

spoke the remainder of the morning hour in favor of retaining the rule. We had the following sketch of the remarks of Judge Saunders in the Globe of the 10th instant:

Judge SAUNDERS took the floor, and after some preliminary remarks, went on to say, that he should prefer at once to reply to the objections that had been urged to the 21st rule. We have (said he) patiently asked those gentlemen who are opposed to the 21st rule, what it was they meant by the sacred right of petition, when they talked of its being violated? Where did it commence, and where did it end? If they said that the people had the right of petition when and where they pleased, and on any subject, for the redress of grievances, whether real or imaginary, then he would say that there was no necessity for their travelling up to Magna Carta to support that position, for no one questioned it. He would go one step farther than some of these gentlemen had done. He admitted that the people not only had the right of petition, but the right to an unqualified answer from this House. Even on this admission, he was prepared to sustain the 21st rule. What was the language of the Constitution, on which gentlemen relied in their opposition to the 21st rule? It was, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." Now, the rule passed by Congress, called the one hour rule, which limited the speech of members to one hour's time, was an abridgment of the freedom of speech. But the advocates of that rule contended that there was an existing abuse impeding the transaction of the business of the House, which required correction, and the rule was passed for that purpose. The rule establishing the previous question was not only abridgment of the freedom of speech, but a total suppression of it, as it cut off debate; but that was justified by the argument that this rule was necessary for facilitating the business of the House.

Congress (said the Constitution) should not have power to abridge the freedom of the press; and yet laws were made on that subject, with which the House was familiar. But it was said this rule violated the right of petition, because it did not allow petitioners to be heard here, and their petitions to be deliberated upon. In this there was a great error. A calling order has had said the House could not know whether the petitions prayed for a constitutional or an unconstitutional act, or indeed for any improper or unlawful petition were heard; and a gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Duncan] had said that the inhabitants of this District could not petition for the abolition of slavery in this District, unless this rule was repealed. In all this there was great fallacy. The House knew what the rule was.

It was that the petition memorial, resolution, or other paper praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or Territory, or the slave trade between the States or Territories, of the United States, in which it now exists, shall not be received by this House, or entertained in any way whatever. That was the rule which the Speaker, as the presiding officer of this House, was required to enforce, and he could not enforce that rule until the agent of the petitioners had announced the purpose of the petition which he rose to present. The House was then informed of the purpose of such petitions, and the petitioners were then shown, by that rule, that the House had considered the subject and given its judgment. Here, then, the facts were ascertained, the prayer was heard, and it was when met by the Speaker, as the presiding officer of the House, that the rule as to the judgment of the House was to be applied. He illustrated this point in various ways, and then came to the question whether this rule was a violation of the right of petition.

He understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. Beardsley] to say, the other day, that the petition asking the House to interfere with slavery in the States, was to ask Congress to do that which it could not do; and that he would not receive such petition. Why? Because it asked for an unconstitutional thing. But the same gentleman said, when a petition asked Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, that was a different question, and it became a matter of expediency whether the petition should be received and acted upon. Now, he intended to present the gentleman from New York on that point. Who was to decide on the constitutional or unconstitutional of the subject prayed for? It must be done by a majority of the members of this House. Now he [Mr. S.] asserted that Congress possessed no power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, Congress could not expend the public money for such a purpose. The right of the owners of slaves to that species of property was admitted to be as conclusive as the right to any other property. The right to this property was recognized in Maryland in 1715—Maryland being then a colony. He showed what were the laws on this subject in eleven slaveholding States, and replied to some remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Hudson] on this branch of the subject, and he proceeded to say that the Constitution expressly provided that Congress should not take private property unless it were for public uses, then only on making compensation to the owners of the property. The gentleman from New York admitted that slaves were private property; he said, likewise, that Congress might emancipate the slaves; but he did not say whether Congress should make compensation for those slaves. He dodged that question. But he [Mr. S.] contended that Congress could not take the public money for any such purposes. The eighth section of the first article of the Constitution contained an enumeration of the powers of Congress; but no gentleman could tell him that it contained any such powers.

The honorable gentleman went into a long argument to prove the position he assumed; in the course of which, he took occasion to show what had been done by Congress heretofore in relation to this class of petitioners, and how the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Adams] had voted thereon. He read various resolutions of the House adopted in the years 1836 and 1838.

How stood the question in 1838? Then they had the famous resolution declaring that Congress had no power to interfere with slaves in the States, and the such interference would be a breach of public faith.

Mr. Beardsley said the gentleman has misapprehended him upon this question. He had not said that all he desired was that these petitions should be received and laid upon the table. He had added a qualification, that if the House was ready to act upon them, as he himself had always been in such case, he cared not whether they were laid upon the table or not, the reception was sufficient to meet the requirements of the Constitution. He had added that, in his opinion, the expedient and proper course was to send them to the committee most favorable to the prayer of the petition, to the end that they might see what such committee would advise the country to do under the circumstances.

Mr. Saunders said he had stood the gentleman now to say that he had made up his mind that slavery ought to be abolished.

Mr. Beardsley said he had so declared, perhaps a hundred times.

Mr. Saunders said he was glad to find that he was not misrepresenting the gentleman. All that the gentleman desired was that the petitions should be received, and laid upon the table; he did not desire that they should be considered. Why? Because his mind was made up upon the subject. To what? Not to abolish slavery. He admitted, that if the majority there thought that they ought to abolish slavery, they ought to receive and consider the petitions; but it was because the majority were not in favor of the abolition of slavery that the 21st rule ought to be established. When the petition was laid upon the table it was an answer, and showed that the prayer of the petition was refused. Suppose a petition were presented to that House asking to apply the torch of destruction to the capitol, ought such a petition to be received? No; because it was asking us to commit a felony. And did not these petitions ask the destruction of the temple of liberty itself? Where was the difference, therefore, between receiving such a petition as he had alluded to, and receiving abolition petitions, which pray for a thing which all admit ought not to be done? The 21st rule, so far from being wrong, was, in fact, perfectly right in itself. It was the judgment of the House upon the subject; and so far from being productive of injury, it had been productive of good; why? Because it had kept off that continual clamor which would otherwise have prevailed, about the abolition of slavery. He must be permitted to say to the gentleman from New York, in good feeling, that he was deceiving himself by supposing that the discussion which was going on there produced no mischief elsewhere. Yes, the very proclamation which the gentleman from Massachusetts had made, that he had triumphed upon this question, was already producing mischief elsewhere. As soon as the colored population were led to believe that they would receive especial encouragement and protection from the Congress of the United States, they would be ready for almost any act of insubordination.

It is important to the Democracy of the Union that the Democracy of each State should be kept in the ascendant, and in union and harmony in itself, and it is perhaps undeniable that no party can be long permanent and predominant in the Union, unless it has the support of some or all of the larger States.

Against the principle here asserted, we enter our most solemn protest. The effect of it will be to get a system of corrupt political bargaining among the party leaders in the larger States, and to establish in each of these larger States a secret political junta, charged with the distribution of the honors and emoluments of office, controlling the selection of candidates and dictating the measures of government. The minority of the party, however much they may disapprove, must throw their weight and influence in favor of men and measures adopted and put forth by their party leaders, or unite with their political opponents to resist them. The effect therefore of yielding our support to this principle, will be to encourage these party leaders to select their candidates and adopt these measures in reference to their own selfish purposes of individual aggrandizement, regardless of the interests of the great body of the people, or of the principles of the party. Such a party organization is dangerous to public liberty, and it is the duty of every man, whatever he may have been his previous party associations, to unite with us in resisting it.

It was urged in the Syracuse Convention that the practice is to elect the electors by general ticket, and they say that they believe it would violate the creed, and change the practice of the Democratic party to choose delegates by districts, while the electors are chosen by general ticket. We do not feel ourselves called upon now to discuss the question, whether the choice of electors by districts is most in accordance with Democratic usage and principles. The choice of electors to carry into effect the will of the democratic party after that will has been fairly and properly ascertained and expressed is a disposition entirely distinct from the choice of delegates to a convention, whose duty it is to consult, and after due consultation to select a candidate to be voted for. The selection of the candidate makes the issue between us and our political opponents, and we may fully admit that when that selection is fairly and properly made, it becomes our duty to sustain the selection thus made, and that it is a question for the Democratic party in each State to determine for themselves in what manner they can best aid the Democratic cause in such issue. For a very different question is presented in a Democratic Convention. The question there is between persons of the same political faith and principles, met together for the purpose of consulting upon whom it is their duty to unite as a means of consolidating their strength; and we need not go further than the analysis of the seven States given above, to illustrate the injustice, the fatal injustice, of adopting the principle asserted by the Syracuse Convention, for we candidly believe that Mr. Van Buren, (the candidate recommended by that convention, and who, if its principle prevails, will not doubt be nominated at Baltimore,) will not obtain a single electoral vote in the seven States, thus making the nomination. In 1840 he was sustained by all the influence of the power and patronage of the Government, and yet these seven States, with the exception of Virginia, now giving a majority of the electoral vote, all voted against him. Who can name for him now? And who, that is not blinded by the most fatal party delusion, in the face of these facts and the radical and conclusive objections to the organization of the Baltimore Convention, can believe that he can be elected? It is preposterous—impossible. This brings us to consider what we should do in this great emergency. Shall we patiently acquiesce, and go into a hopeless contest forced upon us by intriguing and interested persons, who see no prospect of being restored to office but in the re-election of a candidate whom the people have rejected, and by doing so, abandon our principles, or shall we rally in their support as freemen?

For our services, we are resolved. We desire to act in harmony with, and to preserve the integrity of, the Democratic party. We wish to secure the triumph of our principles, by selecting a candidate nominated in such a manner as to unite and arouse its energies in his support. We cannot concur in any nomination to be made by the Baltimore Convention, because we cannot acquiesce in the principle on which it is to be organized. Chagrined, as we have been, by the Republican voters of the city and county of New York, with recommending measures for the preservation of their free and unbiased right of suffrage, we have deemed it expedient to ascertain, as far as practicable, the public sentiment of the party as to the best and surest means of preserving harmony and of securing the success of our candidate, and as the only hope of accomplishing these desirable ends, after due deliberation and consultation, we propose that the voters in each Congressional district in the United States shall, at such time and place as they may deem fit, elect one delegate to a convention to be held in the city of Philadelphia, in the State House, where our fathers declared our independence, to nominate on the 4th day of July next, (the anniversary of that day on which we became a free people,) a candidate to be supported by the democratic party. The delegates thus chosen in each State to choose two others for such State and all of them, when in Convention, to vote per capita. That the candidate of the party, if thus nominated, will be elected, is as certain that the candidate nominated by the Baltimore Convention will be defeated. On the one hand is union, harmony, and success, because the nomination would be a fair expression of the party; on the other is disunion, discord, and defeat, because the nomination will be in violation of the spirit and letter of the Constitution.

We have seen that the proposed organization of the Baltimore Convention is urged, as a means of preserving the controlling influence of the large States. Now it might be well objected, that none of the States but those in which the democratic candidate will receive a majority, admit into the Convention, delegates from other States, which cannot send a single democratic electoral vote into the electoral college, and why do they do so? Is it not because they desire to give to each part of the democratic family, that influence in the selection of a candidate, which was contemplated by the Constitution—which gave to New York 36 votes, not because New York was a State, but because New York as a State, contains a population, which, as compared with the population of the other States, entitles that population to 36 votes. The 36 votes are given to the people of the State and not to the State. In deed, when the State, comes to vote as a State, the 36 representatives in Congress, give but one vote in 36, thus negating the principle asserted by the Syracuse Convention, which would enable the voters of 7 States to control the votes of the other nineteen States, in violation of the principle asserted in the Constitution.

But it is not only as advocates of the rights of the people of this and the other States, who protest against the proceedings of the Syracuse Convention, and the manner in which the Baltimore Convention is to be organized. We who wish to preserve good

faith with the whole democratic family—who wish to give effect to the will of the people, protest in our own behalf, and in the name of public liberty, against proceedings which are an utter abandonment of our principles; which enable a minority to control the majority—and we protest the more earnestly, because our political opponents, taking advantage of our discussions, have constituted their convention by a distinct representation on the democratic basis. Names are things, and when we remember how often the federal party have changed their name, and that but for the act of God, their change of name and Mr. Van Buren's want of popularity, would have enabled them to impose upon us a National Bank, with other measures most prejudicial to our interests, we are admonished of the necessity of adhering to our principles and preserving the democratic platform, not only for this, but for every other contest, with our political opponents. We would urge an immediate and energetic organization. The time has come, when the people must act together—and for themselves—to do this they must organize—let no one put off until to-morrow, what should be done to-day. Meet together—organize committees—select your delegates to the democratic convention, and, as you value public liberty, exert yourselves in support of the candidate whom they may nominate.

We have said that our political opponents, taking advantage of our discussions, have constituted their convention by districts, on the Democratic basis; it is proper that we should add that, as a party, their proceedings, and especially the measures adopted during the extra session of the late Congress, as the test questions of their party, are liable to the objections we urge against the proceedings of the Syracuse Convention. It is well known that those measures were discussed and adopted in caucus, and that members of Congress, elected by and responsible to the people; sworn to preserve and protect the Constitution; bound to discharge their duty so as best to promote the welfare of their constituents, have surrendered their judgment and their votes at the dictation of an irresponsible body, sitting in concealment who hide their proceedings from the public eye, because their deeds being evil, they dare not perform them in open day. It is the duty of the people to rescue the Government from such a despotism; and we call upon you to rally with us in sending delegates to Philadelphia, there to declare our independence of King Caucus upon the spot, and on the anniversary of the day on which our ancestors declared their independence of King George. Let it not be said that this is a proposition to divide the party. The party is already divided; and they are so divided because a few unworthy men seek to rule or ruin us, and because in their attempt to do this, they have abused our confidence and deserted our principles. So far from intending to divide the party, we propose this measure as the only means of producing union and concert.

If the advocates of the Baltimore Convention desire the election of a Democratic candidate, let them abandon their caucus dictation and unite with us in giving a fair and unbiased expression to the will of the party; but if they are resolved to rule or ruin, if they prefer to deal with the candidate nominated by a Convention, organized upon a principle which enables a corrupt combination of a few intriguing politicians to control and defeat the will and the preferences of the party, to success with a candidate nominated by a Convention organized upon a principle which gives full effect to the will and secures the preference of the people, upon them and not upon us be the responsibility. They may, by the desertion of our principles and dividing our party, defeat us now; they may place power in the hands of our political opponents; they may thus, for a time, rule us; but ruin us they cannot. Truth and public virtue are immortal, and it is for us, fellow citizens, the tax-paying people, to rally upon the principles of the Constitution, and thus to preserve and perpetuate the free institutions of our country.

COMMITTEE.
Abm. D. Wilson, Charles A. Clinton,
George E. Baldwin, J. L. H. McCrackan,
Edmund S. Derry, John Murphy,
Mad. Platt, William Francis,
Stephen Hasbrouck, Samuel R. McNeven,
Robert Berney, F. T. Forns,
J. F. Hutton, Abm. T. Hillier,
Joseph Le Count, Eccles Gillender,
Samuel A. Lawrence, Henry A. Alvarius, sen.
Charles Stuart, Emanuel B. Hart,
Thomas S. Gibbs, George Dixey.

Five Negroes FOR SALE.
I INTEND to sell at public auction in front of the Court House door in the town of Charlotte, on Tuesday the 27th of February, 1844; (being Tuesday of our Superior Court.) FIVE LIKELY NEGROES belonging to the estate of M. T. C. Kennedy, dec'd. viz.,
SAM, 50 or 60 years old, a good Farmer;
MILTON, 24, " a good carriage driver and wagoner;
CHARLES, 16, " a good field hand;
LUCINDA, 22, " a first rate cook and house servant;
CAROLINE, 14, " a field hand.
Terms, nine months credit, with interest from date, note and approved security.
MARY KENNEDY, Executrix.
January 30, 1844. 46cts.

JOSEPH HOLLIFIELD, DENTIST.
HAVING located himself permanently in the professional services to the citizens of the village and the surrounding country. Having been engaged in the practice of his profession for a number of years, he flatters himself that he can give entire satisfaction to all such as may need his services. His terms shall be very moderate. A portion of public patronage is respectfully solicited. Examinations made and advice given gratis, and the poor served gratis. Dr. H. may at all times be found at the Charlotte Hotel, in Charlotte. Patients in the country will be visited without extra charge.
February 1, 1844. 46cts.

SOLD OUT!
Lucy Springs
ANNOUNCES to his customers and friends, that he has sold out his stock of goods to Charles E. Moss & Co., and has retired from business. He tenders his sincere thanks to a generous public for the very liberal patronage received at their hands while merchandizing, and would respectfully recommend his former friends and customers to call on his successors, C. E. M. & Co., who he feels sure will accommodate them with as good bargains as can be had in this country.

L. S. would also state, that having now retired from business, it is positively necessary to close up his books without delay. Those, therefore, who are indebted to him by book account, must call and settle immediately. It would be extremely painful to have to force collections; but those who do not settle in a short time will find their accounts in the possession of a collecting officer. This is the last notice that will be given on the subject.
Feb. 1, 1844. 46cts.

It is thus apparent that the principle of the organization of the Baltimore Convention is, that 19 votes in New York are to be counted as 36; 14 in Pennsylvania, as 26; 9 in Virginia, as 17; and that the 75 votes in the seven States controlling the nomination are enabled thus to control it, because the sixty-four minority votes are to be given in favor of the candidate selected by the 75. To say that it will rarely, if ever happen, that the districts in these seven States will be so divided as to make the case here presented, does not meet the issue, because the principle remains the same, whether the rights, interests and preferences thus to be trodden under foot, be of one or of sixty-four districts.

The reason assigned by the Syracuse Convention is no less objectionable than the principle itself. It is that this concentration of the power of the LARGER STATES is indispensable to secure their ASCENDANCY in the Democratic party. For, says one of their resolutions:

It is important to the Democracy of the Union that the Democracy of each State should be kept in the ascendant, and in union and harmony in itself, and it is perhaps undeniable that no party can be long permanent and predominant in the Union, unless it has the support of some or all of the larger States.

Against the principle here asserted, we enter our most solemn protest. The effect of it will be to get a system of corrupt political bargaining among the party leaders in the larger States, and to establish in each of these larger States a secret political junta, charged with the distribution of the honors and emoluments of office, controlling the selection of candidates and dictating the measures of government. The minority of the party, however much they may disapprove, must throw their weight and influence in favor of men and measures adopted and put forth by their party leaders, or unite with their political opponents to resist them. The effect therefore of yielding our support to this principle, will be to encourage these party leaders to select their candidates and adopt these measures in reference to their own selfish purposes of individual aggrandizement, regardless of the interests of the great body of the people, or of the principles of the party. Such a party organization is dangerous to public liberty, and it is the duty of every man, whatever he may have been his previous party associations, to unite with us in resisting it.

It was urged in the Syracuse Convention that the practice is to elect the electors by general ticket, and they say that they believe it would violate the creed, and change the practice of the Democratic party to choose delegates by districts, while the electors are chosen by general ticket. We do not feel ourselves called upon now to discuss the question, whether the choice of electors by districts is most in accordance with Democratic usage and principles. The choice of electors to carry into effect the will of the democratic party after that will has been fairly and properly ascertained and expressed is a disposition entirely distinct from the choice of delegates to a convention, whose duty it is to consult, and after due consultation to select a candidate to be voted for. The selection of the candidate makes the issue between us and our political opponents, and we may fully admit that when that selection is fairly and properly made, it becomes our duty to sustain the selection thus made, and that it is a question for the Democratic party in each State to determine for themselves in what manner they can best aid the Democratic cause in such issue. For a very different question is presented in a Democratic Convention. The question there is between persons of the same political faith and principles, met together for the purpose of consulting upon whom it is their duty to unite as a means of consolidating their strength; and we need not go further than the analysis of the seven States given above, to illustrate the injustice, the fatal injustice, of adopting the principle asserted by the Syracuse Convention, for we candidly believe that Mr. Van Buren, (the candidate recommended by that convention, and who, if its principle prevails, will not doubt be nominated at Baltimore,) will not obtain a single electoral vote in the seven States, thus making the nomination. In 1840 he was sustained by all the influence of the power and patronage of the Government, and yet these seven States, with the exception of Virginia, now giving a majority of the electoral vote, all voted against him. Who can name for him now? And who, that is not blinded by the most fatal party delusion, in the face of these facts and the radical and conclusive objections to the organization of the Baltimore Convention, can believe that he can be elected? It is preposterous—impossible. This brings us to consider what we should do in this great emergency. Shall we patiently acquiesce, and go into a hopeless contest forced upon us by intriguing and interested persons, who see no prospect of being restored to office but in the re-election of a candidate whom the people have rejected, and by doing so, abandon our principles, or shall we rally in their support as freemen?

For our services, we are resolved. We desire to act in harmony with, and to preserve the integrity of, the Democratic party. We wish to secure the triumph of our principles, by selecting a candidate nominated in such a manner as to unite and arouse its energies in his support. We cannot concur in any nomination to be made by the Baltimore Convention, because we cannot acquiesce in the principle on which it is to be organized. Chagrined, as we have been, by the Republican voters of the city and county of New York, with recommending measures for the preservation of their free and unbiased right of suffrage, we have deemed it expedient to ascertain, as far as practicable, the public sentiment of the party as to the best and surest means of preserving harmony and of securing the success of our candidate, and as the only hope of accomplishing these desirable ends, after due deliberation and consultation, we propose that the voters in each Congressional district in the United States shall, at such time and place as they may deem fit, elect one delegate to a convention to be held in the city of Philadelphia, in the State House, where our fathers declared our independence, to nominate on the 4th day of July next, (the anniversary of that day on which we became a free people,) a candidate to be supported by the democratic party. The delegates thus chosen in each State to choose two others for such State and all of them, when in Convention, to vote per capita. That the candidate of the party, if thus nominated, will be elected, is as certain that the candidate nominated by the Baltimore Convention will be defeated. On the one hand is union, harmony, and success, because the nomination would be a fair expression of the party; on the other is disunion, discord, and defeat, because the nomination will be in violation of the spirit and letter of the Constitution.

It is important to the Democracy of the Union that the Democracy of each State should be kept in the ascendant, and in union and harmony in itself, and it is perhaps undeniable that no party can be long permanent and predominant in the Union, unless it has the support of some or all of the larger States.

Against the principle here asserted, we enter our most solemn protest. The effect of it will be to get a system of corrupt political bargaining among the party leaders in the larger States, and to establish in each of these larger States a secret political junta, charged with the distribution of the honors and emoluments of office, controlling the selection of candidates and dictating the measures of government. The minority of the party, however much they may disapprove, must throw their weight and influence in favor of men and measures adopted and put forth by their party leaders, or unite with their political opponents to resist them. The effect therefore of yielding our support to this principle, will be to encourage these party leaders to select their candidates and adopt these measures in reference to their own selfish purposes of individual aggrandizement, regardless of the interests of the great body of the people, or of the principles of the party. Such a party organization is dangerous to public liberty, and it is the duty of every man, whatever he may have been his previous party associations, to unite with us in resisting it.

It was urged in the Syracuse Convention that the practice is to elect the electors by general ticket, and they say that they believe it would violate the creed, and change the practice of the Democratic party to choose delegates by districts, while the electors are chosen by general ticket. We do not feel ourselves called upon now to discuss the question, whether the choice of electors by districts is most in accordance with Democratic usage and principles. The choice of electors to carry into effect the will of the democratic party after that will has been fairly and properly ascertained and expressed is a disposition entirely distinct from the choice of delegates to a convention, whose duty it is to consult, and after due consultation to select a candidate to be voted for. The selection of the candidate makes the issue between us and our political opponents, and we may fully admit that when that selection is fairly and properly made, it becomes our duty to sustain the selection thus made, and that it is a question for the Democratic party in each State to determine for themselves in what manner they can best aid the Democratic cause in such issue. For a very different question is presented in a Democratic Convention. The question there is between persons of the same political faith and principles, met together for the purpose of consulting upon whom it is their duty to unite as a means of consolidating their strength; and we need not go further than the analysis of the seven States given above, to illustrate the injustice, the fatal injustice, of adopting the principle asserted by the Syracuse Convention, for we candidly believe that Mr. Van Buren, (the candidate recommended by that convention, and who, if its principle prevails, will not doubt be nominated at Baltimore,) will not obtain a single electoral vote in the seven States, thus making the nomination. In 1840 he was sustained by all the influence of the power and patronage of the Government, and yet these seven States, with the exception of Virginia, now giving a majority of the electoral vote, all voted against him. Who can name for him now? And who, that is not blinded by the most fatal party delusion, in the face of these facts and the radical and conclusive objections to the organization of the Baltimore Convention, can believe that he can be elected? It is preposterous—impossible. This brings us to consider what we should do in this great emergency. Shall we patiently acquiesce, and go into a hopeless contest forced upon us by intriguing and interested persons, who see no prospect of being restored to office but in the re-election of a candidate whom the people have rejected, and by doing so, abandon our principles, or shall we rally in their support as freemen?

For our services, we are resolved. We desire to act in harmony with, and to preserve the integrity of, the Democratic party. We wish to secure the triumph of our principles, by selecting a candidate nominated in such a manner as to unite and arouse its energies in his support. We cannot concur in any nomination to be made by the Baltimore Convention, because we cannot acquiesce in the principle on which it is to be organized. Chagrined, as we have been, by the Republican voters of the city and county of New York, with recommending measures for the preservation of their free and unbiased right of suffrage, we have deemed it expedient to ascertain, as far as practicable, the public sentiment of the party as to the best and surest means of preserving harmony and of securing the success of our candidate, and as the only hope of accomplishing these desirable ends, after due deliberation and consultation, we propose that the voters in each Congressional district in the United States shall, at such time and place as they may deem fit, elect one delegate to a convention to be held in the city of Philadelphia, in the State House, where our fathers declared our independence, to nominate on the 4th day of July next, (the anniversary of that day on which we became a free people,) a candidate to be supported by the democratic party. The delegates thus chosen in each State to choose two others for such State and all of them, when in Convention, to vote per capita. That the candidate of the party, if thus nominated, will be elected, is as certain that the candidate nominated by the Baltimore Convention will be defeated. On the one hand is union, harmony, and success, because the nomination would be a fair expression of the party; on the other is disunion, discord, and defeat, because the nomination will be in violation of the spirit and letter of the Constitution.

We have seen that the proposed organization of the Baltimore Convention is urged, as a means of preserving the controlling influence of the large States. Now it might be well objected, that none of the States but those in which the democratic candidate will receive a majority, admit into the Convention, delegates from other States, which cannot send a single democratic electoral vote into the electoral college, and why do they do so? Is it not because they desire to give to each part of the democratic family, that influence in the selection of a candidate, which was contemplated by the Constitution—which gave to New York 36 votes, not because New York was a State, but because New York as a State, contains a population, which, as compared with the population of the other States, entitles that population to 36 votes. The 36 votes are given to the people of the State and not to the State. In deed, when the State, comes to vote as a State, the 36 representatives in Congress, give but one vote in 36, thus negating the principle asserted by the Syracuse Convention, which would enable the voters of 7 States to control the votes of the other nineteen States, in violation of the principle asserted in the Constitution.

But it is not only as advocates of the rights of the people of this and the other States, who protest against the proceedings of the Syracuse Convention, and the manner in which the Baltimore Convention is to be organized. We who wish to preserve good

faith with the whole democratic family—who wish to give effect to the will of the people, protest in our own behalf, and in the name of public liberty, against proceedings which are an utter abandonment of our principles; which enable a minority to control the majority—and we protest the more earnestly, because our political opponents, taking advantage of our discussions, have constituted their convention by a distinct representation on the democratic basis. Names are things, and when we remember how often the federal party have changed their name, and that but for the act of God, their change of name and Mr. Van Buren's want of popularity, would have enabled them to impose upon us a National Bank, with other measures most prejudicial to our interests, we are admonished of the necessity of adhering to our principles and preserving the democratic platform, not only for this, but for every other contest, with our political opponents. We would urge an immediate and energetic organization. The time has come, when the people must act together—and for themselves—to do this they must organize—let no one put off until to-morrow, what should be done to-day. Meet together—organize committees—select your delegates to the democratic convention, and, as you value public liberty, exert yourselves in support of the candidate whom they may nominate.

We have said that our political opponents, taking advantage of our discussions, have constituted their convention by districts, on the Democratic basis; it is proper that we should add that, as a party, their proceedings, and especially the measures adopted during the extra session of the late Congress, as the test questions of their party, are liable to the objections we urge against the proceedings of the Syracuse Convention. It is well known that those measures were discussed and adopted in caucus, and that members of Congress, elected by and responsible to the people; sworn to preserve and protect the Constitution; bound to discharge their duty so as best to promote the welfare of their constituents, have surrendered their judgment and their votes at the dictation of an irresponsible body, sitting in concealment who hide their proceedings from the public eye, because their deeds being evil, they dare not perform them in open day. It is the duty of the people to rescue the Government from such a despotism; and we call upon you to rally with us in sending delegates to Philadelphia, there to declare our independence of King Caucus upon the spot, and on the anniversary of the day on which our ancestors declared their independence of King George. Let it not be said that this is a proposition to divide the party. The party is already divided; and they are so divided because a few unworthy men seek to rule or ruin us, and because in their attempt to do this, they have abused our confidence and deserted our principles. So far from intending to divide the party, we propose this measure as the only means of producing union and concert.

If the advocates of the Baltimore Convention desire the election of a Democratic candidate, let them abandon their caucus dictation and unite with us in giving a fair and unbiased expression to the will of the party; but if they are resolved to rule or ruin, if they prefer to deal with the candidate nominated by a Convention, organized upon a principle which enables a corrupt combination of a few intriguing politicians to control and defeat the will and the preferences of the party, to success with a candidate nominated by a Convention organized upon a principle which gives full effect to the will and secures the preference of the people, upon them and not upon us be the responsibility. They may, by the desertion of our principles and dividing our party, defeat us now; they may place power in the hands of our political opponents; they may thus, for a time, rule us; but ruin us they cannot. Truth and public virtue are immortal, and it is for us, fellow citizens, the tax-paying people, to rally upon the principles of the Constitution, and thus to preserve and perpetuate the free institutions of our country.

COMMITTEE.
Abm. D. Wilson, Charles A. Clinton,
George E. Baldwin, J. L. H. McCrackan,
Edmund S. Derry, John Murphy,
Mad. Platt, William Francis,
Stephen Hasbrouck, Samuel R. McNeven,
Robert Berney, F. T. Forns,
J. F. Hutton, Abm. T. Hillier,
Joseph Le Count, Eccles Gillender,
Samuel A. Lawrence, Henry A. Alvarius, sen.
Charles Stuart, Emanuel B. Hart,
Thomas S. Gibbs, George Dixey.

Five Negroes FOR SALE.
I INTEND to sell at public auction in front of the Court House door in the town of Charlotte, on Tuesday the 27th of February, 1844; (being Tuesday of our Superior Court.) FIVE LIKELY NEGROES belonging to the estate of M. T. C. Kennedy, dec'd. viz.,
SAM, 50 or 60 years old, a good Farmer;
MILTON, 24, " a good carriage driver and wagoner;
CHARLES, 16, " a good field hand;
LUCINDA, 22, " a first rate cook and house servant;
CAROLINE, 14, " a field hand.
Terms, nine months credit, with interest from date, note and approved security.
MARY KENNEDY, Executrix.
January 30, 1844. 46cts.

JOSEPH HOLLIFIELD, DENTIST.
HAVING located himself permanently in the professional services to the citizens of the village and the surrounding country. Having been engaged in the practice of his profession for a number of years, he flatters himself that he can give entire satisfaction to all such as may need his services. His terms shall be very moderate. A portion of public patronage is respectfully solicited. Examinations made and advice given gratis, and the poor served gratis. Dr. H. may at all times be found at the Charlotte Hotel, in Charlotte. Patients in the country will be visited without extra charge.
February 1, 1844. 46cts.

SOLD OUT!
Lucy Springs
ANNOUNCES to his customers and friends, that he has sold out his stock of goods to Charles E. Moss & Co., and has retired from business. He tenders his sincere thanks to a generous public for the very liberal patronage received at their hands while merchandizing, and would respectfully recommend his former friends and customers to call on his successors, C. E. M. & Co., who he feels sure will accommodate them with as good bargains as can be had in this country.

L. S. would also state, that having now retired from business, it is positively necessary to close up his books without delay. Those, therefore, who are indebted to him by book account, must call and settle immediately. It would be extremely painful to have to force collections; but those who do not settle in a short time will find their accounts in the possession of a collecting officer. This is the last notice that will be given on the subject.
Feb. 1, 1844. 46cts.

It is important to the Democracy of the Union that the Democracy of each State should be kept in the ascendant, and in union and harmony in itself, and it is perhaps undeniable that no party can be long permanent and predominant in the Union, unless it has the support of some or all of the larger States.

Against the principle here asserted, we enter our most solemn protest. The effect of it will be to get a system of corrupt political bargaining among the party leaders in the larger States, and to establish in each of these larger States a secret political junta, charged with the distribution of the honors and emoluments of office, controlling the selection of candidates and dictating the measures of government. The minority of the party, however much they may disapprove, must throw their weight and influence in favor of men and measures adopted and put forth by their party leaders, or unite with their political opponents to resist them. The effect therefore of yielding our support to this principle, will be to encourage these party leaders to select their candidates and adopt these measures in reference to their own selfish purposes of individual aggrandizement, regardless of the interests of the great body of the people, or of the principles of the party. Such a party organization is dangerous to public liberty, and it is the duty of every man, whatever he may have been his previous party associations, to unite with us in resisting it.

It was urged in the Syracuse Convention that the practice is to elect the electors by general ticket, and they say that they believe it would violate the creed, and change the practice of the Democratic party to choose delegates by districts, while the electors are chosen by general ticket. We do not feel ourselves called upon now to discuss the question, whether the choice of electors by districts is most in accordance with Democratic usage and principles. The choice of electors to carry into effect the will of the democratic party after that will has been fairly and properly ascertained and expressed is a disposition entirely distinct from the choice of delegates to a convention, whose duty it is to consult, and after due consultation to select a candidate to be voted for. The selection of the candidate makes the issue between us and our political opponents, and we may fully admit that when that selection is fairly and properly made, it becomes our duty to sustain the selection thus made, and that it is a question for the Democratic party in each State to determine for themselves in what manner they can best aid the Democratic cause in such issue. For a very different question is presented in a Democratic Convention. The question there is between persons of the same political faith and principles, met together for the purpose of consulting upon whom it is their duty to unite as a means of consolidating their strength; and we need not go further than the analysis of the seven States given above, to illustrate the injustice, the fatal injustice, of adopting the principle asserted by the Syracuse Convention, for we candidly believe that Mr. Van Buren, (the candidate recommended by that convention, and who, if its principle prevails, will not doubt be nominated at Baltimore,) will not obtain a single electoral vote in the seven States, thus making the nomination. In 1840 he was sustained by all the influence of the power and patronage of the Government, and yet these seven States, with the exception of Virginia, now giving a majority of the electoral vote, all voted against him. Who can name for him now? And who, that is not blinded by the most fatal party delusion, in the face of these facts and the radical and conclusive objections to the organization of the Baltimore Convention, can believe that he can be elected? It is preposterous—impossible. This brings us to consider what we should do in this great emergency. Shall we patiently acquiesce, and go into a hopeless contest forced upon us by intriguing and interested persons, who see no prospect of being restored to office but in the re-election of a candidate whom the people have rejected, and by doing so, abandon our principles, or shall we rally in their support as freemen?

For our services, we are resolved. We desire to act in harmony with, and to preserve the integrity of, the Democratic party. We wish to secure the triumph of our principles, by selecting a candidate nominated in such a manner as to unite and arouse its energies in his support. We cannot concur in any nomination to be made by the Baltimore Convention, because we cannot acquiesce in the principle on which it is to be organized. Chagrined, as we have been, by the Republican voters of the city and county of New York, with recommending measures for the preservation of their free and unbiased right of suffrage, we have deemed it expedient to ascertain, as far as practicable, the public sentiment of the party as to the best and surest means of preserving harmony and of securing the success of our candidate, and as the only hope of accomplishing these desirable ends, after due deliberation and consultation, we propose that the voters in each Congressional district in the United States shall, at such time and place as they may deem fit, elect one delegate to a convention to be held in the city of Philadelphia, in the State House, where our fathers declared our independence, to nominate on the 4th day of July next, (the anniversary of that day on which we became a free people,) a candidate to be supported by the democratic party. The delegates thus chosen in each State to choose two others for such State and all of them, when in Convention, to vote per capita. That the candidate of the party, if thus nominated, will be elected, is as certain that the candidate nominated by the Baltimore Convention will be defeated. On the one hand is union, harmony, and success, because the nomination would be a fair expression of the party; on the other is disunion, discord, and defeat, because the nomination will be in violation of the spirit and letter of the Constitution.

We have seen that the proposed organization of the Baltimore Convention is urged, as a means of preserving the controlling influence of the large States. Now it might be well objected, that none of