and his arguments with this provision of the federal constitution.

Dr. Fort exults at this argument, that as the United States purchased Louisiana and Florida, they can now if found expedient, sell either to a foreign power. We have asserted and proved, that the general government had not the power to cede a territory of the United States, and much less to cede a state of the Union, as is Louisiana. The Constitution declares, "that new states may be admitted into the Union." When Louisiana was admitted into the Union, she acquired the same rights, the same sovereignty, and the same independence of the other states. A contract was formed between her and the other states, which no power on earth can cancel. Louisiana was purchased, but to secure ostensibly the blessings of liberty to her, but because it was the interest of all the other states that this outlet of the West should belong to the union.—The United States purchased Louisiana admitted her into the Union on an equal footing with them, and have insured to her the blessings of a free government. Now is it said, because we purchased Louisiana we have the power to sell that state to a foreign power! We will ask Dr Fort if after giving freedom to a slave, that freedom can be recalled, and the free man made a slave again? What applies to individuals, is applicable to nations, for the laws of nations are nothing more nor less, than the laws of nature. Nations have the same powers and the same rights as Massachusetts and Virginia; and whatever affects these two states must affect the former. The position of Dr Fort is fallacious, and his arguments in favor of them insubstantial.

Dr Fort again exults at an argument he produces, which is founded on the claim of England to a certain portion of Maine. Dr Fort did not state the case fairly. The difference between the United States and Great Britain in regard to this subject, is entirely foreign to the power claimed by the Doctor for the general government to cede any portion of the United States. Dr. Fort knows, or ought to know, the origin of the controversy. If he does not, we can inform him, that it originated in the treaty of peace between Great Britain and the United States of 1783, the northern boundaries of the United States have never been well ascertained. The United States claim several islands in the Bay of Passamaquoddy, and the Island of Grand Menan in the Bay of Fundy, which Great Britain claims also as being within the limits of Nova Scotia. By the treaty of Ghent commissioners were to be appointed by both Governments to decide on the respective claims of the two countries mentioned in the treaty of peace of 1783. By the same treaty, of Ghent, commissioners were to be appointed to ascertain and determine the boundary of the United States, from the source of the river St. Croix, to the river Cataraquay, in conformity to the treaty of 1783. Commissioners have been appointed by both governments agreeably to the treaty of Ghent, and nothing desirable has yet been done. It will be seen by the above statement, that the difference between Great Britain and the United States cannot have the most distant connexion with the subject of Dr. Fort's essay. This difference grew out of the treaty of 1783 and if by establishing a true boundary between the United States and the possessions of Great Britain in America, Maine should loose some part of her territory, assured y there will be nothing but justice that she should be deprived of it, and given to the rightful owner. If the United States succeeded to the claims in the Bays of Fundy and Passamaquoddy, assuredly Great Britain will have to allow and acknowledge the claim of the United States to be just.

The Editor of the Charleston City Gazette has thought proper to assign the reasons why the friends of Mr. Crawford should not praise Mr. Adams or Gen. Jackson. On this the power to dispose of the territory of the United States into a number of sovereignties, with a government for each, as would be found more convenient, and to admit into the union, on the footing of the other states, those territories. This we so clear, that it requires no further elucidation. The Constitution says also, that "the United States shall guarantee every State of this Union a republican form of government." Now we will ask again Dr. Fort, how can the United States guarantee to a state of the union a republican form of government, if the general government have the power to cede that state to either England, France or Spain? Can Dr. Fort reconcile his positions and his arguments with this provision of the federal constitution.

Dr. Fort exults at this argument, that as the United States purchased Louisiana and Florida, they can now if found expedient, sell either to a foreign power. We have asserted and proved, that the general government had not the power to cede a territory of the United States, and much less to cede a state of the Union, as is Louisiana. The Constitution declares, "that new states may be admitted into the Union." When Louisiana was admitted into the Union, she acquired the same rights, the same sovereignty, and the same independence of the other states. A contract was formed between her and the other states, which no power on earth can cancel. Louisiana was purchased, but to secure ostensibly the blessings of liberty to her, but because it was the interest of all the other states that this outlet of the West should belong to the union.—The United States purchased Louisiana admitted her into the Union on an equal footing with them, and have insured to her the blessings of a free government. Now is it said, because we purchased Louisiana we have the power to sell that state to a foreign power! We will ask Dr Fort if after giving freedom to a slave, that freedom can be recalled, and the free man made a slave again? What applies to individuals, is applicable to nations, for the laws of nations are nothing more nor less, than the laws of nature. Nations have the same powers and the same rights as Massachusetts and Virginia; and whatever affects these two states must affect the former. The position of Dr Fort is fallacious, and his arguments in favor of them insubstantial.

Dr Fort again exults at an argument he produces, which is founded on the claim of England to a certain portion of Maine. Dr Fort did not state the case fairly. The difference between the United States and Great Britain in regard to this subject, is entirely foreign to the power claimed by the Doctor for the general government to cede any portion of the United States. Dr. Fort knows, or ought to know, the origin of the controversy. If he does not, we can inform him, that it originated in the treaty of peace between Great Britain and the United States of 1783, the northern boundaries of the United States have never been well ascertained. The United States claim several islands in the Bay of Passamaquoddy, and the Island of Grand Menan in the Bay of Fundy, which Great Britain claims also as being within the limits of Nova Scotia. By the treaty of Ghent commissioners were to be appointed by both Governments to decide on the respective claims of the two countries mentioned in the treaty of peace of 1783. By the same treaty, of Ghent, commissioners were to be appointed to ascertain and determine the boundary of the United States, from the source of the river St. Croix, to the river Cataraquay, in conformity to the treaty of 1783. Commissioners have been appointed by both governments agreeably to the treaty of Ghent, and nothing desirable has yet been done. It will be seen by the above statement, that the difference between Great Britain and the United States cannot have the most distant connexion with the subject of Dr. Fort's essay. This difference grew out of the treaty of 1783 and if by establishing a true boundary between the United States and the possessions of Great Britain in America, Maine should loose some part of her territory, assured y there will be nothing but justice that she should be deprived of it, and given to the rightful owner. If the United States succeeded to the claims in the Bays of Fundy and Passamaquoddy, assuredly Great Britain will have to allow and acknowledge the claim of the United States to be just.

From the Athens Central.

Mr. Robertson—It is not an uncommon thing for weak minds driven from argument to fly to abuse, or for wicked ones, when, without truth, to resort to deceit. I am therefore, not at all surprised at the late attempts to pervert my meaning in the remarks accompanying the *Tools* lately handed you for publication. If I had the inclination to forego the respect I owe to myself, or to forget what was due to politeness, I own I have not yet so frequented the annals of vulgarity, as to be able to resort the Billingsgate language employed in the chronicles of the 5th column, and consequently unable to hand him a piece as supplied the people with *pieces*, I believe, and still believe, that the public good and intelligence enough to draw their own useful inferences; for instance, when I show them, by records, no one dare deny that out of sixty-five counties, forty-one are unable to pay their representation, every man must see, who is not gangrened with prejudice, that there is *in this* something wrong in the system. When I show these counties, for example, Dooly, Irwin, and Rabun, with an aggregate representative population of only 2228 souls, and a number of taxable property, sufficient to pay the Legislature two members more than the county of Columbia, which has a population of only 8455 souls pays a tax of 1315 dollars, and therefore, is liable, to have its money voted away as it may please the majority of the Legislature, and, if there be any interest of the first, I think there is no one who can say that *this matter* is wrong. If the people do not wish to profit by this information, and can in their hearts, content themselves with the shameful extravagance of the government, and the *unequal* taxation *amongst* as well as *inequality* of representation. If they are satisfied to suffer their hard-earnings to be voted into the pockets of men who do not know how it has come into the public treasury, because they pay little or nothing towards it, why let it so; I can live under any government that the rest of my fellow citizens can, but I shall ever maintain that such a system is *wrong*, and that it will be so, as long as it is, I shall take a peculiar pleasure in doing so, *at all times*, even though I stand alone. A decent respect for the community, which I believe to every man is bound to entertain, induces me to notice some wilful perversions of my meaning, in reference to the "Table" above mentioned, otherwise the spiritless and ingenuinously publication before alluded to, would have passed off with that contempt it deserved, and which its author, if he has a proper knowledge of himself, no doubt expected. The first objection is, that I have stated, "it is universal principle upon which representative republics are founded, and especially our own, at the formation of our constitution, that representation should be regulated by taxation and population." This I have asserted, and still avow, but I have never said that taxation *alone*, as is most falsely represented in the foregoing publication, is the proper measure of representation. Why has the word *population*, also mentioned in my remark, been so inaccurately omitted? Truth, I hope, will ever be as odious a principle as Mr. *Columbian*, or any one else, but even he may recollect, and if he does not, I hope the people will, who are not blind, or designing, or such strangers to common honesty, that the *Revolutionary war itself* grew out of this very principle; Great Britain maintaining that she had a right to tax us in all cases whatever, and we affirming that *Representation and Taxation* can never be seperated—our fathers fought for the principle and obtained it. No man can be taxed without his consent. Will any one deny this truth? Was it not inserted by every state in the Union, and was it not, after a seven years war, yielded by Great Britain? Britain has cannot be taxed without his consent, he must give it either by himself or by his *Representatives*. Every one sees, if he has no Representative, and no voice of his own, it would be a tyranny to take his property from him. Now, what is the difference between having no Representative, and having one whose powers are crippled, and made of no more use than a mere cypher? A superior power is to others, who have no right to it, bounted in either justice or equity? To give a man a representative to which he is fairly entitled, and then give that to another man, to which he is not entitled, every one must perceive that this places the first completely in the power of the last, and in plain common sense is a representation a nullity. Take away the Representative, which he is entitled to four representatives, by reason of her eight thousand souls, which have paid into the public treasury fifteen hundred dollars the other three counties have six representatives, from two thousand souls, and one hundred dollars taxes. Can any one believe that the taxes of Columbia, together, (as I say before) should, should be at the control of the other three, to be voted away upon any object they please, to go into their own pockets to improve their own counties, or expended upon whatever else they choose? It is no argument to say they would not do it, any one perceives they have the power, and every bad knows power is never declined. But to show what our "revolutionary fathers" thought on this same subject when they were repelling the attempt of Great Britain to tax them without representation, the Colony of Massachusetts, the very people of the revolution declared "that what a man hath honestly acquired is absolutely his own, which his may freely give, but cannot be taken from him without his consent." In order to do this, they must be represented, but frankly owned that their local circumstances, "seperated by an ocean of a distinct legislature prevented the "possibility of being *equally represented* in Parliament, and consequently *not at all*," establishing clearly the principle of their struggle was for a fair *representation*. And this idea was confirmed by the strong declaration expressed by the same Colony, viz: "Considering the other inconvenience of their being *fully and equally* represented in Parliament, and the great expense that must unavoidably attend even a *partial* representation there, the house think, that a taxation of their constituents, even without their consent, grievous as it is, would be preferable to any representation that could be admitted for them there." *See Washington's life, vol. 2d, in the note, page 3, 4, and 5.* "Let that *volume on the origin of the revolution*." In view of these revolutionary doctrines, and relying on their justness, I made use of the remarks so unkindly perverted, which if it is critically examined, it will be found I was not applying the principle to Georgia than I was to our sister "Republics" of the Union. I said, "it is a universal principle upon which representative *Republics* are founded, and especially our own (meaning Republics) at the formation of our Constitution, that representation should be regulated by taxation and population." None but those, who are actuated by a low and dirty purpose, can misconstrued this salutary principle. No one, I believe, and even the little crafty *Columbian*, that I intended to say that representation should *alone* be *founded* upon taxation, or that I wished "men's rights to be measured by their wealth," or desired to oppress the "poor man" or to make any reflections upon "poor counties" there is not a solitary expression in any of the publications of that, or any of my writings. And I think, it will be no secret to the good people of Columbia, believing, as I do, they have *fully* as much abusement as some of their representatives, that this is all right down cutting, hypocritical, electioneering preaching, well understood by them, and worth just as much as it will bring. It is thought by a little smoothed face, dropt chin gentry, that the people of Columbia could be so far gulled, as to have their prejudices aroused against a worthy man, by his throwing out some facts and reflections for their consideration, and that, nothing he had said, though it might be supported by a record, and mined not only for them, but every man's good, would have any effect upon their judgment and sound discretion—and thus, by throwing a little sand in their eyes, keep them from scrutinizing the conduct of some of their very *pious* representatives, in matters vitally affecting, not their's only, but the best interests of the state about which, I claim to possess, and will assert an opinion, even though I have not been in the Legislature, I have sufficient comprehension to make it my duty to speak a principle "so oppressive and aristocratical" But strange as it may appear, nor however because it has "escaped the observation" of the *Columbian*, there is something on this subject "embodied even in *our Constitution*." The first section of the 4th art. declares that electors of the General Assembly, to be qualified to vote, shall have paid all taxes for the year of them. Settling, beyond all question, this doctrine, that as no man can be *taxed* without the consent of his representative, so man shall have a representative who *do* not pay a *tax* and every one must perceive how unjust and unequal it would be to place the taxes of a people, often wrung from them by no option but suffering, in the power of those who pay no taxes, and consequently, can neither care nor feel for their burthens. This is *all* that was meant by my remark, and I should have no doubt that it was so understood by even the Columbian, if I could have as much faith in his apprehension, as I have in his duplicity.

There is but one other matter worthy of notice, in this refined gentleman's strictures, and it relates to the state of our finances—The best evidence on this subject are the records of the Comptroller, and that there is no mistake between us, I have been at the pains to procure such a collection of facts as will stagger even his hardihood, and to controvert which will try the reins of much better politicians than a great deal more honesty than he possesses

A Statement of the Funds of the State, taken from the Public Documents.

All the Fractions are sold, and the State owns, at the time, only the reservations at Fort Hawkins, about 19 600 acres

The following Funds were due to the State in 1824, to wit:

Bonds and Notes for Fractions sold in August 1824,	21763 54	
Do Rent due under the act of May, 1821,	109 62	
Do do do do Dec 1821,	593 72 1-2	
Do sale of Gas and square lots 1811,	102 25	
Do sale of unlocated lands,	964 19	
Do Rent for Tavern at Fort Hawkins,	1493 31 1-4	
Do in the hands of C. J. McDonald, Sol. Gen.	3763 37 1-2	
Do for received fees,	1357 50	
Do Rent of property at Fort Hawkins,	6374 50	
Do Indian Goods,	731 61	
Do for French claims in Baldwin and Wilkinson,	2151 82	
Do Loss in the town of Macon,	6135 02	
Do Rent of Bank Building Louisville,	269 86	
Due by defaulting Tax Collectors, Sheriffs, &c.	47364 31	
		$102980 02 1-4

[*See the above, see Journal of 1824, page 245.*]

There is little doubt that a large part of these debts is totally lost to the State, from removals, insolvencies, &c.

Due on Bedford Franklin's receipt for fraction bonds, about	35210 59	
Do Ned do do do do	4653 37	
Do Bonds for reversed confiscated property,	21043 16	
		61006 02

See Journals, 1824, page 116—it is believed the whole, or nearly the whole, of these items, are totally lost to the State.

Due about the first of — next, on University bonds, about	50000 00	
Do do do do 1st instalment, due in December next, for Fractions sold in 1825.	50000 00	
		129999 04 1-4

It is believed that a large portion of these items is paid into the Treasury. By referring to the Journals of Senate of this session, page 156 and 7, will appear, that on the 1st of Dec. last, there was in the Treasury, $34 Dart and 24 Darien, on year, $20,735 66, and the Darien paper continued to flow into the Treasury, after that period, till the 1st day of January, 1826, no bond, at a 1,00 or $90,000 ought to be added.

5000 Shares in State Bank,	500000 00	
2000 do Darien do	200000 00	
100 do Macon do	10000 00	
1000 do Planter's do	100000 00	
	1200000 00	
Due Darien Bank for Stock,	175000	
Due Planter's do do	20000	
	195000 00	
		1,005,000 00

Every dollar of *dividends* of the Bank Stock is pledged to internal improvement endowment of county academies and free schools, from this time forward, and, as it will prove, this year, only $33,000, the Darien and Planter's Stock make no dividends in 1826

On the 24 Dec last, there was in the Treasury Darien Bills,	55057	
In Specie and Current Bills,	55533 73	
		835 193 73
		2,134,129 77

This is the aggregate amount of Cash, Bank Stock, and debts due the State,

Nearly $100,000 of the Current Bills were drawn from the Treasury at the close of the last session, and the appropriations are drawn out of the Treasury as fast as they are made, and not one cent of Specie or Current Bills will remain in the Treasury.

There was supposed to be $50,000 in Darien money (see laws of last sess. page 36) without interest in the Governor that act by him, that the Darien Bills are as par—he if then to pay 5 per cent. *This is not a fact.*

Receipts and Expenditures of 1822—See Journals, pages 318 and 319

Received from the General Tax of 1819,	1945 62	
* Do do 1820,	11 81	
* Do do 1821,	577 84	
* Do do 1822,	4500 02	
* Do do 1823,	90660 32	
* Do do 1824,	11799 77	—109142 19
* Do Fractions sold under the act of 1822,	42435 54	
* Do do do 1820,	12248 01	
		54683 95
* Do do Rent of Fractions,	3684 02	
* Do Fees for land grants drawn in 1820,	11268	
Do do do do in 1821,	20640	
		31248 00
* Do Sales of Fractions sold the market of 1823,	1400 00	
* Do do agent fees, 5 a 10 and 100,	1019 03	
* Do Fees of Governor Troup's grants,	2500 00	
* Do From Fractions sold under the act of 1822,	48 00	
* Do Sale of Milledgeville Lots	1019 00	
* Do Tax on Pedlers,	11114 50	
* Do Proceeds received from	178 60	
Do Vendue Tax,	1977 54	
* Do Sale of public property at Fort Hawkins,	412 30	
* Do Fees paid for sales in Baldwin and Wilkinson,	36 00	
* Do Grants to lands improperly drawn	15 00	
* Do Tax on Pedlers,	3620 05	
* Do Fees for sales in Jones, Hancock in Macon,	6 00	
* Do do Jackson and Baldwin by drawn,	253 53	
* Do Tax on Pedlers,	3 00	
* Do Salary Participants Wilkinson, Baldwin and Wayne	79 98	
* Do Rent of Bridge on Oconee river,	133 00	
* Do Fees on Grants for Fractions in Early Sheriffs,	20 00	
* Do Fees on Grants for Baldwin and Wilkinson,	12 13	
* Do Interest on University bonds,	6691 92	
* Do Suspense account,	16 50	
* Do Rent of Bank Stock,	63000 00	
* Do Sale of Stock,	2964 33	
* Do Dividends on Bank Stock,	52500 00	—167154 13
		365332 73

All the items marked thus (*) were incidental and was never considered apart of the permanent revenue of the State, which would have left the Treasury about $200,000 received in the Treasury, and what amounts to

The annual amount received in the Treasury from a certain permanent revenue, | 127365 69

To this last sum may be added the balance of Taxes of 1824 (about) | 44768 00

The annual amount of what was and ought to have been received in 1824 from the permanent and annual revenue of 1823, | 172133 69

Expenditures of 1825.

Expenses of Extra Session in May and June, 1823,	20681 21	
Warrants drawn by Executive on the Treasury,	123436 31	
President and Speaker's warrants for the Fall Session,	40126 60	
Pay of the officers of the Legislature, about	3000 00	
		193045 22
The State expended in 1825 more than its ordinary revenue		21761 53

Indications of the probable Receipts and Expenditures of 1826.

General Tax of 1825,	90527 77	
Forty-one Grants in the Lotteries of 1820 and 1821, about	20000 00	
Interest on University bonds,	6691 92	
Do Bank Stock,	31114 56	
Do Vendues, summer 1825,	1977 44	
Do Pedlers do do	3600 00	
Dividends on State Bank Stock,	52500 00	
Do August Do	26250 00	
Small incidental receipts, about	3000 00	
		242661 69
The ordinary & contingent expenses of government for 1826,	123436 31	
Expenses of the usual Legislature,	45000 00	
Interest of Public Works and mining Alabama line, about	5000 00	
110 Surveyors, to receive each $300 as on oath,	33000 00	
		214436 31
		97775 12

If this estimate be correct, and it is believed to be nearly so, the State, in 1826, will spend over and above her ordinary and permanent revenue, about

In 1825, the Darien Bank paid $19,500 as a dividend—In 1826, it pays not one cent—The expenses of the government are annually increasing, every new county adds to the embarrassment of the State. Their members are to be paid—they are entitled to $815 for their Academies and their proportion of the Poor School fund. From these last funds a part of the 41 counties, that do not pay their representation, has already received $26,710 21, and when they all draw their proportion according to law, they will have received from the Treasury upwards of $40,000, and yet there are some who say we must be taxed to pay their Petit Juries.

The expenditures are increasing, our revenue decreasing—In five years, without expending one dollar on internal improvements, unless we have a few more fractions to help us out, there will not be a dollar in the Treasury.

Let the people take these facts, examine them attentively and reflect for themselves—Suffer no designing office hunters to blind their eyes by deceitful representations—Let not their jealousies be aroused by the miserable suggestion that this information comes from a source, out of the limits of their respective counties, and therefore ought to be disregarded. Let them rather remember that we are all Georgians and our interests are not different because we happen to live in different counties. It is the business of every man to expose a fool, and it becomes a duty to detect a knave, and if in either respect I have, as I think it probable, been a co-labourer in *this very thing*, in the county of Columbia, I deserve thanks rather than censure.

ATTICUS.

From the Macon Messenger.

We have received a request from a neighboring county, to publish the following resolution proposition to recommend to the consideration of the committee on the State of the Republic, the expediency of addressing a memorial to the President, setting forth the conduct and requesting the removal of John Crowell, &c. and also the vote on adopting the report of the committee on the subject in the Senate, and the House of Representatives. As his reason for making this request our correspondent says, "many of the gentlemen who composed the last legislature are again before the people, and shall have a representative who *do* not pay a *tax* and every one must perceive how unjust and unequal it would be to place the taxes of a people, often wrung from them by no option but suffering, in the power of those who pay no taxes, and consequently, can neither care nor feel for their burthens. This is *all* that was meant by my remark, and I should have no doubt that it was so understood by even the Columbian, if I could have as much faith in his apprehension, as I have in his duplicity.

There is but one other matter worthy of notice, in this refined gentleman's strictures, and it relates to the state of our finances—The best evidence on this subject are the records of the Comptroller, and that there is no mistake between us, I have been at the pains to procure such a collection of facts as will stagger even his hardihood, and to controvert which will try the reins of much better politicians than a great deal more honesty than he possesses

In Senate—Tuesday, 22d Nov. 1825.

Mr. Jones presented the following resolution:

Resolved, That the joint committee on the state of the republic be instructed to enquire into the expediency of addressing a memorial to the President of the United States, setting forth the conduct of Col John Crowell, the present Agent for the Creek Nation of Indians, and request his removal from office as a measure highly conducive to the interest of the said Creek Nation of Indians, and the citizens of this state, and that the said memorial and report be referred to the legislature.

Which was read.

And on the question to agree to said resolution, it was decided in the affirmative.

The yeas and nays being required are—yeas 33, nays 5

Those who voted in the affirmative are,

Avian	Harris	
Aston	Hilliard	
Anderson	Johnson of De Kalb	
Atkinson	Johnson of Tattnall	
Baker of Liberty	Jones	
Baker of Warren	Lawson,	
Beall	Lindell	
Bird	Mitchell	
Blackshear	Miller	
Brantham	Phillips	
Brown of Camden	Powers	
Brown of Decatur	Sheet	
Brown of Hancock	Sellers	
Burney	Spann	
Burton	Stocks	
Cleveland	Stokes	
Coffee	Strawn	
Crawford	Swain	
Crittenden	Swilly	
Daniel	Trouitte	
Dye	Walker	
Frazer	Welborn of Monroe	
Gibson	Wickinson	
Griffin	Wooten	
Groves	Worthy	
Hardeman	Young	
Harmon		

Those who voted in the negative are

Broadnax	Mitchell
Bryan	Wilson
Cuyler	Welborn of Houston
Matthews	

[In concluding their report on the instructions above quoted, the committee recommend the following resolution, which is adopted:]

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Georgia in General Assembly met, That the Legislature ought to be placed in the late treaty concluded between the United States for the use of Georgia, and the Creek Nation of Indians at Indian Springs—That the title of the territory obtained by said treaty within the limits of Georgia, is considered as an absolute vested interest, and that nothing short of fully whole territory thus acquired, will be satisfactory to the Georgia of entry immediately, upon the expiration of the time limited in the treaty, be insisted on and accordingly carried into effect. As respects the reference to your committee, directing them to enquire into the expediency of requesting the removal of the Agent for Indian Affairs, your committee considering the time very short of the subject at the extra session of the Legislature of the present year, by the report of your committee of the State of the Republic, deem it unnecessary to say more on the subject, than to express their concurrence in the sentiments and wishes therein contained, and to repeat their opinion, as the representative of the people of this state, that the interest of the state of Georgia, and the policy of the general government require that Col. John Crowell, the present Agent of Indian Affairs, should be removed from office; and they do not doubt the rectitude of the government of the United States, his immediate removal.

The correspondence conducted by the Executive and the Agent of the Creek nation, government, T. P. Andrews and General Gaines, and with the general government itself, is also made matter of reference to your committee, and remains, to be noticed.

Your committee would remark of the whole of this correspondence, that it contains much matter, which is not the subject of specific report—Such portions may well be left between the parties themselves, and to public observation. There are certain other portions, however, disclosing facts which have already had their operation, and of evil tendency to the rights of Georgia. Of this nature, were the proceedings at Broken Arrow, and Fort Mitchell, were, for the first time, we hear of the Indian complaining of the invalidity of the Treaty in the use of the borrowed words, that it was "procured alike with intrigue and treachery" A charge so flagrantly indefence thus acquired when no one was present to defend the validity of the Treaty, and when every art which cunning could design, or wickedness could execute, put in exercise to defend the Agent by attacking the Treaty, and the means of its obtainment, seems to have formed the ground of the reference to Congress by the Agent. Your committee therefore selecting so much of said correspondence as furnishes the facts of the reference of the Treaty to Congress, and the grounds on which such reference was made, consider it within the scope of their duty to report, that such proceedings form the cause of Just Protest on the part of the State of Georgia. It is impossible from the organization of the Creek nation and the state of excitement which prevailed at the time, that the truth could have been arrived at by any *ex parte* proceeding but such as that plain and undisguised character, as to bring into question the rights of Georgia, as secured by the Treaty. Against the proceeding then by view the Agent, it is proper to have been ascertained, and against the proceeding founded thereon, of referring the Treaty for revocation, your committee consider it proper that Georgia should enter her most solemn *protest*. If there is to be a revision, it is due to the interest and rights of the state, that she should be represented in the ulterior proceedings as well preparatory as final.

The question being put on agreeing to the report of the committee on the state of the Republic,

And decided in the affirmative

The yeas and nays being required are—yeas 38, nays, 13

Those who voted in the affirmative are,

Aston	Hardeman	
Anderson	Harmon	
Atkinson	Hilliard	
Baker of Liberty	Johnson of Tattnall	
Baker of Warren	Jones	
Beall	Miller	
Bird	Phillips	
Blackshear	Powers	
Brantham	Scarlett	
Brown of Camden	Sellers	
Brown of Decatur	Spann	
Brown of Hancock	Stokes	
Cleveland	Strawn	
Crawford	Swain	
Daniel	Swilly	
Gibson	Walker	
Griffin	Wooten	
Groves	Worth