

POLITICAL.

THE "AXON" IRON.

From the Zanesville (Ohio) Messenger.

For the purpose of benefiting the large capitalists engaged in the iron business, Congress imposed a tax or tariff of thirty-seven dollars a ton on all unwrought iron imported from abroad into the United States.

FROM THE BANNER OF THE CONSTITUTION.

We publish to day an extract from a Speech, delivered on the 25th ultimo, by the Hon. Samuel D. Ingham, late Secretary of the Treasury, at a public dinner given to him in Bucks County, where he resides.

Is it not for the interest of the whole community that nails should be cheap? How many roofs of houses, floors, weather boarding, fences, gates, and various other things, made of wood, could often be saved by having a few nails! A stitch in time saves nine.

Now, that the farmers may see how they are bamboozled by the iron-masters, we can assure them, that if there was no duty on iron, cut nails could be made in the United States at three and a half cents per lb. which is \$2 per 100 lbs. less than the present price.

The whole contest between the Free Trade party and the Tariff party, resolves itself into this. The former contend that two and two are four—the latter insist upon it that two and two are five.

The Free Trade party have always contended that duties upon foreign commodities make them dearer than they would otherwise be.

In answer to this argument, which is self-evident to every man of common understanding, the Tariff party assert, that this is not true, for that since the imposition of high duties the protected goods have fallen in price.

That the protected goods have fallen in price is true enough, but what is left out of sight by these gentry is, that almost all other goods have fallen in price too, since the year 1819, whether protected or not.

The exceptions are: Pig copper, madder, pine, wax, honey, Bordeaux brandy, and cloret in bottles, which are quoted at the same prices at both periods.

The present Tariff has set the wits of people to work in a wonderful manner, and some of the most curious results have taken place.

LATEST FROM EUROPE.

SUCCESS OF THE POLES.

We learn from the Boston Evening Transcript that by the arrival at that port of the Nereus, the editors have London dates of the evening of 3d June.

CONTINUED SUCCESS OF THE POLES.

The London Star of the evening of the 2d June says, "The brave Polish Commander has completely overpowered the Russians. While a Polish corps was amusing them at Minsk, Skrzynecki united all the corps on his left, crossed the Bug, and taking Ostrolenka by assault has proceeded to Lomza, defeated the Russian Guards at Tychosin, and in fact occupied the whole country between the Bug and Narew."

Accounts from Warsaw of the 25th, left Diebitsch at Zaslouf, apparently in route for Ostrolenka or for Bialystock, with no resource but to throw himself on the protection of the Prussians, as Dwer-nicki threw himself on the protection of the Austrians.

The march of Skrzynecki is without parallel in modern warfare. From Warsaw to Ostrolenka, was a flank march of full eighty miles; thence to Lomza another 80; and to Tychosin 20 more—the last 50 being in the rear of the Russian grand army.

the Russians at Minsk, and this, with the new position of Skrzynecki, no doubt forced Diebitsch to retreat to Zaslouf, near the lower Bug.

The ranks of the Prussians have also been recruited by volunteers from Prussian and Austria Poland; and the whole campaign resembles a war of attrition, in which the enlightened enterprise of Europe is directed individually against the further encroachments of the barbarous Muscovite, Tartar and Siberians.

We have just seen from the London Globe, under date June 2, three o'clock P. M. that a report is general in the city of a Russian defeat by the Poles, and that the Imperial Guards had been cut to pieces. It is certainly very prevalent.

The Morning Star of the 3d says, that the above report probably alludes to the overthrow of the Guards at Tychosin, who were taken by surprise.

A private letter from Warsaw, dated 18th inst.—Since last Thursday the two armies are in full movement. Gen. Diebitsch made a manoeuvre with the principal part of his army, in the direction of the Bug, and Narew, with a manifest intention to get into the woods of Plock, to gain the Prussian frontiers.

Gen. Skrzynecki has also made a flank movement; on Friday morning his headquarters were at Mlonska, and in the afternoon at Juhons and on Saturday at Sierock; his main army was in the direction of Pulaski, three hundred Polish officers have received orders to proceed to Lithuania, to organize the insurrection there.

The Messenger de Pologne, a Warsaw paper, of 21st May, announces that Gen. Skrzynecki had taken Ostrolenka on the 18th, where he obtained a large sum of money, the baggage of the enemy, and 1700 prisoners. The object of Skrzynecki is supposed to have been to get between the Russians and their supplies.

Salisbury! AUGUST 1, 1831.

MR. NILES'S AMERICAN SYSTEM, &c.

It has been the usage of this party to take extracts from the writings of the fathers of our country and toature them to suit their views. The people are led to believe, from their inferences, in ducting which they would otherwise shun, but which they think that they are safe in believing because they are advanced by some one of the fathers of our constitution.

THE STATES SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT GOVERNMENTS.

THE STATES ARE SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT GOVERNMENTS EXCEPT SO FAR AS THEY GAVE BY A PORTION OF THEIR SOVEREIGNTY FOR THE OBJECT OF RECEIVING PROTECTION.

These two propositions were thought very self-evident, but this however, it seems we were mistaken, for some have denied their correctness. We should not attempt their proof were not our reasoning, in many cases, built upon them.

American people do not wish to see the country of the old gentleman and the old lady, but they wish to see the country of the new gentleman and the new lady.

After making some base and vulgar charges upon the Southern people and the Southern press, which we will not offend the eye of a mollusc by quoting, Mr. Niles sketches with some accuracy the comforts and enjoyments of some accuracy the comforts and enjoyments of the American people which sketch he closes by saying, "And can it be believed that there is a party which would deny to industry the privilege of having a spoonful of sugar to put in his coffee; there is a party which would not only send the poor laborer supperless to bed, but there is a party which would deny him the privilege of having a good blanket to protect himself from the cold and wintry blast, after he had gone to bed, say, there is a party which would deny him the privilege of a bed itself—there is a party which would deny him not only the means of enjoying his sensual comforts, but there is a party which would prevent him from enjoying his 'natural rights'—which would take away from him the elective franchise—which would forbid him to complain of the oppressions of that party; there is a party which would grind the poor laborer to the very dust—that party is the Clay, or 'American System' or national Republican party, for it is called indifferently by all these names. That party has been, and still is, planning the destruction of the liberties of the people. We call upon them to be on their guard—we do not wish them to take our word for it but we ask them to look and judge for themselves.

It is known to all that England is and has been governed by the restrictive system,—she has carried it to its utmost extent. It is equally well known that the condition of the poor laborer is deplorable—that famine is staring him in the face; that the distress is, generally, more awful in the agricultural than in the manufacturing countries; that Mr. Niles tells us himself and yet he says the "free-trade" party are endeavoring to reduce the people of the United States to the equal condition of the people of Ireland and Great Britain.

Another correspondence—The last Telegraph contains a correspondence between Mr. Berrien, late Attorney General and Mr. Bar Editor of the Globe, concerning the dissolution of the late cabinet. It appears that a statement in the Globe contradicting a statement which appeared in the Telegraph that a member of Congress, with the approbation of the President, sent to Messrs. Berrien, Ingham and Branch for the purpose of forcing their families to visit Mr. Eaton, gave rise to the correspondence. This charge is reiterated by Mr. Berrien. Our charges were premeditated or we should have laid the correspondence before our readers. We may revert to it again next week.

Edward Frost, District Attorney of the United States in Charleston S. C. has declined to prosecute a suit against a person who had refused to pay a custom house bond. Mr. Frost deemed the Tariff laws unconstitutional and therefore could not take any part in enforcing them.

On the first page of our paper will be found a resolution against the practice of treating at elections. This practice has been so long continued, in contempt of the freedom of elections, that many look upon it as the duty of every candidate for popular favor. This should not be so—the candidates should stop forward and put their faces against it. We know many are prevented from doing this because they fear that they will injure their elections. This would not follow as an necessary consequence of the discontinuance of the custom.—We have better opinion of the citizens of N. Carolina than to think that it would make one jot or tittle difference whether a candidate treated or not.

These two propositions were thought very self-evident, but this however, it seems we were mistaken, for some have denied their correctness. We should not attempt their proof were not our reasoning, in many cases, built upon them. That they are correct, however, we doubt not our ability to prove to the satisfaction of even the most stubborn. We will except those who will not admit that allegiance and protection are reciprocal; for if this be not admitted we shall have argued to no purpose. But if allegiance and protection are reciprocal we shall easily make out our case.

Anterior to the formation of the federal compact, nay, anterior to the declaration of independence we, (the States) were declared to be the King of G. Britain, out of his protection we did not, then, owe him any allegiance and our patriotic sires refused, in consequence, to pay him any. From whom then did we receive protection, and to whom, did we pay allegiance? Did we pay it to France. No, she never claimed any jurisdiction over us. Did we pay it to Spain? No, she too never claimed any jurisdiction over us. Did we pay it to any power in

the world? We received no protection from any power if we paid allegiance to no power! If we power claimed jurisdiction over us we must have been independent. It has been said that we received protection from the old confederates, we received protection from the old confederates, from no received protection from the Confederation after it was formed but from whom did we receive it anterior to that time—during the time which intervened between the production of George the third, in which he assumed as out of his protection and the declaration of independence? Many of the States actually formed constitutions during that period, for example Virginia, who formed her constitution on the 12th of June 1776, nearly one month before the declaration of independence; all of them virtually and many actually declared that they owed no allegiance to Great Britain, anterior to the fourth of July 1776; None of them paid Great Britain any allegiance after the issuing of the King's proclamation, which happened many months antecedent to the formation of the old confederation. The first proposition, now is quite clear. To prove the second, it will only be necessary to quote an amendment to the constitution which we believe was adopted at the instance of N. Carolina, who refused to accede to the federal compact until it was adopted, viz: "The powers not delegated to the U. States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." Amendments to the constitution, Art. 2. Upon this clause we rely for the proof that the States are separate and independent sovereignties, except in cases where they have given a portion of their sovereignty, for protection from foreign force, we wish we could add, and for protection from domestic force. For the exercise of powers by the U. S. not delegated to them by the States respectively, is force—its force.

Mr. Byrum, the appointee of Gov. Branch has withdrawn from the contest. It appears from the correspondence which was published in the Halifax paper, that Mr. Byrum in a conversation with Mr. Beach, said if he could be convinced that he (Mr. Branch) had acted correctly about his removal from the cabinet that he (Mr. Byrum) would withdraw. It was left to a committee of their friends who decided in favor of Mr. Branch and Mr. Byrum then, addressed a letter to his constituents, through the columns of the Halifax Advocate, in which he states his reasons for declining. We are glad of this and hope that Mr. Byrum's magnanimity will be properly appreciated.

Another correspondence—The last Telegraph contains a correspondence between Mr. Berrien, late Attorney General and Mr. Bar Editor of the Globe, concerning the dissolution of the late cabinet. It appears that a statement in the Globe contradicting a statement which appeared in the Telegraph that a member of Congress, with the approbation of the President, sent to Messrs. Berrien, Ingham and Branch for the purpose of forcing their families to visit Mr. Eaton, gave rise to the correspondence. This charge is reiterated by Mr. Berrien. Our charges were premeditated or we should have laid the correspondence before our readers. We may revert to it again next week.

Edward Frost, District Attorney of the United States in Charleston S. C. has declined to prosecute a suit against a person who had refused to pay a custom house bond. Mr. Frost deemed the Tariff laws unconstitutional and therefore could not take any part in enforcing them.

On the first page of our paper will be found a resolution against the practice of treating at elections. This practice has been so long continued, in contempt of the freedom of elections, that many look upon it as the duty of every candidate for popular favor. This should not be so—the candidates should stop forward and put their faces against it. We know many are prevented from doing this because they fear that they will injure their elections. This would not follow as an necessary consequence of the discontinuance of the custom.—We have better opinion of the citizens of N. Carolina than to think that it would make one jot or tittle difference whether a candidate treated or not.

These two propositions were thought very self-evident, but this however, it seems we were mistaken, for some have denied their correctness. We should not attempt their proof were not our reasoning, in many cases, built upon them. That they are correct, however, we doubt not our ability to prove to the satisfaction of even the most stubborn. We will except those who will not admit that allegiance and protection are reciprocal; for if this be not admitted we shall have argued to no purpose. But if allegiance and protection are reciprocal we shall easily make out our case.

Anterior to the formation of the federal compact, nay, anterior to the declaration of independence we, (the States) were declared to be the King of G. Britain, out of his protection we did not, then, owe him any allegiance and our patriotic sires refused, in consequence, to pay him any. From whom then did we receive protection, and to whom, did we pay allegiance? Did we pay it to France. No, she never claimed any jurisdiction over us. Did we pay it to Spain? No, she too never claimed any jurisdiction over us. Did we pay it to any power in