

Hillsborough Recorder.

UNION, THE CONSTITUTION, AND THE LAWS—THE GUARDIANS OF OUR LIBERTY

Vol. XVII.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1836.

No. 543.

JUDGE WHITE—THE SPOILS PARTY.

From the Raleigh Star.
It is but a short time since the farmer of Tennessee was, in the estimation of the party, a man of unblemished character, of high intellectual attainments, and a statesman who would adorn any station in the Republic. Now, he is, they would have people believe, "an apostate" in principle, a weak old man, totally unworthy of public confidence.

Is it true he is "an apostate," and how, if he is not, are we to account for the bitter violence with which the spoils mongers, with Mr. Ritchie at their head, assail "this purist of politicians," this Jeffersonian Republican?

The only subject upon which there is the appearance of inconsistency even in his public life, is the land bill. But any man of common honesty and common sense, will see that it was quite a different thing to vote against that measure when the public debt was unpaid, when the amount of the public revenue was unknown, and to vote against it after that debt was paid and when there was such an overflowing treasury as we have at present. Gen. Jackson's inconsistency is, that after recommending the measure as proper when the nation should be relieved of debt, he opposed his own recommendation.

Judge White came into Congress the advocate of a reduction of executive patronage. He is so now. The party who clamoured so lustily for it before General Jackson's election, and when its distribution was in other hands, are now opposed to it. Who are the apostates, the party of Judge White? He came into Congress opposed to any attempt to influence the elections by the patronage of the federal government. He still continues opposed to it. The party clamoured against Adams for removing a few printers, declared the purity of the press in danger, and saw in the President an embryo monarch. Now every printer in the United States opposed to the "near prescriptive" has been removed, and offices are bestowed with the manifest and secretly concealed design of promoting his election. Who are apostates, the party of Judge White?

The Judge came into Congress opposed to proscribing men for the temperate and independent exercise of their privileges as citizens. He continues so still. The party act on the principle that partisan services are to be rewarded at the public expense, and that the offices created for the people's benefit are "spoils" to be divided out among their retainers. Whose is the apostasy, Judge White's or the party's?

Judge White came into the Senate of the United States in favor of an economical administration of the government; believing that simplicity in a Republic was far preferable to splendid extravagance. The party made like professions when asking power at the hands of the people. What has been their practice? They have doubled, and trebled the public expenditures in eight years. Who has stuck to principle, and who has apostasized here?

The Tennessee Senator came into Congress, opposed to internal improvements by the federal government, believing them unconstitutional, unjust in their operations, because partial; and dangerous to public morals because they introduced a system of log rolling into the legislation of the country. He has uniformly acted on his principles. How do the party stand? They have no principles on this subject. Some are for toll gates on the Cumberland road—some for internal improvements below ports of entry—some for national works; in fine each man fights pretty much on his own hook. Yet they are the Van Buren democratic party, "one and indivisible." Judge White was opposed to any Bank of the United States; he is now. On this subject too, the party are much in the same glorious state of *betweenthy*, notwithstanding all their clamor, as on the subject of internal improvements. They have no principle in common. Bank men and anti-Bank men, National Bank men and Executive Bank men, all are found in this same immaculate Jackson Van Buren Amos Kendall Isaac Hill Faneu Democratic party.

Judge White in 1824 was opposed to a caucus, as unwarrantable dictation to the people, and a dangerous usurpation of popular rights. He still continues that opposition. How stands the case with the party; who were so much alarmed at the Congressional Caucus which nominated William H. Crawford for the Presidency? Do they still continue that opposition? No, they have taken up as their candidate, the President of that same Congressional Caucus, and by means of a caucus a thousand times more objectionable, composed of office holders and office hunters, without constituents, and without any very great pretensions

to character or wisdom, have sought to do what they so loudly condemned in 1824, and regarded as such a dangerous interference with the people's rights.—Who are the apostates, we repeat again, the party or the Judge?

Judge White has always been in favor of the domestic institutions of the south, and opposed to any interference with slave property by the general government.—He maintains with inflexible firmness his old opinions. What position does the party occupy in relation to this question? They profess the same attachment, the same abhorrence of Congressional interference as does the Judge. (We speak out of the northern portion of the party, many of whom are rank abolitionists) yet they have as their candidate a Missouri Restrictionist, and a district abolitionist, and for the Vice Presidency a practical amalgamator, whom the Louisville Journal charges (we hope not truly) with having married a black wife!! Such, fellow citizens, are the principles of Hugh Lawson White, and such the want of principle in that arrogant and piebald faction which has the effrontery to talk of other people's apostasy. They themselves, (and when we speak of the spoils party we mean the leaders) are apostates, unless indeed it be true, that men who have no principles cannot apostasize. If that be so, and not otherwise, they are consistent.

And why is it that Judge White, that "Jeffersonian republican" as old Mr. Aronson of the Enquirer called him in 1831, is so obnoxious to the spoils mongers? Simply because he consented that his fellow citizens of the United States might, if they thought proper, run him for the Presidency. Simply because he would not submit to the President's dictation and that of the steam caucus, and aid them in electing the Grimalkin.—For this contumacy, for this resistance to a daring encroachment and usurpation of the people's rights, this distinguished son of North Carolina, whose purity and virtue are without a stain, who has served his country in many and important stations with signal ability, is covered with defamation by the hired presses of the party, and especially by that \$82,000 pensionary, Francis P. Blair. Republicans of North Carolina, are you prepared to aid in prostrating this man, who does honor to our state, whose principles are our principles, whose interests are our interests! and for whom? For that man who has in every great emergency, and upon every great principle, been our bitter and deadly foe. Are you to be driven from your choice because the President wishes it? Are you willing to surrender your right of judging of men's qualifications for office to a caucus?

ELECTORAL VOTE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

We see the attempt simultaneously made by the tory papers in this state, to create the impression, that if the whig electoral ticket is elected, the vote of North Carolina will be given for Harrison. There is but little doubt this is a concerted movement, originating in that system of fraud and deception which the spoils mongers have so frequently practised. We meet their assertions with a flat contradiction. The persons nominated on the whig ticket were nominated by the friends of Judge White, and will cast their votes for him unless otherwise instructed by the people. The story about the declaration of Mr. Joseph Seawell Jones in New York may or may not be true. But if it is, it was the expression of his own wishes and opinions merely, for which the opponents of the spoils mongers in this state, are in no wise responsible.

How the whigs of this state would vote, if their choice was between Harrison and Van Buren, it is not difficult to tell. We believe they would vote for Gen. Harrison. For although there are objections to him, and in our estimation great objections, yet they are not to be compared to those against Van Buren. He has not been nominated by an irresponsible caucus nor dictated by the President, nor is he an advocate of that system of tactics, by which the people wherever it prevails are virtually enslaved to a few unprincipled and ambitious demagogues.

The Standard might spare its affected fears about the election of an "emancipationist." He who supports a Missouri Restrictionist and District Abolitionist for President, and a practical amalgamator for Vice President, need have no fears about Gen. Harrison's heterodoxy on that subject, if it were true. But General Harrison, opposed as he is to slavery in the abstract, is not for emancipation, unless with the consent of the slave holders, and believes that Congress is clothed with no such power, as the following extract from a speech delivered by him in Vincennes in Indiana a non-slaveholding state in May 1835, will show: "Neither the

states where slavery does not exist, nor the government of the United States can, without usurpation of power and the violation of a solemn compact, do any thing to remove it, (slavery) without the consent of those immediately interested." In addition to this it will be recollected, that Gen. Harrison was in Congress from a non-slaveholding state too, when the Missouri question came up, and instead of joining that fanatical crusade as did Martin Van Buren, from considerations looking to his personal advancement, he resisted it and voted with the south, for which he was beaten at the next election. Now we put it to all honorable men, if it does not require just such a man as the tory editor to support Martin Van Buren, the Missouri Restrictionist and District Abolitionist, and to pretend to feel any apprehensions on the score of slave property from a man of Gen. Harrison's opinions. We wish not to be misunderstood. We are among those who believe that slavery, as it exists in the southern states, is a blessing rather than a curse. We know that this opinion differs from that of many at the south, and when Gen. Harrison said he wished to see the day when the sun would not shine on an American slave, he expressed the wish of many who are utterly opposed to the fanatics. But that is as wide as the poles are asunder, from countenancing as has done Martin Van Buren, an interference with slave property by the federal government, "without the consent of those who are immediately interested."

The charge of being an alien and seditious law Federalist is brought against Gen. Harrison, and upon the authority of a speech of Mr. John Randolph. The following reply of Gen. Harrison at the time, puts that charge to rest:

"But he was seriously charged with the heinous offence of associating with federal gentlemen. He pleaded guilty—he respected the revolutionary services of President Adams, and had paid him that courtesy which was due him as a man and as chief magistrate. He also associated with such men as John Marshall and James A. Bayard—was the acknowledgement of such guilt to throw him out of the pale of political salvation? On the other hand, he was on intimate terms with Mr. Gallatin, and with the whole Virginia delegation, among whom he had near kinsmen and dear friends. They were his principal associates in Philadelphia, in whose mess he had often met the gentleman who was now his accuser, and with whom he had spent some of the happiest hours of his life. It was true, as the Senator alleged, he had been appointed Governor of the North Western Territory by John Adams—so had he been by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. He was not in Congress when the standing army was created, and the alien and sedition laws were passed, and if he had been he could not have voted for them, and would not if he could. It was not in his nature to be a violent or proscriptionist partisan, but he had given a firm support to the republican administrations of Jefferson, Madison and Monroe."

But if Gen. Harrison were a Federalist he was not one of that squad of Federalists, desirous of crippling the energies of the country. He was not leagued with any party as was that immaculate democratic candidate Martin Van Buren, in opposing James Madison. He was in the field bravely defending his country and repelling her foes.

That Gen. Harrison was a tariff man we admit is true. For that reason among others we decidedly prefer Judge White. But it is inconceivable how those who support Van Buren should expect to escape exciting the scorn and disgust of all honest men, when they urge this as an objection against Harrison. Is his any more a tariff man than Mr. Van Buren or Dick Johnson, or did he vote for the imposition of any tariff which they or either of them voted against? The Standard knows he did not, we know not terms strong enough to characterize as it merits its shabby hypocrisy.

It may be a matter of surprise to the tory editor, that we should vindicate Gen. Harrison from its base calumnies. We are not surprised at it. A party which belongs to a party which enforces the most rigid discipline, and which as *aut nefus*, all who stand in its way cannot conceive that others who do not thus enslaved themselves, should be its enemy, an adversary, though that party is a war worn veteran.

If the Standard really wished to prevent the election of an "odious tariff man," and of one free from all suspicion of abolitionism, why not unite in the party with which it has never been charged, nor with an emancipationist, "a Federalist," or "a Bank man."

Is it not clear as a sunbeam, that the object of the tory and spoils editor is deception, fraud and imposture upon the people? And is it not equally clear that his charges against Gen. Harrison, even if they were true, apply with greater force to Martin Van Buren?

This movement of the spoils party, in striving to create the impression that the whig electors will vote for Harrison, makes it our duty again to warn the public against false charges and reports started on the eve of the election. Desperate and unscrupulous as we know some of the leaders of the party to be, we should not be surprised if they propagated a report that Judge White was withdrawn. His friends are determined to stick to him to the last, to give him as many votes as possible, and leave the consequences to God.

MR. SENATOR EWING, OF OHIO.

We copy with pleasure from an Ohio paper the subjoined letter from Thomas Ewing, honorable by courtesy, but twice honorable by nature, if we had no other evidence than this letter to prove it. We know no better illustration of the combined manliness, energy and intellectual vigour of the Great West, than is embodied in the person and mind of the writer of this letter; and, after reading it, we can conscientiously say that we believe no man ever better understood himself than Mr. Ewing does. He stands in the first rank of what the miserable demagogues of the day call "the aristocracy" of the country, that is to say, he is a true whig, and a friend to the Constitution and Laws of his country. Nat. Intell.

Lancaster, October 31, 1836.
Gentlemen:—I received your favor of the 27th ult. inviting me, in behalf of the working men of Cincinnati, to attend and address a meeting to be held by them on the 8th instant.

I would accept the invitation with pleasure if my other engagements would permit it, but unfortunately they do not. I must, therefore, deny myself the gratification which I should feel in meeting with so many of my fellow citizens, and joining with them in the discussion of subjects important to the character of our state, and to the pure republican institutions of our country. I should be more gratified to be with them, as I am assured they are, what they profess to be, real *working men*—a portion of the hard handed and sound-hearted yeomen and mechanics of our country; men on whose intelligence, integrity and patriotism, our republican Constitution must rest as the surest and strongest pillar which sustains and supports it.

You have been kind enough, in the letter which you wrote in their behalf, to speak in terms grateful to my feelings of the taunts and sneers which have been cast out against me for having once been a working man, and having labored with my own hands for my support and advancement. Many false things have been said and written of me, but this is not one of them. This is true. I admit the charge to the full extent. And if the working men in our Republic, then I am unworthy. If wealthy parentage, tender nurture, and youth spent in ease, in indulgence, or luxury, be essential to qualify a man for office in a Republic, then am I qualified, for I have had none of the advantages. My father was poor, and lived a life of hardship and privation.

When young he was a subaltern officer in the Revolution, and shared the fortune of many of the ardent youth of that day, who devoted themselves to the same glorious cause. At the close of the war he was cast upon the world without property, or the habit or the means of acquiring it. He left his native state, and sought a home in the frontier settlements, in the then "Far West," where I was born, in a very humble shed, and reared, not, surely, in the lap of luxury. With my mental and physical powers as my only inheritance, I was brought up a working man, or, rather, a working boy—among the People, and truly one of them—and I have no regret that my lot was so cast.

I have seen, and known, and felt, how much of manly sense, shrewdness of observation, sterling worth, and generous feeling, are concealed beneath the rough exterior of the plain working men of our country. I know them well, for I have been an inmate of their homes, a guest at their tables, and one amid the social circle around their firesides; and I look back to those scenes, not only with pleasure, but with pride.

I am proud to feel that I carry with me something of the true character and spirit of the American working man. I was early imbued with that spirit—I imbibed it in infancy—I grew up with it to manhood, and I trust I shall retain it to the latest period of my life. And if to

these characteristics, which I claim with them as our common heritage—if to their sound good sense, just moral feeling, patriotic devotion and firmness in the support of the right, I have been able to add that knowledge which is the fruit of long and laborious study—that faculty for business which springs from habit—something of literary taste, and a talent for public speaking, which enables me to bring the powers of my mind and my stores of knowledge into use, then I claim that, even without the advantage of high birth or early fortune, I am fit to stand forth in the presence of the nation as the true representative of the people of my state.

If the elevated station to which their partiality has called me, I have still been a working man. I have not wasted my time in idleness, nor my energies in the halls of dissipation; but have devoted myself fully and entirely to my official duties—the service of my State and the Union. I am now assailed with a virulence heretofore unknown in the annals of our political warfare: those who have fixed their eyes on the revenues of the General Post Office, the Public Treasury, and the Public Lands, and marked them as their plunder and their spoils, now rage with fury against me. I am not surprised at it. I stand in their path, and they have been so long kept back from the tempting bait that they are now hungry and fierce for their prey. If I had been dull and inefficient—if I had slept upon my post—or, especially, if I had connived at the villany which I saw practiced, I might have been permitted to pass without reproach, and probably received as a favorite by those who now assail me.

But I did not, for my very nature forbade it—I did not calculate chances, or weigh the advantage which one course of conduct would bring, or the danger to which another would expose me. A sentinel on the watch-tower, I had no choice but to give warning of danger when I saw it approaching. Placed in the breach, I must defend my post, until the people could rally and come to my rescue. And whether I now be sustained by their cheering voices, or be borne down by the multitude, and the malice of my enemies, I regret nothing of my course, and shall never wish that I had changed it. One of its consequences only I look to with anxiety and pain—it is, that many good men, all deceived by the base falsehoods which have for years been invented and circulated against me, withhold from me that approbation to which I feel I am entitled at their hands, and which I know they would extend to me, if they could be undeceived as to my political course.

Be kind enough to communicate my sentiments to the meeting, and believe me, with great respect, your obedient servant,
T. EWING.

THE SURPLUS REVENUE.

We should infer from the annexed articles which appeared contemporaneously in two intelligent journals, several hundred miles from each other, that some mischief is meditated by the Spoils party in regard to the surplus revenue; some scheme for preventing the execution of the law for distributing that surplus amongst the States.

From the New York Express, Oct. 17.
The Surplus Revenue.—There is no doubt now that the Van Buren men intend to make a set to the next session of Congress upon the surplus revenue, and to do away with the distribution if they can, notwithstanding General Jackson approved the law. Ay, it is even said on good authority, that General Jackson himself will recommend the repeal! This is a question, therefore, which should enter largely into the ensuing elections. The Van Buren party look upon the surplus revenue as *spoils*, which they have a right to dispose of; and if they are successful in the elections, they will undoubtedly, in the language of Governor Marcy, consider them as the *spoils of victory*. But however indifferent the country may be to their creed, which pronounces *offices* the spoils of victory, we question very much whether the people are as yet prepared to sanction the claim, that the United States Treasury is the spoil of victory.

No party in this country pretends to say that it is proper to raise money just to create a surplus revenue to distribute among the people; but we did think when General Jackson approved the late law, that all parties agreed that it was proper to distribute among the people what surplus might happen to be in the Treasury. We knew very well it was said when the law was passing that Mr. Van Buren remarked, "we are in a bad box," but we did not believe that even he would attempt to organize his party against a law, which passed so unanimously, and which