

# THE MESSENGER.

D. R. MANALLY & J. ROBERTS, EDITORS.

ASHEVILLE, N. C.

Friday, Sept. 29, 1843.

## TO THE PATRONS OF THE FEMALE ACADEMY IN ASHEVILLE.

The trustees of this institution most respectfully and earnestly urge the propriety, the necessity of prompt payments of the tuition fees for the session which closes to-day. Heavy expenses have been incurred during the present summer by the principal, which render it important that moneys due for tuition be promptly paid in. It is hoped that this suggestion will be sufficient.

## THE PRESIDENCY.

"The Whigs seem to be still chuckling with joy over what they regard as prospects of a division in the democratic ranks in 1844, by which they may succeed in electing a President. If on this depends their only hope of success, (and on this alone it does depend,) they are doomed to disappointment. The Democrats will have but one candidate for President, and him they will elect."—Mecklenburg Jeffersonian.

From present appearances, it would seem that there will be a most wonderful exhibition of unity and the cohesive power of brotherly feeling among the Locofocos in general, as to who shall be their leader in the coming contest for President. The Democracy of every section of the Union have their preference, which they are loath to give up. And the way they enter into one another's democratic affections, with a hearty good will, is a caution to the lovers of "British gold," "coon skins," and "hard cider." The way their paper bullets fly thick and "fast as arrows from a Tartar's bow," must be distressing to that portion of the party who have the interests of their country at heart. They give "every thing for the cause—nothing for men."

Have we any assurance that the self-styled Democratic party, squabbling as they are about their leader, with the probability of the tumult increasing, and the time so near at hand when they should single out their captain, will unite on one man? They tell us they will. Well, on whom will they unite? Will it be Martin Van Buren? The people have weighed him in the balance and found him wanting, and they will not reverse their decision. Will it be John C. Calhoun? He is a nullifier, and Gen. Jackson, the godfather of the Democratic party, once said that he ought to be hung as high as Haman.—He is every thing by turns and nothing long. He has been a United States Bank man and an anti-United States Bank man. He has been a protective tariff man and an anti-protective tariff man. In short, he has been for and against almost every important measure that has been brought before the people since he became a public man. Is it possible that the people, the honest yeomanry of the country, can be deluded into the support of a man who, weather-cock-like, is turning with every current of popular opinion? Can it be possible that the Democratic party will support the man who asserted that they were only "held together by the cohesive power of public plunder?" Can it be possible that the Democratic party will support the man whom they, ten years ago, considered "utterly unsafe and never to be trusted?" They should curse the traitor, though they love the treason. Will it be James Buchanan? He once denounced the Democratic party for every thing that was corrupt and dishonest in every sense of the word. And more, he is one of those upon whom the Democrats heap their unmeasured anathemas—a Federalist, and is reported to have said upon a certain occasion that "if he had one drop of democratic blood in his veins, and knew where it was, he would open the vein and let it run out." How could the Democracy reconcile it to their pure consciences to support a man so impregnated with federalism? They surely could not expect the people to vote for him. Will it be Thomas H. Benton? He supported Mr. Clay in 1824, because that gentleman was the "founder"—mark the expression—of "a system of American policy, based on the agriculture and manufactures of his own country," and because he "would be the triumphant champion of the new tariff." Will it be Richard M. Johnson? He glories in being the father of the bankrupt law—a measure so odious in the eyes of modern Democracy. They surely could not ask the people to elect him. As Mr. Van Buren and Mr. Buchanan, supported the tariff of 1828, and Mr. Calhoun that of 1816, which modern Democrats term a "bill of abominations." Under these circumstances, we ask, how can the Democratic party support either of these men for the Presidency?

The Democrats themselves have no assurance that they will have but one candidate for President. They are so confusedly divided in their choice of men, as to render it almost impossible to rally them to the

support of any one of the numerous aspirants claiming their suffrages. And even if they have but one candidate, they cannot elect him. They may boast as much as they please, but when the time comes for the decision, they will be as effectually routed as they were in 1840. The American people are just beginning to appreciate the merits of Henry Clay, and in 1844, they will signally manifest their approbation of his integrity and the principles he advocates.

The Whig party fear no disappointment. Their hopes of success are not founded on the prospect of a division in the Democratic ranks. If the Democrats unite on one man, the Whigs have nothing to fear. With Henry Clay for the leader, they must and will triumph. And upon him they have united to a man. The shout for Clay is raised in the valleys of the west, and reverberated among the hills of New England; it peals over the plains of the sunny south, nor is it permitted to die away on the lakes of the north. Are the Whigs to be defeated when they are thus enthusiastically rallying around their champion, with new accessions constantly adding to their strength in almost every section of the Union. As well might ye tell us that the Mississippi is to flow backwards, or that the mountains and hills of our country are to become solid masses of pure gold. The Whig party to be defeated! Just as they were in '76 and '40. The Whig party to be defeated! Just as they ever will be, so long as the principles which animated the heroes of the revolution, can find a response in the breasts of the American people. The Whig party to be defeated! When liberty cannot find an asylum in America, then, and not till then, will the Whig party be defeated!

## MODERN DEMOCRACY.

In 1816 John C. Calhoun said that "a tariff for protection was of vital importance to the security and permanent prosperity of the Union." More than that, he said "it would preserve us from a new and terrible danger—DISUNION!" In 1834 John C. Calhoun was a strong United States Bank man. Now this same John C. Calhoun lustily vociferates *free trade; low duties; separation from banks; strict adherence to the constitution!* What are his reasons for this desertion of former principles? *Mum, mum!* This is modern Democracy.

In 1830 Mr. McDuffie, then a representative in Congress, and at present a Locofoco Senator from South Carolina, in a report to the House of Representatives on the subject of the United States Bank, used the following strong and explicit language: "The Bank being now recommended by a Republican Administration, (Mr. Madison's,) was carried through both branches of Congress, as a republican measure, by an overwhelming majority of the republican party." Now Mr. McDuffie is violently opposed to a United States Bank, though it is a REPUBLICAN MEASURE.

In 1828 Martin Van Buren, then a Senator in Congress, voted for the tariff of that year—the very same tariff which the present Democratic party of South Carolina, with John C. Calhoun (the tariff man of 1816) at their head, sought to nullify, "and by his vote," says a cotemporary, "was its passage secured," and yet Mr. Van Buren was avowedly hostile to the tariff policy.

In 1842 Silas Wright a Locofoco Senator from New York, in defining his position in relation to the present tariff, which a large portion of his party dubs a "bill of abominations," declared that he utterly loathed the bill; yet he voted for it, according to his own avowal, to prevent its defeat! This, and the preceding instance of "twistification," is characteristic of modern Democracy.

It is useless to enumerate instances; the leaders of the Democratic party are proverbial for such shameful inconsistencies. They will denounce a bill as a "Federal Whig measure," and often enough of them vote for it purposely to secure its passage! This is modern Democracy. How can a party be sustained whose leaders act so inconsistently with their professions? The fact is the Democratic party will have to rid themselves of such corrupt, profligate and unprincipled leaders as they are burdened with, before they can claim the confidence and respect of the American people.

¶ The Editor of the Chronicle & Sentinel, at Augusta, Ga., has been presented with another new hat. Can't see puff somebody's new and fashionable hats?

¶ The insanity of the Hon. John M. Niles is said to be of a religious caste, and his mind is rational and sound upon other topics. He voluntarily placed himself with Dr. Breigham. Hope he'll soon recover.

¶ The Oxford Mercury has been discontinued for want of patronage. The editor proposes publishing a neutral paper, to take the place of the Mercury, called "RIP VAN WINKLE," as soon as he can collect what is due him, pay his own debts, and add fifty new subscribers to his list, and get married!

THIEVES!  
Our county seems to be of late, beset by a gang of thieves, who, as it will be seen by the advertisements in this week's paper, have been committing several thefts in this vicinity. On last Sunday evening a couple of suspicious looking strangers, badly clad, were seen travelling on foot some eighteen or nineteen miles below this, on the Warm Spring road, in the direction of Asheville. About 8 o'clock the same evening, two men, supposed to be the same, were seen passing the road in the same direction, the one walking and the other riding; the one on foot was some distance before. Next morning a mare was missing from the stable of Mr. Samuel Smith, 18 miles below this, the only house which these men had passed Esq. Rice's and their being seen, one riding, about one mile above Mr. Smith's. On the same night a valuable young mare was stolen from Col. Alexander's stable, 10 miles below this place. On Sunday morning Mr. Smith's mare was found near this village—having been, apparently, rode very hard. The supposition is that as she was barefooted and very tender, she had been turned loose. No account of these men can be had after they were seen Saturday night. Every effort should immediately be made by our citizens generally, for the apprehension of the thieves, and from all the circumstances, we think there is but little doubt but that the thefts were perpetrated by the individuals alluded to.

## A HIGH PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

Strange as it may seem, some of the more reckless of the Locofoco party labor with a zeal worthy of a better cause, to impress upon the minds of the American people that the Whigs are in favor of a high protective tariff. Now this is all hyperbole, and they know it. The Whigs are not in favor of a high protective tariff. They are in favor of a tariff, though, that will give to the country a revenue adequate to the economical wants of the government, and at the same time afford incidental protection to American industry. This is the sort of a tariff they are in favor of, and none other, and it has been proclaimed throughout the length and breadth of the Union. But the policy of the Locofoco party demands that the Whigs should be misrepresented, and on what subject more easily than the tariff? The Locofocos assert that the Whigs are in favor of a high protective tariff, and the Whigs positively deny it—which ought to know best? Let us hear no more about the Whigs being the advocates of a high protective tariff, until proof is produced that they really are.

¶ When the convention which is expected to meet at this place next week, is in session, would it not be well for the Whigs of this county, to nominate some suitable person to represent the county in the state convention which is to be held at Raleigh the ensuing winter? We think so. The Democratic party are holding meetings in several parts of the state, appointing their delegates, and expressing preference, and we think it time the Whigs were beginning to make a move in regard to the same subject. We should like also to hear from them an expression of opinion as to the name whom they would prefer for our next governor. There can be no harm that we can see, in speaking out plainly, and at once saying who it is that we should most like to see seated in the chair of state. Of course we will most cheerfully abide the decision of a state convention, but feel much disposed to hear what Buncombe has to say on the subject; and who she would make her first choice.

¶ The Democratic convention which met at Syracuse, N. Y., on the 3d inst., appointed delegates to the Baltimore convention, with instructions to support the claims of Mr. Van Buren for the Presidency. The Calhoun papers in the south are rather wrathful because Mr. Calhoun was not the choice of the convention.

¶ The Locofocos of Moore and Cumberland counties have held meetings and nominated Michael Hoke, Esq., of Lincoln, as the Democratic candidate for Governor. Another meeting has been held in Beaufort, which recommended Gen. Wm. Blount of that county for the same office.

¶ We were presented the other day with a peach weighing 10 oz., and measuring 11 inches in circumference; also with an apple weighing 14 oz., and measuring 13 1/2 inches in circumference. Who can beat either?

¶ There never was so much specie in the country as at the present time.—Cincinnati Message.

¶ We neither get nor see any of it about these parts.—Vincennes Gazette.

¶ Just come to Buncombe, and we will show you a rusty sixpence—all that.

¶ Our readers will please excuse us for sending out this week only a half sheet, as all the hands in the office but one, is sick and unable to render any assistance whatever.—Carolina Watchman.

¶ You is excusable.

¶ In Mexico there are about six million of females, only two thousand of whom can write their own names!

## LETTER OF MR. CAROTHERS OF TENNESSEE.

We have before us the letter of the Hon. ROBERT L. CAROTHERS to the Hon. CAVE JOHNSON. It is a scathing and withering exposure of the humbuggery of the leaders of modern Democracy. Its exposition of excessive expenditures and heavy accumulation of the public debt during Mr. Van Buren's administration, is clear and conclusive, as well as authentic, and enough to convince the most doubting. Its great length prevents us from laying it before our readers entire, and we must, therefore, content ourselves with an extract. We may give other extracts hereafter.

After making some inquiries as to who will be the Democratic candidate for President, and despoiling upon the merits of the different aspirants, and the profound ignorance of the party as to who will be their standard bearer, he says:

"How different is our cause! We are all of one mind both as to the general under whom we go to battle, and the principles and measures for which we wage the war. We have proclaimed it the whole world, and sworn it upon the altar of our country, that he who led our national councils in the perilous days of the last war, and manfully sustained Madison, 'the war candidate,' against Clinton, 'the peace candidate,' with Van Buren and all the federalists at his back—that he who negotiated for our country an honorable peace at Ghent after the British lion had been tamed—he who saved the Union when the Missouri question, (of which Mr. Jefferson said it fell upon his ear with all the terror of a fire-bell at night) was shaking our political fabric like an earthquake—he who extinguished the unholy fires of nullification which Calhoun and others had kindled in the South—he who snatched the incendiary torch from the fanatical hands of abolitionism—he who has filled a greater space in the eyes of the world than any American statesman of his day—and has been most persecuted—HENRY CLAY of the West is our candidate. He is the impersonation of our principles, and they are inscribed upon our banner in letters of light that all the people may read them, and none be deceived; and that our enemies may have them as targets to shoot at. They are—

"1st. A sound national currency of paper based upon specie; by means of a well regulated United States Bank, which shall serve as a fiscal agent of the government, instead of a *Su-Treasury* or *Pet Bank*.

"2d. The distribution of the proceeds of the public lands among the States to whom they rightfully belong, instead of leaving them as a corruption fund for federal politicians.

"3d. A tariff for revenue with incidental protection to American industry—agricultural, manufacturing, mechanical and commercial, against the pauper labor and princely capital of Europe, instead of free trade on our part with the most enormous exactions of other nations, and direct taxation upon the people's land and negroes, and horses, and cattle, and heads, with a swarm of federal appraisers and tax gatherers scattered through the country, devouring the substance of the people.

"4th. The curtailment of executive power, by the destruction or nullification of the Presidential veto, (which enables one weak or wicked man to frustrate the will of the people and deprive them of the benefit of the most wholesome laws) by the enactment of such laws as will prevent the power and patronage of the executive from coming in conflict with the freedom of elections—the liberation of office holders from slavish subserviency to executive will, restrain them from undue interference in elections, and abridge the unlimited power of removal by the President.

"5th. One Presidential term.

"6th. The administration of the Government on the most rigid principles of economy. Its expenses to be kept down to what the Whigs have now brought them, sixteen millions, and never again permitted to run up to the Democratic average of thirty-three millions.

"So the people have our candidate and principles before them—by them we are willing to be judged. We stand before the judgment seat of the greatest people on earth, and are ready to submit to any sentence they may pronounce. We admit that we have not, in the short period of our power, done all that they and we desired and expected. But they are just, and will consider the circumstances by which we were surrounded.

Who does the best, his circumstance allows, does well, sets nobly—angels could do no more.

"They know that the grave of General HARRISON swallowed up all the executive power of the Whigs, and without the aid of that all are aware, and you well know, that but little comparatively can be done in the reformation of abuses. Without the aid of that, the Augean Stables cannot be thoroughly cleansed, no matter how foul—if Hercules oppose, who can work? So there was not time scarcely to begin the work we had promised and intended to do (only thirty days), before adverse winds of executive power were blowing strong against the tide of reform!"

"But thanks to the noble band of patriots in the other branch of the Government (Congress), who were too pure to be swayed from their course by the most corrupt and infamous executive who ever presided over a free people, and all the vast patronage of his office, enough, more than enough was done to show the people that there was much which was rotten in the Government as we found it, and to prove that the Whigs were faithful to their promises—that what they could do they attempted, and what they could do they did."

From a lengthy postscript annexed to the letter, we make the following extract, which completely answers the paltry subterfuges to which the leaders of the Locofoco party have resorted, in order to deceive the people on the subject of the public liabilities:

"None of you dispute the amount of liabilities you left us. But you say that they were not debts and had never been so called before, but the amount of liabilities which had been created by the expiring Congress for the service of the current year, were always denominated *appropriations* and not *debts*. Now this is a dispute about words and not substance—you can have it as you will. Whether it be called *debt*, *liabilities* or *appropriations*, the amount stated was cast by your acts upon the Whig Congress, and had to be provided for by them, as you failed to do so.

"But you raised an issue and made certain publications, which makes the distinction material. The public debt has been increased in two years near twenty millions, and in order to show which party is responsible for that, it becomes material to ascertain whether the Whigs were saddled by your party with liabilities beyond their means, which they could only discharge by borrowing money or issuing treasury notes, and by that make the increase in question of the debt proper, or was it by their own extravagance; that is the question upon which the people want light. And how do you and your friends attempt to give them satisfaction?"

"First. You insist that the Whigs may have been compelled to borrow money to meet the liabilities you left, and thereby augment the public debt proper, yet as most of these liabilities had not assumed the technical form of a debt before you got out of the sinking ship, but were denominated in the technical language of the treasury, 'appropriations,' the responsibility is changed from you to your successors. That is, you argue that inasmuch as you had only given out the notes and bonds of the government, for seven millions of its liabilities on the 4th March, 1841, you are only chargeable before the people for that amount, notwithstanding you left thirty odd millions besides in the form of appropriations and open accounts, which we had afterwards to settle or close by note or bond. Suppose you had given your notes or bonds for the whole amount before you went out, instead of leaving that for us to do, as you did not provide means, would it not be a clear case? What is the difference? Could we not have paid your notes with just as little difficulty and with the same amount that we could your open accounts and appropriations? But finding this too plain to mislead long before sensible men, you and your wily leader in the publication to which I have alluded, take the ground.

"Secondly. That upon our principle it will appear that when Gen. Jackson came into power in 1829, and Mr. Van Buren in 1837, they found the Government in debt in the same way we did, and that the next Congress will find it in a worse condition, and it is so you insist with all the administrations, because on the 4th of March, at the expiration of every Congress, the Government is left with liabilities to the extent of the appropriations for the service of the current year at least. And in the publication alluded to (in all of which, of course you and every other Democrat seeking office, believe, and will rely upon before the people) it is stated that when Gen. Jackson was installed into office on the 4th of March, 1829, he found liabilities to the amount of \$26,379,941; and that when Mr. Van Buren came in, he found the Government liable for \$57,268,625. Now, for the truth of these statements no documents are referred to, or proof of any sort adduced, and therefore they are but naked assertions, and of course, in these party times, will receive no credit or consideration. But suppose all that be true, does it all meet the question in controversy?"

This, it will be borne in mind, is not what administration came in with the heaviest liabilities or debts, or appropriations to meet, but *what party is responsible to the people for the present public debt*. If, when Gen. Jackson came into power in 1829, or Mr. Van Buren in 1837, they found liabilities exceeding the means which had been provided to discharge them, and were therefore compelled to borrow money upon the bonds or notes of the Government for that purpose, who would be responsible for this debt? The administration who created the liabilities, or the one who borrowed the money to pay them? Is not that a plain question? Just think of it a moment, and you will be ashamed of yourself for your present attempt to guilt the people. If it be true, then, that according to our principle when Jackson came in, he found a debt of twenty-six millions, and Van Buren one of fifty-seven millions cast upon him by his illustrious predecessor, they inherited at the same time ample means to pay off those liabilities. No one cares for the amount of debts he may have to pay for another; if the money is at the same time placed in his hands to pay them. Your draft would be accepted for fifty millions as readily as for one million, if the fund you furnish to pay it is large enough. An estate is not regarded as insolvent no matter how much it owes, if it has means to the same extent. Mr. Adams and Gen. Jackson did not only leave to their successors a certain income sufficient to pay all their liabilities and support the Government in the meantime, but particularly in the former case to create a large surplus.

"This fact I will not leave upon my bare assertion, but give you the proof. How did it stand with Gen. Jackson in 1829? Hear his own words in his message of December 13, 1829, Niles Register, vol. 37, page 250.

"The balance in the Treasury on the 1st January, 1829, was \$5,971,435  
The receipts for the current year, &c. estimated at 24,602,240  
\$31,574,665  
And the expenditures for the same time, 26,184,595

Leaving a balance in the Treasury on the 1st Jan'y next, \$4,410,075

"Here you find it proved by a reliable witness that after paying all the demands upon the Treasury for 1829, left by Mr. Adams, including \$12,403,000 on the war debt, Gen. Jackson, had near four and a half millions in cash to start upon the next year. And how did it work the next year? The old General will tell you in his message of 7th December, 1830, which you will find in Register of Debates, vol. 7, app. page 11 and 12. After stating that he had discharged all demands made that year and near twelve millions on the war debt, he says: 'leaving a balance in the Treasury on the 1st January, 1832, of four millions eight hundred and ninety thousand, seven hundred and eighty-one dollars.'

"Now you see what the old chief private in relation to the liabilities left on him by Mr. Adams, and how easy the provisions for revenue which he found made to his hands and overflow the public coffers. Allow me to favor you with a sentence or two that you may have forgotten. After speaking of the impossibility of so adjusting the Tariff with the consent of the people as to avoid a surplus, and the difficulty of making necessary internal improvements in the States by the General Government, he says: 'to avoid these evils it appears to me that the most safe, just and federal disposition that could be made of the surplus revenue, would be its appropriation among the several States according to their ratio of representation. And should the measure not be found warranted by the Constitution, that it would be expedient to propose to the States an amendment authorizing it. Does not this sound a little of distribution? and must he not have felt at that time very strongly in favor of that policy, when he thought it of sufficient importance to authorize a proposition to amend the Constitution if it should be found necessary. But we are not now disputing about the distribution act, sufficient for the day is the evil thereof.'

It is charged that when Mr. Van Buren was inaugurated on the 4th of March, 1837, there were liabilities resting upon the Government to the amount of \$57,268,625. I have no idea that this amount is correct unless the amount ordered to be distributed among the States by the deposit act of 23d June, 1836, be included as a liability. But at the same time these liabilities were cast upon him what were the means and resources which went with them?

¶ According to the annual report of your own Levi Woodbury, of December 7, 1837, Niles Register, vol. 53, page 242, There was in the Treasury on 1st January, 1837, \$44,968,533  
And he says that the receipts into the Treasury during the year 1837, from all sources, would be 23,499,981

But a part of the receipts were Treasury notes, which ought to be deducted, as they were not provided by the preceding administration, 4,300,000

\$65,168,504

"Here then you see that if even Gen. Jackson left his son Martin liabilities to the extent of \$57,268,625 he left cash on hand and an income to the amount of \$65,168,504.

"So you will see that neither of these cases were similar to ours. The difference between them is simply this, they inherited large liabilities, but still larger means and resources; but we inherited the liabilities without the resources. You are certainly not so blinded by party zeal as to fail to see the distinction now between the cases; if you are I will despair of convincing you, and believe that Ephraim is joined to his idols, and let him alone.

"You and your friends also go on to make a great parade of figures to show that upon our principle in relation to the public liabilities, that we left on the 4th of March last, a debt of \$62,470,410. Now to make out that sum you include all the appropriations not only for the year 1843, but for one half of 1844, as well as the public debt proper which we were bound to pay off your arrears. Instead of the revenue of one year we have that of one and a half years to meet our liabilities. The next Congress will not have any new appropriations to make for the support of the Government until July, 1844. But on the subject of the Whig appropriations and expenditures enough has been shown and proved to satisfy all reflecting men that the 'pruning knife, long, broad and sharp, has been applied to every department of the Government,' as Mr. Clay said it ought to be in his speech at Hanover in 1840, as far as it were possible to do it, with the executive in the hands of our enemies by foul treason and corrupt alliance."

"THE DIFFERENCE.—John Tyler passed from Washington to Boston, and was every where received with what are called 'honors,' and with the power and patronage of the Union in his hands, the expense had to be wrung from the people by taxation. In this city the tax-payers are called to foot a bill of four thousand dollars civilities tendered him by Morris, Purdy & Co. ostensibly in behalf of a People of whom ninety-nine hundredths had him in utter contempt.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS passed through our State a private citizen, with no patronage, no station, a powerless, tottering old man. Yet, thousands crowded from every quarter to welcome him and press his hand, and when his friends in Buffalo resolved to have a public demonstration of the general feeling towards him, they did not turn him over to the Common Council, but called on a few citizens to contribute the sum, and when all was over, expense, they did so; and when all was over, there remained a surplus of fifty dollars, which they handed over to the Orphan Asylum. Such is the difference between respect for the office and respect for the man *per se*.—N. Y. Tribune.

TYLERISM.—The redoubtable Governor Dorr has written a letter to his disciples in Rhode Island, denouncing and repudiating their alliance with Tylerism, and declaring his determination to have nothing whatever to do with it. It is said he ever manages to get lower than to dig the really live to know where it propagates for Tom Dorr. A party that isn't good the bottom as any Dorr is about as much below the bottom as any thing we ever heard of. It is quite impossible for the Tylerites ever to receive another slight in this world. When any other being under heaven kicks them, let them be comforted—they are rising in the world again.—N. Y. Cour. & Enq.