

The next step towards the downfall of this Republic under the false garb of democracy, we leave you to consider. In the mean time, you are entreated to pass before you strike this last fatal blow at the liberties of your country.

"17 That the President of the United States be authorized to call forth and assemble such numbers of the active force of the militia, at such places within their respective districts, and at such times, not exceeding twice, nor more days in the same year, as he may deem necessary; and during such period, including the time when going to and returning from the place of rendezvous, they shall be deemed in the service of the United States, and be subject to such regulations as the President may think proper to adopt for their instruction, discipline, and improvement in military knowledge.

We, the undersigned, hereby certify that the above extracts are true copies from the reports of the Secretary of War, and from the message of the President of the United States.

APRIL 18, 1840.  
R. GARLAND, of Louisiana,  
JOHN BELL, of Tennessee,  
JOHN M. BOTTS, of Virginia,  
THOS. CORWIN, of Ohio,  
M. H. GRINNELL, of New York,  
J. C. CLARK, of New York,  
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Mass.  
TRUMAN SMITH, of Connecticut,  
Executive Committee.

### From the Raleigh Star. TO THE PEOPLE OF N. CAROLINA.

Fellow Citizens: The Resolutions, passed by the General Assembly at its late session, conveying instructions to our Senators on various questions which are agitating the country, embrace principles of a correct understanding of which depend the prosperity and freedom of your country. I cannot flatter myself with the belief that any new light can be added to the already blaze of argument which has been elicited by the discussion of these subjects from some of the first intellects of the nation. But however fatiguing it may be, it is never unprofitable to recur to fundamental principles. Indeed it is enjoined by the very nature of our institutions; and let none calculate on evading the responsibility which a disregard of this injunction places under, both to their ancestors and to posterity. The transactions of the last ten years should be kept constantly before your minds. You should be daily, yes, hourly reminded of the astounding doctrines which have been advanced by those in power; the tendency they have to increase Executive influence and patronage; to steal from the States their legitimate powers; and to excite amongst the people a deep prejudice against all the means and avenues to wealth, virtue and intelligence, which will ultimately root up the very foundations of society, and introduce that spirit of discord which deluged the fairest portions of France with the blood of her own citizens. I would solicit your candid attention whilst I endeavor to place the principles of these Resolutions in their true light.

The first of the series alleges that "the expunging resolution was a palpable violation of the plain letter of the Constitution, and an act of party servility calculated to degrade the character of the Senate." It may be proper for the correct understanding of this dispute between the two political parties, to recur to some of the acts of the past administration. It will be recollected that in 1833 Gen. Jackson, in his zeal to demolish at all hazards, the Bank of the United States, required Mr. Duane, then Secretary of State to remove therefrom the deposits, which, by act of Congress, had been placed in the Bank; which act gave the Secretary, and him alone, the power to remove them.

Mr. Duane refused to obey the requisitions of the President, who, finding that his Secretary was composed of too substantial stuff to become his mere instrument, stripped him of his robes of office, and placed them on another, who soon found that the highest virtue lay in a willing compliance with the will and wishes of his master.—Mr. Taney, on the 1st of October, 1833, removed the Deposits—under whose direction, and for whose gratification, can be easily discovered from the paper read by the President to his cabinet on the 18th of September previous. This document declares expressly "that this measure is the President's, that he assumed the responsibility—and that the first day of October is named by him as a proper time for its execution." Under a belief that the President had transcended his legal and constitutional powers, the Senate, after a long discussion, passed on the 28th of May, 1834, a resolution declaratory of that belief. It is useless to enter into the arguments which were urged in defence of the charges in the Resolution. Suffice it to say, that it was the object of the framers of the constitution to keep the purse and the sword separate and distinct.—They looked with great jealousy on their Union, being well convinced that it had proved, in all countries, the greatest and most inveterate enemy of Freedom. They knew that to grant to the President, who was, by the fundamental law, made the commander in chief of the army, the control of the revenue even in the most indirect way, would be giving him the power to attack, and perhaps successfully, the liberties of the people. Under the principles avowed by the President in his cabinet paper and under the process then used to abstract the Deposits from the Bank the public money was under the direct control of the Executive; and the interposition of the Secretary, who could be removed at his pleasure or refused to deliver to him the public moneys, or to dispose of the contents thereof as he might direct, is a mere device to gull the people—to keep the appearance—the mere shadow of a Republic, when the substance had been given up to the hands of the master, who had the means, though he may have had no inducement to become a tyrant. The law gave the Secretary, and the Secretary alone, the right to remove the Deposits. But who did it? The Secretary? The President told you not, but that he assumed the responsibility, and that on his shoulders must fall the consequences.

Here, then, is the exercise of control over an officer, made independent by the law, and by the constitution from the nature of the duties he is to perform—a control which makes the officer a mere tool, destitute of that freedom of action which is necessary to a faithful discharge of his official duties. Suppose the Secretary had been impeached: could he have pleaded the order of the President in bar thereof? If the President have a constitutional or legal control over him, he could have done it; and so, why it is ridiculous to talk about the power of impeachment, and there is no protection for the public revenue but the arbitrary will of the Executive.

But the power of the Senate to pass the Resolution of the 28th of May, 1834, was denied even admitting he had transcended his constitutional bounds in regard to the revenue. This question deserves some examination; for on it are based the reasons for passing the resolution which blotted, blotted, and disfigured the records of the Senate.

If I understand the principles of our Government correctly, the Senate, in respect to its powers, is threefold.—It may hear and determine impeachments, and so far it is judicial in its functions. It is made the adviser of the President in the appointment of officers, and is so far Executive; and it possesses at the same time, all the ordinary powers of legislative bodies. The Senate did nothing more in passing the Resolution of the 28th of May than the Legislature of this State and the States done from the first foundation of the Government. Has the right of the Legislature to express an opinion as to the conduct of one of the officers of the Government ever been denied? If we desire precedents for this right, they can be found in the history of all legislative bodies—in that of the British Parliament, of the State Legislatures, and of the Senate itself. The Panama Mission affords a case strikingly in point. Governor Branch introduced a Resolution in the Senate of the United States, denying the President certain powers which he had claimed and exercised, and declaring "that a silent acquiescence in such doctrines, on the part of the Senate, should be drawn into precedent, therefore resolves that the President possess no such power or right so claimed by him." No one thought of denying to the Senate a right to pass such a resolution. It was conceded by all. In what material respect, then, does this resolution differ from that of the 28th of May, 1834? By it certain powers are denied to the President, which he had exercised, thereby implying that he had transcended those which had been granted him. That of the 28th of May had nothing more. It impeached no motive and sought not to criminate the intention of the Executive.

But I place the right of the Senate to pass such a resolution on higher grounds—far above, and independent of all precedent. It is a right inherent in, and appertaining to every legislative body—a right of self defence, which is necessary for its very existence. The legislative branch of every Government is guaranteed certain privileges. Of what avail are these privileges without the power to protect them? Are they not nugatory without it? The Constitution declares that all legislation shall be vested in a Congress of the United States. Suppose the President denies this, and claims for himself a part of the legislative power belonging to Congress, must the Senate and House sit mute and trembling, deprived of the right, even to protest against such a claim? "Each House shall have the right to judge of the qualification of its own members," says the Constitution. Should it Executive attempt to deprive them of this right, must they say nothing? Can they not even announce to the people that he is attempting to usurp power? Should the House of Representatives become the servile tool of the Executive, what protection will be left the Senate? They would refuse to impeach, and the Senate, according to the doctrine contended for, would have to remain motionless—towardly motionless, and see itself stripped of its powers one after another, until it would become the very scuff of the nation. But the doctrine leads to yet more dangerous and threatening consequences. It has been the desire of the friends of constitutional liberty, in all ages and countries, to inspire the representative with vigilance. They have endeavored to frame legislative bodies with powers suited to this end. What, then, may be the result of depriving the Senate and House of the privilege to warn the people on the approach of danger? The Constitution guarantees to each State a republican form of Government. Senators are the direct delegates of the States.—Should the President under the influence of a daring ambition attempt to wrest from the States this sacred right, must the Senate remain silent, or, would it not be their duty to call on the people, "trumpet tongue," to come to their rescue?

What was the conduct of the British Parliament when James the 2nd claimed the exorbitant privilege of dispensation, by which Catholics were absolved from the test oath required by law to be taken? They boldly and manfully resisted his claim on the part of the King, denounced his usurpation, and called on the people for aid. Yet no one ever thought of condemning the Parliament for this act—none ever contended they transcended their legislative functions. It was this pivot—the right of the Representative to resist the encroachments of power, and to warn their constituents of their dangerous tendency, on which the Revolution of 1688; which placed English Liberty on a solid basis, turned. Yet would any have restrained causes which produced such a Revolution?

On the 16th of January, 1837, the Senate required this resolution, of the 28th of May 1834, disapproving the conduct of the President, to be expunged from the Journals of that body; and in compliance therewith, the Secretary did expunge it, by drawing black lines around and across it, and writing on its face "expunged by order of the Senate." This, then, is the act which the resolutions passed by the Legislature pronounced "a palpable violation of the plain letter of the Constitution." In the examination of this branch of the subject, your candid attention is solicited. By the 5th paragraph of the 5th section (article 1st) of the Constitution, "each House is required to keep a journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same." To enable us to understand the meaning of this requisition, it is proper to recur to the object of the framers of the Constitution. In a Representative Government, it is highly necessary that the constituent should be apprised of the acts of the representative—that there should be some record to which he can refer to learn what has been the course—the conduct of his public servant. This serves as a check on the representative, and affords matter of evidence against him, should his conduct be reprehensible; and for him, should it be praise-worthy and correct. It likewise serves in many cases, as necessary evidence to establish the acts of the legislative body, under which rights and property are derived to the citizen. When this journal is published, the printed copies may, for a time, accomplish such purposes; but there are cases where they would fail of reaching the object of the Constitution. Should the validity of the printed copy be disputed, to what source but the original, can you resort to determine the question? Establish this right to expunge, and all the rights, both of the successive legislation of Congress, are dependent on, and subject to, the caprice of any party, however corrupt, which may be able to gain the ascendancy. By what, except the journals, are you to know that the requirements of the Constitution have been complied with in that legislation by which privileges are granted and rights secured? The Constitution says that all revenue bills shall originate in the House of Representatives. A bill of this description, originating in the Senate, though it should receive the sanction of the President, all would admit to be null and void. How is this to be ascertained but by the journal? Permit, then, the journal to be expunged at the will of any party, and you give the power to defeat, at pleasure, any act, however important, by destroying the evidence of its having constitutionally passed Congress; and you also break down the veto power, by enabling either House to repeal a law, by the mere act of expunction. Besides, if you admit the right to expunge—to expunge—the right to alter follows of necessity. We all know that in many instances the erasure of a few words in a paragraph may not only destroy its meaning, but alter it to the reverse of what was first intended. How dangerous would such a doctrine be in the hands of a party bent on in-

novation! Take another illustration. The Senate has the sole power to try impeachments. Should the President, or any civil officer be impeached and acquitted, what is to prevent his being again put upon his trial, and his character jeopardized in this respect to expunge be established to the extent to which the Administration would carry it? Should he incur the displeasure of the dominant party in Congress, what is to prevent their drawing black lines across or a raising entirely the verdict of acquittal, and dragging the unfortunate officer once more to the bar of public indignation? I would put another case. When a bill has passed both Houses, it cannot become a law until it receives the sanction of the Executive. If the Executive disapprove, he is to return it to the House where it originated, with his objections, which shall be entered at large on the journal. This, then—the recording his objections—is a right guaranteed to the Executive branch, by the express words of the Constitution. Can any one contend that a subsequent Senate or House can violate this right by expunging these objections? And further: If two thirds approve the bill on the reconsideration, despite the veto of the President, it becomes a law. "But in all such cases," says the 7th section of the 1st article of the Constitution "the votes of both Houses shall be determined by the yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the journal of each House." Can any be so blinded by prejudices as to contend that this express command of the Constitution can be evaded—made null and void by expunging the names from the record? Again: The Constitution says "the yeas and nays of the members of either House, on any question, shall at the desire of one fifth of those present, be entered on the journal." Here then is an expressly granted privilege to the one fifth to have their votes recorded. It is a right—valuable, personal right. Can the majority of that, or any subsequent Senate, have these votes erased? Degraded, indeed, must that people be who would suffer rights so sacred to be invaded by the ruthless hand of party!

But let us again recur to the words of the Constitution. "Each House shall keep a journal, &c. What could our ancestors have meant by the expression "shall keep?" They were certainly good anthropologists, and understood the English language, perhaps, as accurately as any body of men. According to Dr. Johnson, and all the Lexicographers, to which I have had recourse, to keep means to retain, to preserve, to protect, to guard. Milton says "This charge I keep till my appointed day of rendering up." "She kept the fatal key." The scriptural quotations, "Behold I am with thee to keep thee;" and "The Lord keeping mercy for thousands," illustrate very plainly the true meaning of the word. How absurd to say that the framers of the Constitution, in requiring the Senate to keep a journal, implied thereby the right to defeat that very requisition, the right to expunge! Can it be presumed that when they joined upon each House to keep, retain, protect, preserve a journal, that they gave the power to blurr, blot, expunge, and annihilate it? If so, where will the power end? What is to prevent their expunging the whole records of the past legislation of the country—from going back to the administration of Washington, and erasing the evidence of every transaction thereof? What, we would ask, will prevent their expunging the very evidence by which the Constitution itself became the supreme law?

But, fellow citizens, to show more plainly the dangerous tendency of such a doctrine, let us bring it down to practical life. You all hold rights which are evidenced by the records of our courts; they are proof of the tenure by which your lands and other property are held, and how foolish it is to suppose that any certainty is attached to those records when they can be annulled by this process of expunging! A citizen is charged with a violation of the laws of his country. He is brought before a court of competent jurisdiction, tried by his peers, and acquitted. Some tyrannical judge, some ruffian Jeffrey, gains a seat on the bench, and prompted by malice, or desire of the verdict to be expunged from the records of the court, and the unfortunate citizen to be again arraigned for that offence from which he had received an honorable discharge. He can not plead the former acquittal in bar of the indictment, for the record, the only legal evidence thereof, has been erased, and not a vestige of it remains. He submits to his hard fate, and curses the weakness of that principle which is so loudly proclaimed as necessary for liberty; "that the life of the citizen shall not be twice put in jeopardy for the same offence." Who can contemplate, without horror, the awful consequences of such a practice? Where any one's property, any pretension for liberty or life, it belongs ever, and every citizen of the peace and order of society, every one who respects the dignity and independence of the Senate, and reveres the sacred Constitution which has been a source of such blessing to our nation, to set his face against this most dangerous, this most damnable doctrine. This doctrine strikes at the root of all our dearest rights, makes the tenures of property uncertain—character insecure—and brings the life and liberty of the citizen to the foot of any party which, by chicanery and corruption, may gain the ascendancy in the councils of the nation.

The third resolution condemns the Sub-Treasury as a dangerous experiment. It is usual, fellow citizens, to denounce all those who oppose this favorite scheme of the Administration as "Bank Aristocrats" and "Bank Advocates." Now, I do not hesitate to pronounce condemnation on the system of Banking which exists in this Country. It needs reformation. But Gen. Jackson and his supporters contributed more than any men living to introduce this state of things. When he went into power, there were but about 300 Banks in the Country, with a capital of 200 millions of dollars. Now there are 700 banks, the capital of which amounts to upwards of 400 millions and a half. The administration had the ascendancy in nearly every Legislature in the Union, and saw its friends chartering bank after bank with millions of capital, and no voice was raised to object or to warn. Not satisfied with this, they placed the public money in numbers of these pet banks, and permitted them, yes, solicited them to extend their issues of spurious, & base worthless paper money. Experiment after experiment, with distress and ruin following in their train, marked the course of those in power, and Mr. Van Buren, pledged "to follow in the footsteps," still persists after the twice overthrow of the credit system, under which we have so long prospered. There never was a declaration replete with more awful threatenings, than that uttered by Gen. Jackson and reiterated by Mr. Van Buren and his party, "that those who trade on borrowed capital ought to break." Credit is the link between labour and capital. It gives to labour and skill the capital of the country, and enables them to accumulate, to turn themselves to profit. If the credit system were destroyed, it would condemn a large portion of our species to poverty and wretchedness. They would be deprived of one great means of advancing their fortunes, and though the rich might continue rich, the poor would always be poor. Look at the operation of this policy, and say whether this idea be not correct.

A mechanic, by his talent and skill, acquires a reputation in his profession. His wages are small when forced to apply himself to mere manual labour. He obtains from a friend a portion of his redundant capital, extends his business, and in a few years by using prudently and skillfully this borrowed capital, he spreads around his family all the comforts and conveniences of life. How could the mere day labourer be any thing more, without this system, which enables him to draw into his service the dead capital of the country? Take away this system of credit, and you leave him nothing but mere toil and drudgery, reduce his rate of wages, and make his condition daily worse and worse. Besides, it would be impossible to establish a metallic currency, sufficient to meet the demands of such a commercial, trading people as ours. There is, assuming the highest estimate, not more than \$80,000,000 in specie in the United States. The circulating medium demanded by the prosperity and growth of the country is upwards of four hundred millions. Abolish the credit system—draw from circulation this immense amount, resting on the good faith and credit of the country, and introduce hard money, alone, and you make a reduction in all species of property, which will bring derangement and distress never before experienced. Then one dollar would be worth as much as four dollars now, and the debtor who has given his note for \$100 at this time, would be bound to pay \$3000, over and above the value for which he made himself liable.

### WATCHMAN.

SALISBURY:  
FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1840.

#### REPUBLICAN WHIG CANDIDATES

FOR PRESIDENT,  
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,  
OF OHIO.  
FOR VICE PRESIDENT,  
JOHN TYLER  
OF VIRGINIA.  
FOR GOVERNOR  
JOHN M. MOREHEAD,  
OF GUILFORD COUNTY.

#### CANDIDATES IN ROWAN.

We authorized to announce SAMUEL RIBELIN as a candidate for the Senate for Rowan and Davie counties.

We authorized to announce HAMILTON C. JONES, ISAAC BURNS and FRANCIS WILLIAMS, as candidates for the Commons for Rowan and Davie counties.

For Sheriff—Col. R. W. Long, and John H. Hardie, Esq.

#### CANDIDATES IN DAVIDSON.

For Sheriff—Col. John M. Smith, and Mr. B. B. Roberts.

#### CANDIDATES IN CABARRUS.

For the Senate—C. Melchor, Esq.  
For the Commons—Col. D. M. Barringer.

#### Electoral Convention.

The Delegates attending from the Electoral District, composed of Rowan, Davidson, Montgomery, and Davie Counties, having assembled in the Court House in the town of Salisbury, on the 5th inst., for the purpose of appointing an Elector for this District upon the Harrison and Tyler Ticket, the Convention was brought to order by A. Williams of Davidson, who called Col. C. Harbin of Davie to the Chair, and on motion of A. Cowan of Rowan, John B. Ledford of Rowan, C. H. Payne of Davidson, E. F. Lilly, and J. H. Montgomery of Montgomery, were appointed Secretaries.

The Convention being called, the following persons answered:

From Rowan.—John Jones, K. Elliott, John B. Ledford, P. Henderson, Peter Kerns, William Leitch, John L. Beard, John Hartman, Casper Holshouser, Samuel Silliman, J. E. Dobbin, Abel Graham, Noah Paries, George W. Brown, G. B. Wheeler, G. Gillespie, Abel Cowan, R. M. Roseborough, John Raymer, Rufus H. Kilpatrick, William Chambers, Alexander Paulsen, Thomas Craige, M. S. McKenzie, Paul Seaford, H. C. Jones, Samuel Luckey, E. D. Austin, Alexander Long, Henry Barger, A. W. Brandon, Joseph E. Todd, Richard Locke, E. R. Birchhead, William Gay, Samuel Kerr, Maxwell Chambers, Moses A. Locke, Jas. Mason, Jacob Holshouser, John Shuman, Jr. Horace H. Beard, James Sloan, John McKenaghey, John Boston, C. W. West, William Thomason, Lemuel Johnson.

From Davidson.—Henry Ledford, John W. Thomas, Charles Brummell, Robert L. Hargrave, A. Williams, Henry R. Dusenberry, C. L. Payne, D. Huffman, John P. Mabry, L. Wood, James Dossett, L. R. Gordy, H. Wilson, T. Daniel, William Harris, V. Hoover, Joseph Spurgeon, Henry Walsler, Charles Hoover, William Owen, J. Fitzgerald, S. Gaither.

Montgomery.—John H. Montgomery, F. G. Kron, Dr. J. M. Worth, Eli Harris, E. F. Lilly, P. Pemberton, J. C. Atkins, N. Harris, E. Hearne, D. A. S. Palmer, S. H. Christian, A. Freeman.

Davie.—C. Harbin, J. F. Martin, J. Holman, A. Cheshire, A. Hanes, G. W. Pearson, Jos. Ford, G. A. Miller, Jos. Hooser, J. McCorie, F. Williams, E. Gaither, M. F. Miller.

The Chairman then explained the object of the meeting in a brief, but appropriate address, whereupon the following Resolutions and Resolutions were introduced by Eli Harris of Montgomery county, and was ably supported by H. C. Jones and G. W. Pearson, amidst loud and repeated cheers, after which they were unanimously adopted.

Whereas, In reviewing the measures of the Administration of Martin Van Buren, we are forced to the conclusion, that the ruin of trade and credit, and that the distress and embarrassment which now overspread our country in time of profound peace, and while our agricultural labors have been rewarded with the most abundant returns, are attributable to the experiments of the Administration on the Currency of the Country.

office-holders in a substantial increase of their salaries, and to money kings to listen on the destruction which it must inevitably produce; a scheme which we believe to be unwise, unsafe, unconstitutional and revolutionary, and which will surely result in the establishment of a Government Bank, under the management of the President and his officeholders, dangerous to the liberties of the People, corrupting to public virtue, and against the first maxim of a free government, that the Representatives of the people shall control the Revenue which has been collected from them by their own consent and for their own benefit.

And whereas, This Administration with constant professions of Reform and Economy on its lips, has been found in practice the most anti-republican, extravagant and corrupt since the foundation of the Government, has expended not only the large surplus on hand when it came into power, and all the accruing income of the nation, and under the preface of postponing, has deprived the States of the fourth installment due them under the distribution act; but is continually running in debt to meet its enormous expenses, and has swelled its annual disbursements to the average sum of Thirty seven Millions of Dollars a year: an amount more than equal to eighteen times the average annual expense of the Administration of Gen. Washington, while our population has not increased six times since that period.

And whereas, The vast increase of Executive Power and Patronage and the unconstitutional pretensions of the Executive Department, seriously alarming to the friends of Liberty, and dangerous to the rights of the States and the People.

And whereas, The course of this Administration in regard to the Public Lands, which are by solemn compact the common property of all the States, is destructive to the unquestioned rights of the old States, by whom the cessions were made for the benefit of all, themselves inclusive.

And whereas, The project of the President and Secretary of War to establish a standing Army of 200,000 men subject to his control, under the false pretext and legislative definition of an organized "militia," is in violation of the letter and spirit of the Constitution, subversive of the rights of the States, intolerably onerous to the citizen, fatal to the morals and freedom of the people, and deserves the firm and unflinching opposition and indignant rebuke of every patriot in the land.

And whereas, This Administration has been grossly negligent and culpable in failing to bring its numerous public defaulters to condign punishment and in conniving at the mal-practices of which they have been guilty.

Resolved, Therefore, That the whole course of the Administration of Martin Van Buren, justifies and requires our unceasing and energetic opposition to its continuance in power, and that the only effectual remedy for the evils with which the nation is afflicted, and liberty itself endangered, is a change of the rulers under whom the people have suffered.

Resolved further, That we will heartily support for President of the United States the nomination of Gen. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, the distinguished citizen and Patriot Farmer of Ohio, who has always proved himself true in the councils of his country, as well as in the dangers of the battle field, who enjoyed the uninterrupted confidence of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, and has filled all his great offices with ability, integrity, and to the entire satisfaction of the People.

Resolved, That we approve of the nomination of JOHN TYLER, the Republican Statesman of Virginia, for Vice President of the United States.

On motion of Joseph Spurgeon of Davidson, DAVID F. CALDWELL, of Rowan county, was nominated as ELECTOR for this District, which was confirmed without a dissenting voice.

The following resolution was offered by H. C. Jones, and adopted:

Resolved, That William Chambers, Abel Cowan, Thomas Craige, Jacob Holshouser and J. Jamison of Rowan; John P. Mabry, Henry R. Dusenberry, Joseph Spurgeon, L. Wood and H. Ledford of Davidson; Oliver Wiley, J. Allen, Eli W. Christian, Daniel Freeman and J. W. Worth of Montgomery, and C. Harbin, Joseph Hanes, J. Hooser, Thomas Ralfege and James Cook of Davie, be appointed a Committee to make a nomination of Elector for this District in case from any unforeseen cause we should not be able to avail ourselves of the present nomination.

On motion of J. F. Martin of Davie, Resolved, That the Chair appoint a Committee of one from each county, to inform David F. Caldwell of his nomination, and request him in the name of this Convention to visit the most public parts of this District and address the citizens. Whereupon, the Chairman appointed James F. Martin of Davie, Charles Brummell of Davidson, Eli Harris of Montgomery, and H. C. Jones of Rowan.

Having concluded the business of the Convention, the Chairman announced the willingness of the meeting to hear any person who might be called upon to address it. Whereupon, there was a general call for N. Boyden, Esq. of Surry, who attending Court, was present.—Mr. Boyden rose and addressed the meeting at length, in an able and effective manner, being frequently interrupted by the plaudits of his audience.

Upon his conclusion, the following resolution was offered by E. F. Lilly of Montgomery, and unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the thanks of this meeting be presented to Mr. Boyden for the able and patriotic manner in which he responded to the call of the meeting, and that he be earnestly requested to furnish a copy of his speech for publication.

On motion of A. Williams of Davidson, Resolved, That the Whig papers throughout the State as well as in this place, be requested to publish the proceedings of this Convention.

Whereupon, the Convention adjourned.

C. HARBIN, Chm.  
JOHN B. LORD,  
CHAS. I. PAYNE,  
J. H. MONTGOMERY, Secys.  
E. F. LILLY,

CIGARS.—Well—puff—we were yesterday presented a box of Cigars, manufactured by Messrs. Lash & Brothers, at Bethania, Stokes county, N. C.—puff—puff—

We don't often smoke, however, unless we get bold of the article that's just exactly nice, and no mistake: in that case, we sometimes so far overcome our prejudices to the use of tobacco as to—puff—puff—puff—a little. Messrs. Lash's Cigars are excellent, and we think they need only be tried to win for them the preference over any we have ever seen; so puff we must—puff—puff—puff—puff!

Orange District.—Dr. James S. Smith of Hillsboro, has been selected as the Harrison & Tyler Elector for the District composed of the Counties of Orange, Granville and Person.

The Van Buren meeting on Wednesday last, was given through the such such a meeting "suff together" "in support an Elector." Placards every nook and corner of Charles Fisher and made by personal sedition get together a crowd crowd did come and quits his post at Washington, makes a special administration abuses, and still tells the President his position. His ordinary abandonment of business of importance to prepare the Representatives mer session, and money body's business why comes prepared with documents to make a ted his services were it did not make much this District or at Washington, do not choose to notice a paper to wit: "written WHILE HE IS ELECTED."

Mr. Fisher in his hood to say, still, that Why then does he go to address his constituents open field and let the Van Buren meeting be would be met and could did he wish to give Van Buren meeting by to it to hear him, bend the party? The true answer both purposes knew well that all great curiosity to hear sense of his most progress. He was sure audience. He knew a would prevent any body to answer him his Van Buren allies, fullest extent of his power throwing dust in the eyes of the Banks, hard times. He cherishes Abolitionism: with Internal Improvements so far, and stopped at ders upon his military mitted the Indians to Tippecanoe:—had not leep when the Indians the exploded falsehoods Crogan at the battle added a version which that when Gen. Harris Stephenson, instead of the gallant Crogan done, he abandoned his ly observing, "His Majesty Never in the history such a speech uttered was safe from reply, he snogly stuck down a bullet. Buren friends—he he, regardless alike of it. He doubtless those presentations could be the people would be Harrison, that no profit We think he will find ken, as when he told he would get eight to Mr. Fisher has given address the People of Lexington.

We again call the singular and alarm Congress, sent there business should quit and urged to doing has put the business of ten, and in pleading the Martin Van Buren electioneering, such exertions as can help to re-elect Mr. can be permitted to scribble a little deeper than strength of the game of engineering for Mr. in the county to send the lature of the State, IS RECEIVING HIS MEMBER. He has been and he does not deny barefaced injustice. no one has a right to home!

N. B. We have seen ings of each House of May inclusive, and recess of the House, and sweep the floor, and the reason of his coming here on the night of we see a continued session with business and adjourn night, the day before his some error in this matter to have it explained.

We were glad to see Fisher said in his speech on Salisbury, to wit: patriot, a gallant and when he was so hard he would go for Mr. Clay. Nay, we are prepared to said he would prefer Gen. Van Buren or Clay than a Republican.

There was another man we think ought to be in City: he said the Standing the foolish contrivance of war, which nobody was at Washington. His great that Mr. Van Buren and gress that he could not upon them too earnestly.

#### THE VIRGINIA

Victory! Enough has been heard elections to put it beyond State of Virginia is than Van Burenism. The Van Burenism has not been ed, but it cannot be less probably about ripening.