

POLITICAL.
Ever since Mr. Jackson declared war against the Senate...

Ever since Mr. Jackson declared war against the Senate, for refusing to confirm some of his appointments, and for standing up in defence of the Constitution and Laws, in opposition to his dictatorial will, his partisans all over the country, imbued with the genuine spirit of consolidation, have raised a hue and cry against this last remnant of our confederate system. True it is, that many professing devotion to the rights and sovereignty of the States, have joined in the crusade; but the ignorance of the tendency of their measures; though the major part consist of those who have no fixed principles to govern them, and who are ready to applaud any course pursued by their leaders, which they consider calculated to retain in the hands of their party the power and patronage of the government.

At the time of the formation of the Federal Constitution, it is well known that the strong government party were desirous to do away with the State governments, and to form what they termed a National Government. Their design was to establish one splendid consolidated empire, making one people of thirteen separate bodies of people, and thus reducing the States, each of which had carefully asserted its reservation of its freedom, sovereignty, and independence, to mere corporations. Against this scheme, the republican party most strenuously opposed themselves. They knew that liberty could only be preserved within small jurisdictions, and that one general code of laws could not possibly extend over a wide expanse of country, without infringing upon individual rights, more than would thirteen distinct codes of laws adapted to the circumstances, habits, and feelings of the inhabitants of the different States respectively.

THE UNITED STATES SENATE NOT A DEMOCRATIC BODY.
In the Senate of the United States, one citizen of Delaware has the same influence as 11 of Mississippi, 11 of Louisiana, 11 of Rhode Island, 2 of Missouri, 2 of Illinois, 11 of Alabama, 4 of South Carolina, 4 of New Hampshire, 4 of Vermont, 6 of Connecticut, 6 of Maryland, 5 of Georgia, 5 of New Jersey, 9 of Indiana, 6 of Maine, 8 of North Carolina, 9 of Kentucky, 9 of Tennessee, 10 of Massachusetts, 12 of Virginia, 18 of Ohio, 22 of Pennsylvania, and 33 of New York.

Such articles as this are designed to appeal to the prejudices of the ignorant. The small States are declared to be over represented, and the large ones to be under represented; whereas the truth is, that each State is represented precisely according to its territory; and therefore one cannot be over, nor another under, represented. But do not these consolidationists in disguise, know that, in pursuing this course, they are biting a fire? Do they not know that it is expressly declared, in the 5th Article of the Constitution, that "no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate," and that consequently no alteration of the Constitution, but by a unanimous vote of all the States, can break down this great conservative principle of State sovereignty? If they do not, it is high time for them to study the elements of the government which they seek to destroy, and not advocate a measure which could only be carried into effect by a Resolution. If that is their design, let them speak out like men, and see it.

FALSE ACCUSATION.
That portion of the citizens of the United States who, as being friends of the Constitution, and opposed to Executive usurpation, claim the title of Whigs, are denominated, by their opponents, the Bank party.

That portion of the citizens of the United States who, as being friends of the Constitution, and opposed to Executive usurpation, claim the title of Whigs, are denominated, by their opponents, the Bank party. Now, although many of the Whigs advocate the recharter of the present Bank of the United States, with modifications, still many of them are opposed to this renewal, and some of them wish no Bank of the United States at all. There is, no doubt, however, a large majority in favor of some National Bank; but this is not by any means the leading and characteristic trait of the party. The bank, having been the object of Gen. Jackson's hostility and injustice, has been defamed and vindicated by the Whigs, at least so far as the charges against it were false and injurious; and, as having been created by the law, they have also claimed for it an exemption from such warfare as has been urged against it by one who is bound by oath to maintain the law. Thus far the Whigs have gone, and no further. The bank is a secondary object with them all; with some it is a matter of indifference; there are others who are opposed to it. Advocacy of the bank, or of any National Bank, cannot, therefore, with any degree of propriety, be applied to the party.

POST-OFFICE CORRUPTION.
The Postmaster of the city of Philadelphia has published an address to the Public, of some length, admitting the fact of the sale of packages sent to his office from Washington, during the last session of Congress, under the frank of Col. Watson, but denying any criminal intention, or party purpose, on the part of himself or his Clerks; thus disowning of packages which appear the Post-Office does not consider as letters.

Go home and go to work, said Gen. Jackson to the Whig Congressmen. They took him at his word, and the fruits of their labors have been manifested at every election which has since taken place.

Every one knows that our expenses have been doubled during the administration of Jackson. Every one knows that MILLIONS ON MILLIONS of the poor man's money are every year expended to corrupt and enslave the people. Every one knows that the post office has borrowed immense sums without authority, and is now BANKRUPT. Where will all this end? What will become of us if these dreadful abuses are endured? Listen to Jefferson—Revere the advice of the sacred shade of the sage of Monticello. Phil. Intel. . . .

we must live on OATMEAL and POTATOES.
have no time to think, or call the mis-managers of our government to an account, but be glad to obtain subsistence by hiring ourselves to river their chains on the necks of our fellow sufferers. Let then the people, while they have liberty, beware of the acts and tricks of those in power.

OUR SITUATION IS DIFFICULT.—Rich. Enq. The last Richmond Enquirer devotes a considerable portion of its columns to an explanation of its relations with Mr. Stevenson and the Kitchen Cabinet. Out of the whole article, we find but one remark that we are willing to give much credence to, and it is that which forms the heading to this paragraph. The difficulty of the political situation of the Enquirer, is easily to be accounted for. If there ever was an inconsistent, incoherent rhapsodist, it is the venerable Nova Ferrona. His whole soul appears to be engaged in the diplomacy of parties, rather than the actual relations of the belligerents. Mr. Ritchie can read a fine lecture on independence of character, after having had for a long period of years the State printing of Virginia. He can talk volubly about the rights of the States, while he openly supports the great projector of consolidation. He once said Jackson's election would be a curse to the country, and Jackson said of him he was the greatest coward in the United States. Yet these worthies go hand in hand together in the abominations of the day, and are now lion and lamb, lying down together on every occasion.

There is nothing more destructive, says the Cincinnati Gazette, to the elective franchise, than the practice of betting on the result of elections. The direct tendency of this practice is to convert the highest privilege of a free citizen, the choice of his law makers and executive officers, into a selfish sense of gambling. It is a mistake to suppose these bets are made in earnestness of feeling, with a single view to maintain the prospects of a candidate. Although this is sometimes the case, the more general object is to make money. The consequence can be nothing less than to tempt those who bet to engage in unfair jockeying to insure the winning of their bets. The desire of pecuniary gain, and the apprehension of pecuniary loss, supersedes all regard for the public good. Bribery, perjury, fraud, deception in all its various forms, are employed without scruple. An election canvass, instead of exalting the healthful vigorous efforts of intellect and intelligence, of bold and manly independence, presents chiefly the disgusting spectacle of dissimulation and subservience, fraud and meanness, of violence and outrage, of all which the prevalence may justly be traced to betting upon elections.

As we expected, says the Alexandria Gazette, the batteries of the Administration have opened upon Mr. McLane, the late Secretary of State. He is accused, in the Pennsylvania Standard, of intriguing for the Presidency. Mr. McLane, before long, will be villainously abused.—We have all along anticipated the commencement of hostilities. And why should he be spared, more than Ingram, Branch, Berrien, Calhoun, Archer, McDuffie, and every other prominent man who has quitted "the party" in disgust.

Tennessee Oath.—The Tennessee Convention, which has been a long time in session, for the purpose of remodeling the Constitution of that State, had considerable difficulty in settling the phraseology of the oath to be taken by the members of the Legislature. A great variety of forms were offered by various members, and among others the following by Mr. McKinney. It was rejected, we believe, but we are of opinion it comes nearer than any other form to the course followed by a great many members of the Legislative bodies, and that it might be taken with less risk of violation than the ordinary oath.—I, A. B. do solemnly swear that, as a member of this General Assembly, I will in the first place do the best I can for myself—in the second place, for my friends—and in the third place for the State of Tennessee.—N. Y. Cors.



THE CAROLINIAN.
SALISBURY:
Saturday, October 4, 1834.

The newspapers throughout the State are crowded with advertisements of "land for sale." but this is not all—every court-house and mill-bingo door is stuck all over with more economical notices of the same description.

Who, that has a spark of State pride, or feels a single throbb of generous attachment to the scenes of his youth, and for the depository of the dear and venerated remains of departed friends, can view, without emotion, these and many other indications of premature declension in North Carolina? It is a melancholy subject, and peculiarly so at this season of the year, when the periodical decay of the vegetable world, now not more regular in its recurrence than the tide of emigration, naturally induces a feeling of depression.

There are a few facts, and principles, entirely overlooked by those who argue differently. Some suppose that the seasons are generally worse here than in the new countries; this is a sure and certain error; they are regular every where. The seasons are comparatively as good in North Carolina now as they ever were, probably; but the land—the soil that has changed. It has become impoverished by constant and ungenerous cultivation. The consequence is, that extraordinary labor and management are necessary even to make a sufficiency; and, when a little surplus is made, the expense of getting it to market sinks the profits.

Although, therefore, a system of Internal Improvement could not affect the seasons, it would stimulate husbandry, by affording easy and cheap means of getting its products to market; and hence we might hope to see much of the soil that is now impoverished rendered to fertility and cultivation, by a contented and useful yeomanry.

THE DIFFERENCE.—An editor some time since offered a reward of One Thousand Dollars to any person who would find a difference between the Tories of '76 and the Whigs of '34. A lady claims the reward, having found the distinction to be time. The Tories of '76 were short breeches, and the Whigs of '34 were long breeches. Although we do not subscribe fully to this definition, we do to the humor of the joke. If any one were to ask the difference between calling a Jackson a Nigger, and giving the name of Whig to the Federal party, we should say it was very little more.

That the present government contained within itself the elements of speedy dissolution, is by no means certain. The forbearance of its contractor has already permitted an overt act of treason by a State, within its jurisdiction, and the essential wrong of permitting treason to be spoken in its Senate—the session has brandished its dagger and menaced the blow—but whether imprincipled ambition will ever be able to delude the people, in sufficient numbers to subvert the government, is a problem yet unsolved.

The word "Tory" was never applicable to the Federal party, they were never, as such, desirous of establishing a monarchy, and of presenting an Union of Church and State; but, unfortunately for them, all the monarchists and Tories, and all the Tory religionists, both priests and people, were united in their efforts. If the word Tory must be applied in the present day to any party, the Federalists were the best claim to it. The declamatory trick of branding the Republicans

with the name of "Tory," by the Federalists, is entirely inconsistent with the ancient and classic sense of the word; and is a vulgar parody, on which the Hamiltons, the Jays, and the Pickensings, of former times, would have looked with disgust. The trick, however, will deceive only intelligent men in the Union.

The Editor says the Federal party would have before considered the name of "Whig's disgrace." Now, the Federal party will hardly thank him for the gratuitous assertion, which implies either that there is something intrinsically disgraceful in Whigism, or that the Federal party gloried in Whigism, which is the relative of Whigism. We cannot tell, from his essay, which construction he desires to be put upon his proposition; but, under either of them, it would be speaking logically, for we do not intend to be unnecessarily false, and flippant. We shall not stop here to give the origin and meaning of the words whig and tory; in our last we published two articles sufficiently clear upon those subjects, and it is notorious, even to those who never heard of their origin, that Whig has always been esteemed, in this country, by the friends of popular rights, a term of enviable distinction, and Tory a term of deep reproach.

But we have said it is not true now, nor has it ever been, that the Federalists—as a party considered the name of Whig a disgrace. It would uselessly consume too much space to mention all the distinguished Federalists, if we could recollect them, who fought under the Whig banner of our Revolution, against the Tories, who played many fantastic tricks before high heaven in favor of the same doctrines—namely, royal prerogative, and unlimited submission; that now distinguished followers of our ungodly King. The Editor has himself mentioned three venerated names of the description; and in connection with them he has named another fact impossible to be proved; for the "Hamiltons, the Jays, and the Pickens," although they were all accomplished gentlemen, surely were not "disgraced" at hearing their countrymen called Tories.

Considering these true distinctions between the parties, we think that those State Rights Republicans who call the President a Federalist, do injustice to the Federal party, and at the same time are too likely to waste the President's name. He has gone far beyond the Federalists in assuming some powers that belong to Congress, and others that were never delegated to him, nor to Congress, nor to any other department of the Federal Government.

But the Editor of this Press acknowledges that he is not sure but the Federalists were right in their view as to the distribution of power. Why, then, does he cease to heap calumny upon them by associating the name of "Tories, Monarchists, and Tyrants" with Federalism? He says, "to take all these titles upon themselves, (though we suppose they are entitled under the general traitors)," under the shadow of his wing!!!

We will not pretend not to understand what the Editor of the Press means by an "overt act of treason by a State." He means this sort of thing, for our country with the true Jackson Republicans to be maintained by any one who has read the Proclamation. But we must confess we cannot conceive what is meant by an "essential wrong of permitting treason to be spoken in the Senate." Treason spoken!—TREASON SPOKEN!!! Has it come to this? "Treason can be spoken in the Senate!!" and that a contractor of public power—called, too, the People's Press—should publicly complain of the "FORBEARANCE OF THE GOVERNMENT IN PERMITTING TREASON TO BE SPOKEN IN ITS SENATE"!!!!

We know that treason can be spoken at CONSTATINOPELE or ST. PETERSBURGH, and that a disrespectful word there against the Earthly Ruler would be more serious in its immediate consequences to him who uttered it, than the most shocking blasphemy against the Sovereign of the Universe. But we will not do more serious in its immediate consequences to him who uttered it, than the most shocking blasphemy against the Sovereign of the Universe. But we will not do more serious in its immediate consequences to him who uttered it, than the most shocking blasphemy against the Sovereign of the Universe. But we will not do more serious in its immediate consequences to him who uttered it, than the most shocking blasphemy against the Sovereign of the Universe.

One word more, and we leave them. Will the Federalists, to whom the above essay shall come, themselves, under infinite obligations to us, kindly especially for the last paragraph, in which we expressed regret the unhappy circumstances that in his opinion give their party the "best claim to the name of Tory." He admits that the term Tory was never applicable to the Federal party; "but, unfortunately, all the monarchists, and all the Tories, and all the Tory religionists," says he, "both priests and people, are united in branding the Federal party"—ergo, of course, that party will be the Federal party. Admirable logic! According to it, if all sorts of heathens and infidels should call for some Christian church—not the church with which for there is a wide difference—then it would be right to call that church a society of Heathen or Infidels.