

# WILMINGTON JOURNAL.

DAVID FULTON, Editor.

OUR COUNTRY, LIBERTY, AND GOD.

ALFRED L. PRICE } PROPRIETORS.  
AND  
DAVID FULTON }

VOL. 1.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1844.

NO. 1.

PUBLISHED  
EVERY FRIDAY MORNING.

TERMS

OF THE  
**WILMINGTON JOURNAL:**

Two Dollars and fifty cents if paid in advance.  
\$3 00 at the end of three months.  
3 50 at the expiration of the year.

No paper discontinued until arrearages are paid, except at the option of the publishers. No subscription received for less than twelve months.

ADVERTISEMENTS

Inserted at one dollar per square of 16 lines or less, for the first, and twenty-five cents for each succeeding insertion. 25 per cent will be deducted from an advertising bill when it amounts to thirty dollars in any one year. Yearly standing advertisements will be inserted at \$10 per square. All legal advertisements charged 25 per cent higher.

If the number of insertions are not marked on the advertisement, they will be continued until ordered out, and charged for accordingly.

Letters to the proprietors on business connected with this establishment, must be post paid. OFFICE on the south-east corner of Front and Princess streets, opposite the Bank of the State.

AN ADDRESS

To the Freemen and Voters of  
North Carolina.

FELLOW-CITIZENS:

A solemn conviction that the lasting interests of our beloved country is in a great degree dependent upon the approaching Presidential Election, forms our apology for this address. The contests of parties have driven the leaders of that one which advocate the cause of Henry Clay, to a position which is dangerous to the safety of the Republic; and they are fast forcing their followers into a course which the actual people surely do not realize, or in North Carolina, the "Southern land of steady habits," there would hardly be a division of opinion as to the propriety of making resistance to Mr. Clay and his party before it is too late. These questions of mere policy, in which the theory of to-day may yield to the experience of to-morrow, without any permanent injury, are not the only questions about which the candidates for President are disputing, and upon which the vote of the people will be regarded as decisive of their will. Such questions, though some of them are confessedly important in themselves, yet sink into insignificance, when contrasted with the momentous consequences of ALTERING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES—consequences which no human wisdom can foretell.

Fellow-Citizens of North Carolina, are we mistaken in supposing that thousands of you have been led into error or kept in ignorance of the designs of Mr. Clay and his party TO ALTER YOUR CONSTITUTION? We cannot believe that party excitements have so blinded you to the peril of tampering with the sacred Charter of our Union and our Liberties, that a serious wrong will be censured, and a candid appeal to your understandings despised; and if we did, it should not prevent us from making one more effort to reason and to demonstrate with such of our countrymen as own no fealty to party that succeeds their allegiance to the Constitution. We approach you upon the subject with a manly sincerity, and shall address you in that plainness of speech which the occasion requires.

To the various propositions which have been made from time to time for more than 40 years past, to alter the Constitution of the United States, North Carolina has heretofore replied: "No, it is very good as it is, and we do not wish to change the Charter of our Union." And are you ready to reverse that answer now, by electing Mr. Clay President, when he stands pledged to exert all the powers of that high station to effect an object you have hitherto so constantly and so wisely deprecated? If you would, under circumstances more favorable to harmonious and wise counsels, give your countenance to this spirit of innovation, will it be quite prudent or entirely safe to disturb the holy bonds of our Union—to touch the sacred legacy of our fathers with the rude hands of party? Think you the leaders of the Clay Party of 1844, or the leaders of any party maddened as they are by political animosities, will be exactly qualified to Reform the noblest work of the "Whig statesmen of 1776," and to "amend" the Constitution which WASHINGTON and his compatriots bequeathed to us with their blessing? True it is a human work, and of necessity therefore, it must partake of the imperfections belonging to all that man can do. Still the "amendments" to it must also proceed from human hands, not more infallible than those which formed it. The illustrious body of Patriots who framed the instrument were as wise if not wiser, and as pure if not purer, than the Partisans of our time. American Statesmen of the past age loved each other, and their whole country as well, if not better, than the politicians who have succeeded them. Happy would it be for our common country, if the present generation felt the same affection and practised the same loyalty to the Union and the Constitution that our Fathers felt and practised.

With the exception of an amendment made with the concurrence of all the States in 1803, and a clause introduced in 1793, to prohibit suits against STATES, so as to prevent collision between them and the Courts of the Union, the Federal Constitution remains just what it was when it was adopted by North Carolina. So let it be. We have lived under it a free, united and happy people, for fifty years. During all that time, as well as man's wisdom can do it, it has guarded popular rights against the encroachments of Power and protected the rightful authority of Government from the turbulence of unregulated liberty. What more could we expect? What more can we want? Why have the best Government in the world, and why should it be altered? Let not the ambition of Demagogues nor a restless desire for change, nor the frantic delusion of a Party struggling for offices, though backed by the strength of associated wealth, tempt you to put in peril all or any of the blessings we enjoy under it, by making experiments upon your CONSTITUTION. We had better "bear the ills we have, than fly to others we know not of." You had better say at once, to any and every aspirant for the high offices of Government, when they solicit your sup-

port, that they cannot win it by these attempts to alter the organic law of the Union. You had better teach the young men who enlist in their service as partisans, that the first duty of an American patriot is to reverse the "CONSTITUTION AS IT IS." And should time and experience point out the necessity for any amendments, let the necessity be such as men of all parties see, and men of all parties first feel to be indispensable, before you give your assent to them. The present point of attack is the Constitutional VETO of the President. Let it succeed and no man knows what may or may not be the next. It is the Clay party who are striving to attain power now, by making it upon this point of your Constitution. An election may find some other party, as suggested by Mr. Clay's success, to make further and greater inroads upon the Charter of your liberties!

The VETO of the President is a negative power. It was designed as a check upon Congress, the servants of the people, and not the people themselves. It may prevent incalculable mischief. It cannot do harm. It may occasionally intercept the passage of laws, of which by universal consent we have too many rather than too few. It cannot do more. It does not empower the President to touch in the slightest degree the privileges or property of the people, but it only enables him to forbid such interference by others, where he has good cause to apprehend it, by assigning his reasons for it at the same time. And more than all, his VETO falls harmlessly to the ground, if after a reconsideration, two-thirds of Congress should pass the Act, his "Veto notwithstanding."

It was engrained upon the Constitution by those who knew what liberty was worth, and how it might be shielded, and who suffered much to gain it for themselves and their children. And to denounce it as "MONARCHICAL" and "anti-republican," (after the manner of many) is an insult to your understandings, and an ungrateful censure upon the Convention of '87 who formed the Constitution—the wisest, purest, and most illustrious body of Republican Statesmen that the world ever saw!

The facts in relation to the introduction of the VETO in the Constitution are at once remarkable and instructive when put in contrast with the combined efforts of ambition, selfishness and party spirit, in our day, to decri and to destroy it. On 4th June, 1787, the Convention "Resolved that the National Executive shall have a right to NEGATIVE any legislative Act, which shall not be afterwards passed unless by TWO-THIRDS of each branch of the National Legislature." This is the Veto of the Constitution. Against it there were only two votes in the Convention, and on the 21st of July, after nearly two months for consideration and debate, it passed UNANIMOUSLY in the AFFIRMATIVE. (See Journals of Convention of '87, pages 56, 107.)

It may therefore be asserted upon the evidence of the Journals of the Convention which first framed our constitution that the VETO was passed by a UNANIMOUS VOTE.—And whatever may be our respect for the individuals who favor it, it is difficult to treat with courtesy the proposition that it is an odious feature of Monarchy unwisely introduced into the charter of American Liberty. The circumstances which have contributed more than every thing else to suggest this experiment of a Party upon the good old Constitution, are in themselves, still further calculated to alarm into vigilance the jealousy of the people. General Washington exerted the Veto power under the Constitution, and so we believe did the elder Adams, and Mr. Jefferson, and Mr. Madison, and Mr. Monroe, during their several administrations, without serious complaint. None of them however, with the exception of Mr. Madison, vetoed a Bank bill; and Mr. Madison's Veto gave a clear intimation simultaneously that by remodelling the Bill his Veto might be evaded, and that intimation having been acted upon, he finally approved and signed the act. Wherefore neither General Washington nor Mr. Adams nor Mr. Jefferson, nor Mr. Madison, nor Mr. Monroe, was at any time constrained to put a veto upon any favorite privilege to Bankers, Brokers, and other Capitalists.—Their vetoes conflicted with no peculiar measures of the Money-Party;—no interested schemes of "associated wealth." And it was fortunate for their own repose that it was so.

But whilst General Jackson was President, it so turned out that he put his VETO upon a bill to re-charter the Bank of the United States. We say nothing at present of the expediency of a National Bank. It is sufficient that the bill thus vetoed by Gen. Jackson, was one which would have enriched the owners of Stock (foreigners and natives) to an immense amount, besides giving to them other valuable privileges. And what followed this exercise of a Constitutional power by the President of the Nation? Then, for the FIRST TIME in our history, you heard the strong language of denunciation against the VETO power. Then for the FIRST TIME, the tones of indignant reprobation, real or affected, were raised against it as a "one man power." Until it had been thus ex-erted upon the cent per cent interests of associated wealth, you heard nothing of its being "anti-republican"—until a corrupt, irresponsible, heartless money corporation staggered under the blow which Jackson's veto fell upon its guilty head, and Bank corporators and their ambitious party allies saw the privileges of monopolies about to give place to the higher privileges of the people, there had been no party organized, and so far as we know, not an eminent Statesman of America, who had ever proposed to abrogate this power of the Constitution. Immediately after that time, however, the Bank of the United States became an undisguised party organ, and with Mr. Clay for its leader, this contest has been carried on ever since with a degree of violence and corruption unknown before, in the political controversies of the country. The Union has had no repose, and the order of the government has been disturbed, and the current of business in the Nation has been interrupted by the very madness of party spirit ever since! Wise men of every shade of political opinion must perceive the prevailing cause of all this in the baulked ambition of Mr. Clay, who has been struggling for 20 years to be the Chief Ruler of the Nation, and the determination of the LEADERS of the party in alliance with him to accomplish their chimes at every hazard to public

liberty. Rule or ruin seems to be their maxim.

Mr. Clay once opposed to the National Bank as inexpedient and unconstitutional, became the candidate of the Bank party for President. He himself upon the floor of the Senate before the election of 1832, distinctly made up the issue between him and General Jackson. That issue was made, and met, and tried upon Jackson's Veto. It was "Clay and a National Bank, or Jackson and No Bank." We speak to those, many of whom must remember this, and if any should deny it, the facts are indelibly recorded in the debates of the Senate. The panic and violence of that eventful period need only be alluded to. Words could not portray to such as did not witness it, how the elements of party strife were stirred into a hurricane by the combined influence of associated wealth, perverted talents, unblushing bribes, and what were denominated "business transactions," aided it is true by honest advocates of a Bank, whom circumstances had for the time allied to the Bank party. To those who witnessed it, memory will supply our want of language to depict it. Time has since revealed, what many suspected before the disclosure was made, how political leaders and members of Congress had been accommodated with loans at the bank upon slender security—how the purchasable public Presses had been bribed, and the money of the People thereby applied to silence the sentinels of liberty; how the debtors had been alternately indulged, and pressed, taxed, and alarmed. But the people of North Carolina, and the People of the United States nobly withstood the assault, and successfully met that crisis. They resolutely stood by the "Constitution as it is," and by the vote of an immense majority, sided with "Jackson and No Bank." And so ended the first appeal.

For a short period after it, there was an apparent acquiescence in that determination of the People. In 1836, all the candidates for President were presented to you as the opponents of a National Bank. Judge White and Mr. Van Buren (the only candidates in North Carolina) were both pledged against it upon CONSTITUTIONAL grounds, and consequently pledged to VETO any bill to charter such an Institution. There was no Anti-Veto clamor whilst Mr. Clay was out of the field, except from the ABOLITIONISTS, who, of course derided all pledges to veto their fanatical projects, as repugnant to republican principles and adverse to the cause of Liberty and the People. But in the progress of the next four years, the Clay party allied themselves to others, and by their joint efforts Gen. Harrison was elected President. In respect to Gen. Harrison's opinions upon the Bank we shall remark only that his declarations and his votes in Congress were opposed to it, and so his supporters in North Carolina denied that he was in favor of it. His opponents however persisted in declaring that they apprehended the contrary, and the Democratic party of this State confidently predicted that the leaders of the Clay party would go for a National Bank. But, that Gen. Harrison was in favor of the VETO is beyond all controversy. These were his own words as uttered in his Inaugural Address a few short weeks before his death. Hear him:

"The negative upon the acts of the legislative by the Executive authority, and that 'in the hands of one individual would seem to be an incongruity in our system. Like some others of a similar character, however, it appears to be HIGHLY EXPEDIENT; and if used only with the forbearance and in the spirit which was intended by its authors, it may be productive of GREAT GOOD and be found one of the best SAFEGUARDS to the UNION." (Gen. Harrison's Inaugural Address.)

Wherefore it is deceptive to say that the election of General Harrison weakened, and more so to assert that it reversed the old decision of the people to stand by their Constitution as it is, and to sustain the VETO. Gen. Harrison having died soon after his election, Mr. Tyler succeeded to his high station, and in accordance with the predictions of the Democratic party, a Bill to charter a National Bank was twice passed thro' Congress by a majority less than two thirds, but it was as often laid in the dust by the Veto of the President.

Mr. Tyler in his turn was bitterly denounced for it, and Mr. Clay again throwing himself at the head of the Bank Party, upon the floor of the Senate again made an issue before the People against the VETO, and it was sent to the people for trial in the elections of 1842 to the Congress of 1843. We need not tell you how it terminated. A very large majority were returned to Congress in favor of the Veto and against Mr. Clay and his Bank party. So ended the last appeal. The first, it is pretended, had been indecisive of the question because Gen. Jackson was the candidate, and he had a strong party of his own. But the last decision of the People was made the same way when it was a subject of boasting then, and has been ever since, that Mr. Tyler had no "party of his own."

And what has followed? Has there been an acquiescence in the popular will? Has Mr. Clay shown in any sense a Republican submission to the determination of the People? Has he not on the contrary put himself in array against your repeated decision;—against all the eminent men who ever filled the Presidential Office beginning with Washington and ending with Harrison and Tyler; and against the unanimous voice of the framers of our Constitution?

He has surely done all this, for he and his party are now making WAR upon the CONSTITUTION itself. He and they were not content to fight the question of Bank or No Bank over again; but they have now gone a step further and are distinctly pledged to go for ALTERING THE CONSTITUTION OF OUR UNION, and this is the more indefensible on their part, seeing that the same two thirds which it requires to amend the Constitution (if the people will it so), might pass a Bank act, the Veto notwithstanding, and yet more reprehensible in Mr. Clay, seeing that the President of the United States has right fully no voice in altering the Constitution, and therefore he could not honestly use his office to effect it. This plain narrative of undeniable facts leaves no room for doubt, that the scheme to change the CONSTITUTION, originated in party-feelings and with the selfish designs of capitalists; and it has been prosecuted by Mr. Clay in a spirit of pride

and dictation, which deserves to be resisted and rebuked. What shall one man's will prevail over the Constitution to nullify the "one man power?" for so the enemies of the "Constitution as it is" designate the veto.—How inconsistent! And shall the monopoly of the nation be allowed to strike from the Constitution a barrier between the people's rights and the servants they elect,—"one of the best safeguards to the UNION," as Gen. Harrison called it; upon the false pretext that it is an anti-republican restraint upon the majority of the People themselves! How unwisely!—And shall the South who are in a minority, and whose security against the danger of attack by fanaticism reposes in this very clause of our National charter should every other peaceable protection fail, blindly surrender it to make Mr. Clay or any man President? How perilous!

Nor is this all. If these habits of experimenting upon the Constitution were to be encouraged in our leading politicians by a present success, where and when will it stop? What part of the Constitution will be safe against their future attacks, and when can we reckon upon having any repose from the turmoil of Party spirit in its strife against the permanency of the Government? If those parts of the Constitution which were adopted with unanimity are now sacrificed to the ambition and covetousness of associated wealth, and the pride of a single man however eminent, what will be the probable fate of other portions which were obtained by a compromise of opinions and adopted by a lean majority? Will not every election of President, soon involve us in some other question of change in the fundamental law of the Union? If you can be induced at this time to ratify the sentiment that it is "Anti-Republican" to require a vote of two-thirds of Congress to pass an act in case of a Veto by the President, with quite as much reason some aspiring demagogue will insist hereafter, that it is "anti-republican" to require a vote of two-thirds to amend your Constitution; and after having sanctioned the first proposition, how will you be able to oppose the other? Already has Massachusetts proposed to abolish the compromise by which we of the South are taxed and represented under the "Constitution as it is," and the abolition party every where are taking ground for the change; and do you think from the signs of the times that they will find no allies—no leaders—no candidates for the Presidency out of New England? Indeed there is hardly an essential feature in the ancient charter of our Union, which would not soon have a party and a leader to make war upon it, unless the people, the actual people, will keep off all these innovators as they have done for forty years, and adhering to the "old paths" and to "the Constitution as it is," say, as with one voice to all ambitious aspirants that they will vote for no man, and support no party seeking power under a pledge to alter their Constitution. In this there is safety, and there is no security in any other course.

There could not be a stronger instance of the perilous tendency of these party combinations and the pledges of presidential candidates to alter the Constitution, than you have witnessed in North Carolina. The Clay party in the United States as well as Mr. Clay himself were solemnly committed to it, and yet the Clay party leaders at their Convention in this State, purposely omitted this important point in their published proceedings!—What does that signify? Did they mean that this silence on their part should be construed in opposition to the change? Then they owed you more than this negative kind of support to the Constitution. On the other hand did they mean to conceal from the public eye that this crusade upon your Constitution was begun by their candidate and that they were anxious to give it success or prepared to acquiesce in it? Then they were trying to "steal a march" upon you by their silence so as to alter your Constitution without your consent.

No matter what may have been the purpose of this silence upon a question of such momentous interest, and no matter what may be the opinions of the North Carolina leaders of the Clay party, we would this day solemnly warn our countrymen of all parties that their Old Charter is in danger—that Mr. Clay and his party every where out of North Carolina, if not in it, are pledged to alter it; and if you elect Mr. Clay President, he and they will take it for granted that you have given your sanction to the unholy work. Will you do that? Will you agree to mar the proportions of that venerated work of the Revolutionary Whigs of '76? Will you take from the South this shield to our rights of property, at a time when these rights are violently assailed by the united forces of fanatical party and party fanaticism? Will you set the pernicious example of changing our organic law at the bidding of any man or any party, and open the way for others hereafter to unsettle, or it may be, ultimately to overturn the government by new schemes of future amendments? We hope for better things. We do believe that the people of North Carolina are not prepared to encounter this risk; but that however much divided upon other subjects, upon this one they will be UNIFIED. The leaders of Mr. Clay's party in this State probably think so too, and therefore have endeavored to keep it out of view that Mr. Clay will go for ALTERING your constitution, whilst Colonel Polk will go for the "CONSTITUTION AS IT IS."

In thus giving to this subject the prominent position which belongs to it, we mean not to exclude from view altogether those important but subordinate questions of policy upon which the Presidential candidates are divided. The first of these is the Tariff—or, as the Central Committee of the Clay party in North Carolina have frankly entitled it, THEIR TARIFF—the Tariff Act of 1842.

This subject is one that has been frequently discussed, and a full examination of it would be impossible in this form of addressing you. All that we shall aim to do at present will be to lay before the people a few unambiguous remarks; addressed to their patriotism and common sense—such as every body can comprehend, and sophistry itself cannot pervert.

We need not labor to prove that all Taxes imposed by government are collected out of the People directly or indirectly. If they are collected as our State and County taxes are, the tax is a direct one, to wit: the citizen takes the money out of his own pocket

and pays it DIRECTLY to the government.—If, however, they are collected as our National Government raises its revenues, although the people still pay the revenues of government, they do it INDIRECTLY. That is to say, the government collects this Tariff tax from the importer of the articles consumed by the people, to wit: their hats, shoes, clothes, sugar, iron, &c. The importer then adds the amount of impost, or tax, so paid by him upon his price for the articles; and when the citizen purchases the cloth, or iron, or sugar, or other thing to consume, he refunds to the importer the tariff taxes in the additional price he pays, and thereby these imposts or tariff taxes become an INDIRECT tax upon the people. Never a dollar goes into the Treasury which the people do not in some form create under God's blessing by their labor, and afterwards contribute to the government immediately or remotely—DIRECTLY or INDIRECTLY. These are plain, common truths about which there can be no dispute, and upon which there can be no difference of opinion. Our divisions arise in their application. Now, then, to apply them to the Tariff—the favorite taxing system of Mr. Clay and his party—"The Tariff Act of 1842." The returns of the Treasury Department show that the amount of revenue (taxes) collected the present year, or will be, about forty millions of dollars! The expenses of the General Government are quite large enough, if not too great, when they reach twenty millions. Why, then, should the people be thus taxed twice as much as there is any necessity for! The State of N. Carolina—the people of both parties—agree that the government expenses should not be as great as twenty millions. Mr. Clay himself has said the same thing, and his party have likewise, over and over again, declared the same opinion. In this we concur with them heartily and sincerely. We would therefore repeat the inquiry, wherein lies the necessity of the policy of taxing the people forty millions for a government that ought to be administered for less than half that amount? Undeniedly this is done by the tariff act of 1842; and yet Mr. Clay is "utterly opposed to its repeal!" and even in the South his party leaders have gone with their Chief.

It is not only a burden to the people to pay such an excess of taxes but it produces consequences still more deplorable. You know, as all men of observation must know—alas! too well—that Congress, like individuals, when they are in possession of a full treasury are apt to use it extravagantly.—This is peculiarly the case with governments where in the Representatives spend what the people pay. To denounce extravagance in your government, and at the same time oppose a reduction of the taxes below forty millions, is absurd. How can you rely upon any man's professions of economy in public expenses when he goes for adhering to a tariff tax that yields forty millions a year? Then, again, a large revenue like forty millions a year (which is estimated by our opponents themselves will increase to more will not only lead to extravagance, but extravagance in the government begets corruption in its administration, no matter what party rules, as naturally "as the sparks fly upwards."

The Liberties of the People and the Union of the States are never so secure, (to say nothing at all about the cost) as when their Constitution is permanent and undisturbed—the Nation out of debt—the expenditures of Government moderate—the Taxes of the people low—and the real producers of our wealth left to manage and to use the fruits of their own industry under the protection of equal laws.

What would you say to a law of this State for doubling the taxes, when one half the amount is all that has been found necessary for its administration? And if these double taxes (under the Tariff of 1842,) are paid chiefly by the farmers of the country, [as we believe they are,] they have a right to complain against the excess; and North Carolina being a community of farmers, might be expected to reduce such burdens, regardless of party leaders. If it must needs be, that our farmers are taxed, in order to protect favored classes of capitalists, is it not quite enough to tax them ALL that the Government NEEDS? Wherefore should they be oppressed with double taxes? But suppose this Tariff did not operate unequally against the farmers, for we mean not to discuss that question now; let it be conceded that these Double Tariff Taxes were imposed upon all sections and all classes alike, with most unerring impartiality, & that all the People paid them in just proportions, then is it not beyond dispute the interest of all the people in all sections and of all classes to repeal one half of their own Taxes, the economical administration of the Government requiring no more for its liberal support? Nay let it be supposed that these DOUBLE BURDENS were now resting upon the shoulders of four countrymen in other States, and not upon ours, would the people of North Carolina be so unjust and so ungenerous as to refuse any relief to those who pay them, when by taking off but one half of them, there would still be enough for the Government, and to spare? What does it matter to this question whether the North or the South, the East or the West, pays an equal portion of the Taxes? When the amount of revenue so far exceeds the wants of the Government, Justice, Patriotism and self-interest untidely cry out against it, and the People, every where, owe it to themselves, to insist upon a diminution of such burdens, and to elect no one President who is "utterly opposed to it." But Mr. Clay's party leaders have adopted this Tariff of 1842, as THEIR OWN, even in North Carolina. Mr. Clay has pledged himself in writing, that he is "UTTERLY OPPOSED TO ITS REPEAL." Such are his own words not ours. Col. Polk has given no such unwisely pledge against the repeal of Double Taxes, not necessary to an economical administration.

A Tariff for Revenue. The Tax necessary to raise revenues sufficiently large to support the Government, is opposed by no party; certainly it is not by us, nor by the Democratic Party; but we are protesting only against the Double Taxes; we are only resisting double burthens; we are opposing a system by which Forty Millions of Dollars in Taxes are levied upon Revenue, when the Government does not need more Revenue than Twenty Millions.—This single view of the subject would seem to supersede the necessity for presenting it in any other.

The Clay Party say they are for a PROTECTIVE TARIFF. A system to impose burthens upon one class for the benefit of another, for in no other way can it be protective.—And since the elections in August it has been proclaimed that a majority of the People of this State are in favor of that system. When, if ever before, was the voice of North Carolina raised by the PEOPLE against DECREASING their Taxes? Neither is it so now.

No later than the last Assembly it was "Resolved, That while North Carolina will never object to any amount of taxes equally apportioned and imposed for the purpose of raising revenue to support the government economically administered, yet this State will never consent to the imposition of Taxes, the design and operation of which are to promote the interest of particular occupations at the general expense." This was no Party Resolution. All parties voted for it. In the Senate there were only five votes against it, and in the Commons only eighteen! So in Congress all the members of both parties from North Carolina who voted against the protective tariff of 1842, when it was passed, with a solitary exception. So from the tariff of 1816 to that which passed in 1842, the vote of North Carolina has been always given in Congress against this system of taxing the whole people for the benefit or protection of particular occupations. From NATHANIEL MAEON to the time of Willie P. Mangum and his colleague in 1842, (Mr. Mangum, the Governor elect) all our Senators have voted against the protective system. So the Journals of our Assembly show that Congress never passed a protective tariff that the North Carolina Legislature did not remonstrate and protest against it. And in perfect concurrence with all these proceedings have been the tone and language of the leading politicians—and of public meetings of the people every where, and at all times in North Carolina, including amongst the politicians those who now belong to the Clay party. Indeed until a very recent period our opponents in this State denounced the "high tariff system as (one) impoverishing the Southern farmer for the benefit of the Northern manufacturer." Leading men, of all parties in the State reprobated it as a "tax the design and operation of which were to promote the interest of particular occupations at the general expense"—as a burden put upon labor to benefit capital—upon the poor to benefit the rich—upon the weak to benefit the mighty—as a tax upon the planters, farmers and working-men—to enhance the profits of manufacturers, corporations and capitalists. It were not a difficult task to tell the names of our eminent men who have heretofore used such language, but it would swell this paper to an unusual size, and no doubt the people must recollect them. Now we would like to know in view of these concurrent authorities, what extraordinary illumination can have opened the eyes of our distinguished politicians, not only to their errors but to the new & singular truth, that it is both wise and constitutional to do now, under the dictation of the Hon. Henry Clay, what it has been unwise and unconstitutional to allow heretofore under any other chief? App by what sort of miracle in the political world it has been brought about that our TAXES have become BLESSINGS; that it is now good for the people to be taxed; it is still better for them to be taxed double as much as their Government needs; and best of all to raise a double tax out of the mass of the people, when the Government has no need of half of it, in order that the interest of particular occupations may be promoted at the general expense? For ourselves we are not able to see all this, nor to believe that the people of North Carolina will see it. We have been accustomed to think the people of North Carolina more stable in their opinions—more practical in their conclusion than to run after such heresies. Though pained at the party slavishness and political tergiversation of their leaders, we do not believe that the people of our proverbially "honest State" will consent, in blind idolatry to any man, to make a sacrifice of their principles, as they have been held and declared by them ever since the Constitution was adopted. No, no, it is not possible; and we invoke you, fellow-citizens to rescue our State from this imputation, and shake off the burden of an unnecessary and unequal tariff; by voting against Mr. Clay and his double tax. The people have these taxes to pay—their leaders count upon being in power to spend them, and perhaps this is a key to the mystery that has perplexed us. It may be the reason why your leaders have learned to regard taxes as blessings—the more the better. We know it is said that the Clay party are in favor of the Tariff act of 1842 in order to give permanency to some system, and the cry is that "we change our Tariff too often; but we feel authorized to regard this as a mere pretext to excuse what they have not argument to defend—"Permanent taxes!" Are the maxims of free government to be thus openly set at naught and reversed? In the early days of our Republic was it not thought to be essential to popular rights and the safety of the people, that the taxes should not only be light, but imposed for the shortest period, so as to come in frequent review before the constituents who had them to pay? But, besides that, the politicians who put up this plea for permanency in the people's taxes, are themselves, at the moment of doing so, industriously occupied with their schemes to break in upon the stability of the Constitution as it is, as well as to have an unstable government with permanent taxes, or a stable Constitution with short-lived taxes!

We shall probably examine at another time the Bankrupt Law, which Mr. Clay sustained heretofore against the known wishes of his State, and which he has never renounced, so far as we can understand him. The Bank question, upon which he was once the champion of the people, but afterwards asserted, and is now become the leader of monopolies, will be noticed in another form. The Distribution of the proceeds of the Public Lands, the principles of which he opposed when Gen. Jackson was supposed to be in favor of it, and afterwards supported as a measure of his own, has been more prolific of promises than of case to the people of North Carolina; and we may feel it our duty to speak of that heretofore. The Annexation of Texas, which as Secretary of State he once endeavored to accomplish, but now as a candidate for President, resists and opposes, is a question that shall be presented and discussed by itself. One or two