

WESTERN CAROLINIAN.

SALISBURY, N. C. TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1824.

[NO. 224.]

VOL. V.]

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED, EVERY TUESDAY,

By PHILIP WHITE.
The terms of the Western Carolinian will be as follows: Three Dollars a year, in advance.
No paper discount, (except at the option of the Editor, in cases where it is made.)
All letters addressed to the Editor, must be post-paid, or they will not be attended to.

DESULTORY.

SUPPRESSION OF PROFANITY.

At a meeting of the inhabitants of the Central district in Worcester, Massachusetts, the following resolutions reported by a committee were unanimously adopted.

Resolved, That, in the view of this meeting, profane swearing, and lewd language, practised either by the young or old, are evils of enormous magnitude, as being themselves infringements on good morals and Christian duties, and as paving the way to vices and crimes of almost every kind, by weakening that sense of obligation to obey the commands of God, and that regard for decency, which are essential to the best interest of the community.

That it is the duty of every citizen, by example, by precept, and by countenancing the faithful execution of the laws on these subjects, to check these great and growing evils.

That the inhabitants of the Central School District, in Worcester, here assembled, will, individually and collectively, use their influence to suppress these evils in their families, in the streets, and elsewhere, and to support the magistrates in making an example of obstinate offenders.

That it is highly important that the wise and salutary provisions of law enacted to prevent the practice of profanity should be made familiar to the knowledge and understanding of those who are amenable to it; and as the best means of impressing its obligations upon the minds of the children and youth of our village, that it be recommended to the Instructors of the respective schools, to read the law to pupils, to explain and enforce its meaning and obligations, and to notice and reprove every instance of the violation of its prohibitions.

LEVI LINCOLN, per order.

In Rochelle and its vicinity, 47,840,000 yards of flannel and baizes are manufactured yearly. This is supposed to be more than half the quantity manufactured on the whole face of the globe.

Mrs. Counts, the widow of the Great London Banker, in June, gave a *petit déjeuner*, "at her beautiful little villa at Highgate," to about seven hundred ladies and gentlemen of the first rank and fashion in Great Britain, including Royal Duke, &c. The military bands stationed on the lawns consisted of no less than seventy performers of the first ability; the attendants out of livery amounted to forty well dressed persons; three wagon-loads of gold and silver plate were used, and to every servant who came with the guests, a two-shilling ticket was given, to be expended in refreshment for himself. Six hundred partook of this liberality.

RETORT COURTEOUS.

A justice of the peace, in Vermont, who was not very noted for his erudition, had a cause brought before him of rather an indelicate nature; in which a young woman was introduced as a witness, who was not very delicate in the choice of words in her testimony. The justice observed to her, that she had brass enough in her face to make a teapail kettle: To which she answered, yes, sir, and there's sap enough in our head to fill it!

A man carrying a cradle, was stopped by an old woman, and thus accosted: "So, sir, you have got some of the fruit of matrimony." "Softly, softly old lady, (said he) you mistake—this is merely the fruit basket."

An eminent Grocery Company in Dublin announce in the newspapers of that city, that they have whiskey on sale, which was drank by his Majesty while in Ireland.

We follow the world in approving others, but we go before it in approving ourselves.

Debates on the CAUCUS.

In resuming the publication of the debates on Mr. Fisher's resolutions against the caucus, in the House of Commons of the last Legislature, we will begin with one on each side of the question, that our readers may have a view of the subject.

Mr. Adams said, that when these resolutions were first introduced, he saw no great objection to them, but, on examining the preamble he thought it very improper. He was therefore opposed to the proposition altogether.

The 18th section of our Bill of Rights, says, "that the people have a right to assemble together, to consult for the common good, to instruct their representatives," &c. He saw no impropriety in our members of Congress meeting together, and advising their constituents as to the candidate for the Presidency most likely to answer their expectations. There was nothing that infringed any principle of the Constitution. His constituents knew but little of Mr. Crawford, Mr. Adams, or Mr. Calhoun. And where must they inquire for information? Their neighbors know as little of these gentlemen as themselves. To whom, then, can they apply with more prospect of success, than to our members of Congress? What he wished was, to have the people well informed. For himself, he had little preference for any of the candidates. He did not believe the Members of that House were expected by their constituents to instruct our Members in Congress. All the rights which the people have not delegated, are reserved to them; but one of the first things we see in the Preamble to these Resolutions, denies to our Members of Congress the right to act in relation to the Presidential question, as they judge proper. We, in our court-houses and other places, meet and consult on public affairs whenever we please, and yet it is proposed that we shall say to our Representatives in Congress you shall not meet together. For his part, he was willing to hear the opinion of our Members of Congress on this subject or any other. He did not think he or his constituents would be injured by it.

Mr. Croom. I should consider myself chargeable with a dereliction of the duty I owe that respectable portion of the state, which I have the honor to represent, were I to remain silent on the important question now under discussion. These resolutions propose, by an expression of the legislative will, to discountenance the dangerous practice of caucusing, and to recommend that the district mode of electing electors should become uniform throughout the Union. To both these propositions I am decidedly friendly. An ardent admirer and sincere friend to our free institutions, I shall always contribute my best efforts to their preservation, and oppose with alacrity any attempts threatening their existence or purity. The brightest feature in our character of liberty, and one upon which our political fabric is mainly based, is the right of free suffrage. That this right becomes important as the object for which it is exercised is so, must be conceded. No person can then deny, that this right is, in no other instance of its exercise so valuable, as in the election of Chief Magistrate of the Union. Did the venerable sages who framed our Constitution view the subject in this light? That they did, no one can doubt, who will bestow a moment's reflection on the anxious solicitude which they evinced to guard the purity of the Presidential election, whether threatened by aspiring demagogues at home, or by selfish and corrupt intrigues from abroad. If there be any one part of our Constitution on which its framers bestowed greater consideration than on any other, it is that part which secures the purity of the election of our Chief Magistrate. The happy plan devised, shews at once their wisdom and the success of their labors. There were two prominent evils apprehended, and against which they were to guard. The one was the tumult, passion, and disorder, incident to all large assemblies; the other, the cabals, intrigue, corruption, to which all pre-existing bodies are exposed. The plan devised and incorporated into our Constitution, happily avoids both these evils. Our

Electoral College assembly is detached and small bodies, and but a brief existence. But to both these objections is Congress, as an electing body, liable. It is a large and organized body. We are told, however, that members of Congress are not the electors of the President. Let gentlemen, however, look at the fact, and see whether they will oblige them to admit, the according to the caucus plan, the members of Congress virtually elect the President of the United States. Their nomination is, in effect, a dictation. This ought not to be so. It is an unoly usurpation of power not delegated by the Constitution, and exposes us, in the choice of a Chief Magistrate, to all the evils against which the framers of our Constitution designed to secure us. I consider the Caucus meetings held at the City of Washington, for the purpose of nominating a candidate to fill the office of President of these United States, a unconstitutional, anti-republican, dangerous to liberty, and operating injustice to the rights of the small States. Unconstitutional, because the members of those meetings practically transcend their constitutional powers; anti-republican, because they are calculated to rear up a political aristocracy, and thereby vest in the few that power which belongs to the many; dangerous to liberty, because they are, in truth, an usurpation of some of the dearest rights of freemen; and injurious to the rights of the small States, because they are thus deprived of the chance which the Constitution guarantees to them of having an equal voice with the large States in the election of a President, whenever the choice devolves upon Congress. These positions, if not self-evident, have been so ably established by my honorable friend from Rowan, that it would be supererogatory for me to dwell longer upon them. We have been told by the gentleman from Beaufort, that these Resolutions were introduced with a view to the Presidential question. Sir, to my mind it seems disingenuous, when propositions are before this House, stamped with public good, capable of benefiting the rest of ages, and divested of every local, temporary or party feature, to endeavor to excite the prejudices, and blind the understandings of those to whose consideration they are submitted. Do these resolutions wear any thing of this kind on their face? They exhibit the fair aspect of republicanism; they are politic and ought to be adopted. But gentlemen object to a principle contained in these resolutions, the right of the constituent to instruct his representative. They have been repeatedly told by the friends of the bill, that if an opportunity were given, they would willingly put them in such a shape as to render them unexceptionable in this respect. This liberty, however, has been denied them. I sincerely hope that a majority of this House will afford an opportunity so to amend the resolutions as to make them an expression of the will of the Legislature, as I believe such an expression would have a direct tendency to put down the practice of which we complain.

The gentleman from Caswell, gravely tells us, that though members of Congress are prohibited to be electors, yet that should not prevent them from meeting in their private capacity, to recommend some suitable person for the Presidency. Sir, no one who has observed the effect of such recommendations can deny but they are in truth dictations. In what instance, I would ask, has the recommendation of a man to this office failed to insure his election? I have no doubt but members of Congress, through the instrumentality of caucuses, do indirectly what the constitution prohibits them to do directly—not merely designate, but make the President. Again we are told, that a caucus is necessary to keep the dominant party in power. Sir, it is well known that at present there is but one party in the United States—all are friends of the present administration. If any parties do exist, they are but in embryo, and have been produced by the conflicting claims of the Presidency. It cannot be said that there is, at this time, any dominant party. But if there were such a party, shall we adopt a principle, which clothes

with authority a body of men, in open and manifest violation of the genius of our constitution? Let me further ask, if it has always happened, that the interests of the dominant party is identified with that of republics? History teaches us such parties have often proved the bane of free governments. Often under the pretext of promoting public good, have they abused their power to secure self-aggrandizement. Until, therefore, it is shewn, that there is a dominant party, and that the interest of that party is the same with the interest of the government, it is believed that this argument of gentlemen can avail them nothing. It has been said, by my worthy friend from Beaufort, that opinions of eminent men against caucuses are not to be regarded; but I trust, that this House will respect such opinions on this as well as on other subjects. The father of his country has said "that all combinations of individuals for the purpose of controlling and influencing the free exercise of constitutional rights or powers, are seriously to be deprecated." Here is a direct and unequivocal condemnation of caucusing by the greatest patriot and statesman of any age.

Some men say, that we are unnecessarily consulting the opinions of the House by this discussion. Sir, in my humble opinion, the time of this House could not be better employed, than in discussing a question of such vital importance to the welfare of our constituents. It is of more importance to the good of our State, to put down caucuses, than to restore to credit rogues and swindlers. The gentleman from Caswell informs us, that a Caucus nomination has no binding influence. This is really new. I believe, however, it will not be found correct in fact; as no one can say, that such a nomination has not the same effect as if it were obligatory. What is the practice? Members of Congress go into Caucus and nominate their candidate. The members of the State Legislature then go into Caucus, form an Electoral ticket, and recommend the Caucus Candidate and the Caucus Ticket to the support of the people, which proceedings produce the same result, as if they were sanctioned by the Constitution. And thus, Sir, are the freemen of this country ingeniously divested of a most sacred and invaluable privilege. We contend that members of Congress have no right to form a Caucus for the purpose of influencing the Presidential election; because they are elected for an entirely different purpose. When they act in any other capacity than as Legislators, they transgress the Constitutional powers. When they do it with a view of influencing the election of the Executive, they encourage a union of the distinct Departments of the government, which, if effected, would produce tyranny and anarchy. Members of Congress are moreover exposed to the improper influence of the Candidates who will generally be at the Seat of Government, and it would be saying too much for human nature to assert, that these Candidates will not frequently use every means to promote their ambitious views. We have been told, that it would be improper to adopt these resolutions, because one of our Senators is too venerable and virtuous to be instructed by this body. In this country, Sir, we should never allow the creature to be esteemed greater than the Creator. But if all our delegation were like the gentleman alluded to, it would be useless to pass these Resolutions, as it is well known he never attends Caucus meetings. Others of our Representatives, it is to be feared, have not the same scruples. The Legislature of Tennessee has been referred to, as having recently passed similar Resolutions. An attempt is made to impair the force of this example, and how? By saying that Tennessee has eternally disgraced herself by refusing to the citizens of North-Carolina the right to sue for lands in her Courts. We are told, that this one act so irretrievably darkens her character, that she is a stigma on the house from which she sprung. Sir, with this blot on her escutcheon, we have to be proud of our offspring. The citizens of Tennessee are high-minded, intelligent and enter-

prising. They are distinguished in the field and in the Cabinet. Her sons have displayed acts of gallantry and noble daring which would do honor to the proudest nation of the earth. Let then, the example of Tennessee have its full weight. Aware that I shall be followed by gentlemen who are more competent than myself to do justice to this important subject, I will not pass any longer on the patience of this honorable body—I hope the Resolutions will not be indefinitely postponed.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

The Ex-Emperor ITURBIDE.

Extract of a letter dated Alvarado, 3d August, 1824.

"The Iturbide party is now completely prostrate.

"How parties will now stand requires no great penetration to predict. The Republicans will be joined by all those of Iturbide's party, who were ever opposed to the Spanish supremacy, and they composed his only active, effective force. The Spanish party will receive an accession of strength by the force and influence of the clergy, (who, in the establishment of the present government, see the destruction of their own power,) by the nobility and wealth of the country. I should suppose that, of the two parties, the Spanish will be the downfall of Iturbide—for, having money, with a corps of soldiers, like that of Mexico, what may not be done?"

"Gen. Santa Anna, whose appointment to Yucatan I mentioned in a former letter, has taken a stand, supposed to be injurious to the union. Government are fitting, at this port, to sail in a few days an expedition for Campeachy; but whether it is to act in concert with, or against, Santa Anna, is not well understood in this place."

FROM THE FREEMAN'S CHRONICLE.

The Death of ITURBIDE, the late Emperor of Mexico, is an awful lesson to usurpers. He doubtless earned his fate by his wilful violation of the terms upon which his life was spared, and a liberal support granted to him by his countrymen. His career is now ended. His ambition, which hoped to march to glory over the ruins of a dawning Republic, has proved his ruin. He appeared upon the theatre of South American politics in an interesting and laudable character. He fought the battles of his country with a devotedness that did him honor, and gave out to the world, that it was his country's glory only that he fought for. But the honors which awaited him he accepted, and perhaps he found them too grateful and fascinating to be neglected or repelled. When elevated to the highest office in the Mexican Republic, he repeated his assurances of personal exertion for the public good alone. Like our own beloved Washington, he decided upon retiring from the honors which the gratitude of his country heaped upon him. By this too, he secured the public confidence, and enlisted in his own behalf the wishes and sympathies of all Republican America. But, unable to stand the sudden change in his condition, he raised an unauthorized standard, and created himself a monarch! An insulted confidence of a great and growing nation forced him into foreign climes; but his restless, ambitious disposition persuaded him to return; his life has been the price of his temerity.

FROM THE BALTIMORE STAR.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.

The following is the order in which the several counties of this state are arranged in districts, for the election of President and Vice President of the United States:

- 1st District.—The counties of Burke, Buncombe, Rutherford and Haywood.
- 2d do.—Wilkes, Iredell, Surry and Ashe.
- 3d do.—Mecklenburg, Cabarrus and Lincoln.
- 4th do.—Rowan, Montgomery and Davidson.
- 5th do.—Rockingham, Stokes and Caswell.
- 6th do.—Randolph, Guilford and Chatham.
- 7th do.—Richmond, Anson, Moore, Robeson and Cumberland.
- 8th do.—Person, Orange and Granville.
- 9th do.—Wake, Johnston and Wayne.
- 10th do.—Warren, Franklin, Halifax and Nash.
- 11th do.—Bertie, Northampton, Hertford and Martin.
- 12th do.—Pasquotank, Gates, Chowan, Perquimans, Camden and Currituck.
- 13th do.—Beaufort, Edgecombe, Pitt, Washington, Tyrrel and Hyde.
- 14th do.—Craven, Greene, Lenoir, Jones, Carteret and Onslow.
- 15th do.—Bladen, Sampson, Columbus, Duplin, New-Hanover and Brunswick.