

Democratic Candidates for Congress. First District, H. M. SHAW, of Currituck County. Second District, THOMAS RUFFIN, of Wayne County. Third District, WILLIAM S. ASHE, of New Hanover County. Fourth District, A. M. LEWIS, of Franklin County. Sixth District, GEORGE D. BOYD, of Rockingham County. Seventh District, BURTON CRAIG, of Rowan County.

There are eight Districts in this State, and the Democrats, it is seen, have candidates in six Districts. The prospect for electing all of them is good.

We learn that a portion of the Democrats of the fifth District, composed of the Counties of Person, Caswell, Alhance, Chatham, Randolph, Guilford, Moore and Montgomery, intend to vote for the Hon. A. Rencher, of Chatham, and we have been requested so to state. We do not raise Mr. Rencher's name, because he is not a candidate.

THE DISORGANIZERS.

Who are they? A. W. Venable, of the Fourth District, who announced himself for Congress the day he arrived in Granville from Washington, without waiting to consult the Democrats of the District, and who declared in advance that he was not to be controlled by "bottailed lawyers, broken down constables, and beer-house debaters." The failure to hold a Convention in this District is owing more to his opposition to it, both public and private, than to all other causes combined.

Who are they? Walter F. Leak, of the Third District, who is out for Congress in favor of Bennett's bill, and who declares in advance that he will support no man for Governor who is opposed to it. Mr. Leak not only takes ground against a Democratic principle, but he has the assurance—the arrogance to declare that he will support no man for Governor who does not agree with him!

Who are they? The Democratic Free Press, so-called, of Wilmington, which supports Mr. Leak in this conduct and also Messrs. Latham and Loftin in their opposition to Mr. Ruffin.

Who are they? Messrs. Latham and Loftin, of the second District, who are opposing Mr. Ruffin, the regular nominee—the former disappointed on account of office, and the latter once in full favor with his party in Lenoir, but now powerless there, and destined to defeat and final retirement.

Who are they? A little knot of disappointed office-seekers in the First District, who oppose Dr. Shaw, and are thus contributing to the election of Mr. Outlaw.

Here, then, are the disorganizers in North Carolina—all else is bright and cheering. We call upon the Democratic party to rise in its might and rid itself, if it must, of its unsound members. No party can exist without adhering to its principles, or without organization. What is done now will tell for good or for evil next summer.

JACKSON'S LAND BILL VETO.

A correspondent of the Wilmington Journal calls attention to Gen. Jackson's Land Bill Veto Message of 1833, and sends to that paper a portion of the document for publication. The bill vetoed was entitled "an act to appropriate for a limited time the proceeds of the sales of the public lands of the United States, and for granting lands to certain States." Gen. Jackson argues the question at some length, and not only shows the dangerous nature of distribution, but he shows that the bill referred to, "by throwing the land system on the resources from imports for support, virtually distributes among the States a part of those revenues"; and that the whole system tends directly to consolidation—an absorption of all power by the central government. Indeed he says, "it appears to me that a more direct road to consolidation cannot be devised." Read the extracts from this important Message, which we publish to-day. Gen. Jackson makes no distinction between a distribution of the lands and a distribution of the proceeds.

No Democrat, at this time of day, will undertake to call in question Gen. Jackson's opinions.

NORTH-CAROLINA RAILROAD.

We learn that at the meeting of the stockholders of this Road, held at Salisbury on Thursday last, Gov. Morehead, F. Fries, of Forsyth, Dr. F. J. Hill, of Brunswick, and Mr. Davis, of Rowan, were elected Directors on the part of the stockholders; and at a meeting of the Directors Gov. Morehead was re-elected President of the Road for the ensuing year.

Maj. Gwynn was re-appointed Chief Engineer at a salary of \$5,000, and was directed to superintend the surveys of the Roads east and west at a salary of \$3,000 in addition to the \$5,000. It is understood that Maj. Gwynn is to reside permanently in the State.

All the State Directors were in attendance. The Directors adjourned to meet in this City on the last day of next month.

We give place to-day, most cheerfully, to the communication over the signature of Jonathan M. Stone. Mr. Stone is a sound Democrat, and has done good service in the cause. We are concerned to see him forgetting principle, even for a moment, in his regard for a man. We hope the sober-second thought, seldom wrong and always efficient, will have its due influence on his judgment.

Our paper has been open and still is to Mr. Venable's friends. Come on, brother Democrats, if you will—we regret your course, but your voices shall not be stifled. Truth and principle have nothing to fear from discussion.

subvert our well-balanced system of government, and ultimately deprive us of all the blessings now derived from our happy Union. However willing might be that any unavoidable surplus in the Treasury should be returned to the people through their State governments, I cannot assent to the principle that a surplus may be created for the purpose of distribution. Viewing this bill as in effect assuming the right, not only to create a surplus for that purpose, but to divide the contents of the Treasury among the States with limitation, from whatever source they may be derived, and asserting the power to raise and appropriate money for the support of every State government and institution, as well as for making every local improvement, however trivial, I can not give it my assent.

It is difficult to perceive what advantages would accrue to the old States, or the new, from the system of distribution which this bill proposes, if it were otherwise unobjectionable. It requires no argument to prove that, if three millions of dollars a year, or any other sum, shall be taken out of the Treasury by this bill for distribution, it must be replaced by the same sum collected from the people through some other means. The old States will receive annually a sum of money from the Treasury, but they will pay in the Treasury among the States with limitation, from whatever source they may be derived, and asserting the power to raise and appropriate money for the support of every State government and institution, as well as for making every local improvement, however trivial, I can not give it my assent.

For the Standard. LEWIS AND VENABLE—WHICH SHALL WE TAKE?

Mr. Editor: A Whig is now in the field, and I do not suppose any one has a right to complain. Mr. Rogers certainly has a right to be a candidate and the Whigs have a right to keep their principles before the people. But it seems to me, sir, that there should be some understanding among the Democrats, and therefore that they should concentrate themselves freely and endeavor to concentrate on one man, and to prevent the success of the Whig; for it is well known that this district is largely Democratic and cannot of course be represented by a Whig. I think it is much to be regretted that the Democrats failed to have a convention, but so it is, and we must now do the best we can. It is not right, Mr. Editor, that this district should be represented by a Whig—the Democrats have a majority, and therefore entitled to the representation. Let us then concentrate, and the question is how and upon whom can this be done.

I would not, Mr. Editor, undertake to dictate to others, but it does seem to me that no real Democrat could hesitate for a moment which of the two Democratic candidates he would choose. Lewis stands for the old Democratic doctrine—he has placed himself upon an equal ground with the Whig, and goes on against Scott during the last campaign—and uses the distribution in every form, and has had the nerve and independence to attack Mr. Venable fearlessly, and has sustained himself manfully in the canvass. Mr. Venable, on the other hand, has sided with the Whigs on the distribution question—he has disappointed his party in fact done more to break up and distract his party than any man in the State—declares his determination to continue to do so, and goes on apparently regardless of the success or wishes of his party. Indeed at Washington, when it was charged upon him that he had acknowledged himself with the Whigs on the two most important questions of the day, viz: the land and the Cuban question, he did not deny it, but said that he was glad that he and the Whigs had broken the same ground, and that he wished the old party lines to be broken down. Now I ask the good old-fashioned Democrats of this district if they are prepared to give up their principles which they have long been proud to claim? Are they willing to back out from their party—to acknowledge themselves wrong—to go over and join the Whigs in their darling measure? If so, they cannot show an abler champion than Mr. Venable. I do not see why a Democrat should prefer him to a Whig. The only point Mr. Rogers has upon his card is that of distribution—says he is in favor of an equal distribution. Mr. Venable says he is in favor of an unequal distribution—for he particularly declares that the new States are entitled to the most of the public lands. Now I say sir that owing to these principles of Mr. Venable the Democrats of this district cannot support him, at any rate they cannot unite on him. When he is present, he will even who would come out boldly and call him a Whig by his proper name? What, then, is to prevent concentration upon Mr. Lewis? He is a young man of talent—has made a fine impression wherever he has gone, and I can say with safety has done himself good credit; and besides, if I know anything about the matter hold the doctrine of his party. I am sure, at any rate, will be the choice of the district at least of those two. From the information I can gain I do not believe that Venable will get more than two counties of the seven, viz: Granville and Warren. In this connection I would glance at a piece from a Franklin Democrat which I saw in the Standard last week. I do not regard the piece as entitled to a serious notice; but when he says that Venable, "to which" the people are under obligations, will run Lewis close in this county, it is clearly to say that I do not suppose he knows the sentiment in this county; and as to his insinuations against Lewis as an equal for Venable, I shall only say that I'll leave that to those who have heard them speak. I hope we shall hear from different parts of the district. Franklin, July 14th, 1853. VOTER.

For the Standard. GRANVILLE COUNTY, July 15, 1853.

Mr. Holden: I have read with much attention a communication in your paper of July 13th, purporting to be from a Democrat, in which you seem to believe he has expressed the opinion of a large majority of the Democratic party of Wake respecting the Congressional election of the fourth District—Messrs. Venable and Lewis being the then contending candidates. Wake sets off by setting up the claims of Mr. Lewis as the regular nominee of the Democratic party, because forsooth some five or six men met at Raleigh on the last day of June past, purporting to be delegates from Johnston County, held a Convention and nominated Mr. Lewis as the Democratic candidate for Congress, without even the Wake delegation meeting, after calling loud and loud for a County Convention to meet and appoint those delegates, and after appointing fifty, there was not one met in Convention, as I am informed; but Johnston spoke considers Lewis the regular nominee of the party. Now, sir, I for one am not willing to let Johnston, or the editors of the Johnston delegation, or even the Wake Democrat himself, and I am very certain I express the voice of the Democracy of Granville when I say so, and I believe the voice of the whole District. I live near the line and have had an opportunity of mixing with a large portion of the Democracy of Wake, and so far as I have been able to ascertain, Venable is the choice of a majority of the Democracy of Wake—at least the northern portion of it. Again, the Democrat of Wake seems to assume to be the expounder of Mr. Venable's principles, in which he is egregiously mistaken, or most willfully misrepresents.

Mr. Editor: I have recently travelled through a portion of Franklin, and attended a meeting where there were not less than four hundred men, and had the pleasure of hearing a good many Democrats express themselves, stating that they were for Mr. Venable in the outset, but after hearing his views on the subject in Congress explained to the public they could not be for him any longer. I think the gentleman who wrote over the signature of "Franklin" was actuated by pure motives, and expressed the sentiments of a large majority of the people in Franklin, and on the contrary, I must think the gentleman who wrote the article in the Standard, "A Democrat" must have written merely for effect. I will not say a great deal respecting old Nash; he is a Democrat still the same. Mr. Venable, we think, has voted against our interest, and we shall vote against him. A NASH DEMOCRAT.

FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

The Whig Democratic majority in this District is about 2,000. Gov. Reid's last majority in the Counties composing it was 2,500; but we repeat we cannot calculate, with certainty, on more than 2,000—the full Whig vote being about 4,000, and the full Democratic vote about 6,000. If Mr. Rogers should receive the full Whig vote, and if the Democratic vote should be equally divided between Messrs. Lewis and Venable, the former will, of course, be elected. It is, therefore, not merely important but indispensable to success that there should be a concentration of Democratic strength. No Convention has been held, and it is too late to hold one now. The party must, therefore, unite on the strongest man in order to defeat the Whig candidate; and the party, we take this occasion to say, is fortunate in having in the strongest man, one who stands upon its platform and agrees with it in its principles. Mr. Venable differs with the Democratic party on Bennett's land bill, on the Cuban question, and on organization; and this being the case, it would be in vain to expect a majority of Democrats in the District to rally on him with any degree of cordiality or unanimity. To attempt it would be to invite inevitable, disastrous defeat. The contest is between Mr. Lewis and Mr. Rogers, the representatives of the respective parties; and with this fact standing prominently out, it cannot be that the Democrats of the District will permit the Whig candidate to be elected.

As we have heretofore stated, our duty in this emergency is two-fold—first, to stand by the State and Baltimore platforms, and secondly, to do what we can to prevent the election of a Whig. We have restrained our pen as long as we could deem it prudent or proper to do so. Sincerely anxious for the restoration of harmony, and reluctant to speak of Mr. Venable as his deviation from principle would seem to require, we have stood, to a considerable extent, aloof; but the hour has come when silence, or the course we have thus far pursued, would be justly regarded as evidence that we are disposed to favor a man at the expense of principle and party victory, and we have come forward to discharge our duty with a purpose deliberately fixed, and not to be disturbed by subsequent events. At the close of the last Congress Mr. Venable found himself in a new District, with but two Counties of his old District. He returned home, and in hot haste declared himself a candidate. He did not deign to await the action even of Orange and Granville, the two Counties referred to, but announced himself at once. He was met by Mr. Lewis, who proposed a Convention, and pledged himself to abide its action. Mr. Venable, on the contrary, referred in rather contemptuous terms to Conventions—said he was not to be disposed of or ruled off by Conventions composed of "bottailed lawyers, broken-down constables, and beer-house debaters"—but intimated, at the same time, that if a fair Convention (one that would suit him, we suppose) was held, he would submit. This was a reflection upon the honesty and integrity of the party, and it is to be regretted that it did not result at once in a Convention. A Convention of the character imagined by Mr. Venable, would be a new thing in this State, our Conventions heretofore have been fair, and Mr. Venable had no right to presume that the Convention proposed by Mr. Lewis would be an unfair one. Such language, to say the least, comes with a bad grace from one who was brought forward and politically made by Conventions, and who has been sustained from the first by party effort and party organization. But the truth is, Mr. Venable knew he had voted, on Bennett's land bill, against his party—he knew that his views in regard to Cuba and the acquisition of territory were not entirely acceptable to the Democracy, and he therefore feared to submit his pretensions and his conduct to the consideration of the Democrats of the District in Convention assembled. It was thus, for selfish purposes, that he produced and encouraged a spirit of disorganization, which now threatens, unless speedily checked, to throw this noble district into Whig hands.

In voting for Bennett's land bill Mr. Venable voted with the Whigs, and against the great mass of his own party. He voted for a bill which gave the little State of Arkansas three millions of acres, and to North Carolina land warrants for one million five hundred thousand acres!—for a bill which "authorized" sovereign States to do certain things, as if the general government, the creature of the States, could "authorize" the States to perform its will!—for a bill which, in substance, distributes the proceeds of the lands to nineteen States, in that it "authorizes" them to sell the land warrants for cash!—for a bill, federal in its scope and character, and which was but the beginning of a system condemned alike by Gen. Jackson, by the Democratic party in our national and State Conventions, and which, if carried out, would change the nature of our federal government by making the States dependent on it for largesses and bounties. Mr. Venable was kindly warned of what the result must be if he persisted in justifying or defending this vote, but he was deaf to both advice and warning. He might have retreated with honor, and regained his position in the regards of his friends, but for his convictions of right, his self-sufficiency, or his pride. If he was satisfied that he was right, and if he was determined to persevere in this course, then he ought, we respectfully submit, to have declined a canvass, for the plain reason that he could make no fit representative for such a District as this; but otherwise, he might have taken the ground that he voted for this bill in the belief that the policy of dividing the lands would prevail, and was anxious to obtain something for his State,—but that now, with Gen. Pierce as President, he foresaw that all such bills would be vetoed, and he would therefore fall back on the old Democratic doctrine. Instead of this, we learn that he exults in the vote, and stands pledged, out and out, to the policy of land distribution. He endeavors—vainly, of course—to show, that this bill is not opposed to the Baltimore Resolution, while he boldly opposes or disregards the State Resolution of 1852. He says, we understand, that he is not to be bound by platforms, thus openly repudiating the principles he has heretofore professed. But it is not for us to "lecture" Mr.

Venable, and it would be useless to attempt to do the past. We must deal with things as they are. We cannot support him, because we cannot abandon principle. We have stood by him in many a hard-fought battle; we have cheered him as the blows of the federal champions fell thick and fast upon his shield, and we have rejoiced when in contests for principles and Democracy he won in contests for principles and Democracy. Now we part company. We regret to see you deeper than he does, perhaps, but we cannot help it. The fault is not ours. In the language of Levi Woodbury, "we go where Democracy's principles lead, and when they cease to lead we cease to follow." We, therefore, appeal to our brother Democrats of the District to look the crisis full in the face—to bestir themselves, and to come up to the aid of Mr. Lewis. He is not, we are free to confess, the first choice of many in the District; but that is a matter about which we have no time to think, much less to act. He is a young gentleman of decided ability, sound upon all the issues, devoted to organization, and will make a useful and reliable representative. He has met Mr. Venable in a manner which would have done credit to an old and experienced debater. He has him in the wrong on the defensive, and he keeps him there. He is contending boldly and nobly for all our principles; and he will go to Washington, not to oppose or embarrass Gen. Pierce, but to give him a cordial support. By a vigorous and united rally his election can be secured. Every vote for Mr. Venable no matter upon what grounds, will be a vote against Democratic principles on land distribution as laid down by Gen. Jackson, by the State and Baltimore Conventions, and as held by all the Democratic candidates in the other Districts and by all the Democratic presses of the State with one voice. Every vote withheld from Mr. Lewis will strengthen Mr. Rogers, for the reason that the contest is between the two, and the latter is sum of the full Whig vote. That vote must be overcome by Mr. Lewis, or defeat awaits us. United, then, brother Democrats, and determine in your strength that the Democratic flag shall still stream in triumph over this District. What care we for a man, or for men, when our principles are at stake? Men pass away like leaves in autumn, but principles live evermore. Let us, then, still cherish these principles in our hearts and vote them at the polls, and cling to them, whatever may betide us, "as the mariner clings to his last plank when night and the tempest close around him."

We have already alluded to the fact that the course of Mr. Venable on Bennett's land bill is being used in other Congressional Districts against the Democratic candidates. The following extract from a communication in the Salisbury Whig, will show the nature of the appeal against Burton Craige. The writer says: "Mr. Venable, a most decided and distinguished Democrat, and now a candidate for Congress in the Wake District, on this question fixing his eyes steadily upon justice, and the rights of the old States, has boldly braved the chains of party and is doing battle for an equitable distribution of the public lands among all the States."

The gallant Craige has not only to meet Federalism with its slang, its deception, and its sophistry, but the example and the name of a man once high in the confidence of his party are arrayed against him; and that, too, when his District is nearly equally divided, and the District from which this weapon of attack is drawn is Democratic by 2,000 votes! The same holds good, to a greater or less extent, as to Ashe, Shaw, Boyd, and Ruffin.

We make the following extract from a letter dated July 12, 1853:

"The people of this County have never departed from the Democratic fold, and were I to guess I would say they will still adhere to their ancient faith. They have always believed that the perpetuity of the Union and the preservation of our free institutions depended upon the maintenance of Democratic principles—and no one can fail to perceive the path they plainly point out. If the principles embodied in Bennett's land bill shall obtain the ascendancy in the United States, then Democracy is dead, I fear never again to be resurrected; and the Democrats whose defeat may cause this greatest of all calamities will find themselves excluded from all share in the popular influence which this fatal scheme of public bounty cannot fail to wield. Their associates, the Whigs, will claim all the benefit, and the deluded people will certainly accord to them. There is no power to donate the public lands or their proceeds; and once allow the politicians of the country to dispose of and bestow this vast fund according to their own discretion, without any limitation, and you entrust to them a fund as potent for mischief as Phillip's gold or the granaries of Rome. But admit the power, should the South ever consent to the principle of distribution! Can they hope, with a majority of almost fifty against them in the House of Representatives, to get their fair and equal share? I consider the virtue of the people and the strength of Republican government more severely tried at this time than ever before from the foundation of the Republic; and the only way to preserve both is to keep the harness ways on politicians and allow the exercise of no power except for specific and definite purposes—and especially to withhold from them the power of granting largesses or bestowing favors. Allow me to say, without intending censure, that the public press has not done its whole duty on this subject. But the theme is too fruitful for the limits of a letter."

MR. VENABLE BIDDING FOR WHIG VOTES! It will be seen, by the following certificate, which has been furnished us for publication, that Mr. Venable has been making his position on Cuba and the public lands the ground of appeal to the Whigs for their support:

HILLSBOROUGH, July 10, 1853. Mr. Lewis: I have just received your letter stating the particulars of a conversation which took place in Raleigh between Mr. Venable and myself. Mr. Venable approached me in the street between Lawrence's Hotel and the Court-House, and remarked that if the Whigs were sincere they were bound to vote for him, because he was with them on two important questions—while Lewis was against them in every thing. If Mr. Venable denies this, put him to the book, and my honor for it he will acknowledge its truth. Respectfully yours, R. F. MORRIS.

We submit this without comment. It speaks for itself.

Messrs. Venable and Lewis will address the people at Gardner's, (Barney Jones') Wake, to-morrow, Thursday. This precinct has always been true, and we trust it will roll up at least one hundred votes for Lewis.

John B. Wheeler, of this State, has been appointed by the President as Secretary to sign Land Warrants.

From the Wilmington Journal. PUBLIC LANDS.

Discussion at Kannaville—Genl Jackson's Veto Message.

I was present at Kannaville at the discussion between Messrs. Ashe and Leak, and had my attention drawn by the reference of both the gentlemen to one of the most able state-papers ever written by Gen. Jackson—I mean his veto land bill message. Each of the gentlemen quoted from this message, and in order to sustain himself fully offered to bear half of the expenses necessary to issue ten thousand copies of it in pamphlet form for distribution.

This offer was intended as evidence of the sincerity of their respective opinions, but in the conclusion of their debate Mr. Ashe stated as he was willing, yes, anxious, to let the voters of the District decide who was correct in his quotations from the message, he wished Mr. Leak would adhere to his proposition to have it re-printed, each of these bearing half of the expenses. From this Mr. Leak backed out. This back out clearly shows a consciousness on the part of Mr. Leak that he had misquoted Jackson's opinions on the distribution of the lands among the States. But in order entirely to satisfy myself, I procured a copy of the message and have given it a careful perusal, and with the result that Mr. Leak backed out; for it does appear to me that there is not a single sentence in the message but what is authority against him. The bill in question was one for the distribution of the proceeds of the lands among the several States, as also a partial distribution of the lands themselves. Jackson, in his veto, after reviewing the different deeds of cession, shows conclusively, that the distribution of the lands or their proceeds among the States could be consistent with the condition of the different deeds of cession; and as the Constitution of the United States makes all of these compacts binding on the present Government, he concluded that Congress had no right to pass such a bill. But independent of the want of power in Congress to do this, the old General expressly declares that there are other considerations which would compel him to veto the bill; and as these considerations have as strong application now as heretofore, and in my opinion should be decisive of the fate of this Saunders hobby, I send you the enclosed extract, which I hope you will be able to publish in your valuable Journal. These extracts contain the portion of the message showing the fatal policy of distribution.

A SPECTATOR.

Extract from Jackson's Veto Message of the Land Bill, Dec. 4, 1833—Stateman's Manual—Appendix, p. 37:

But there are other principles asserted in the bill which should have impelled me to withhold my signature, had I not seen in it a violation of the compact by which the United States acquired title to a large portion of the public lands. It required the principles contained in the bill authorizing a subscription to the stock of the Mayaville, Washington, Fayette, and Lexington turnpike-road company, from which I was compelled to withhold my consent for reasons contained in my message on the 27th May, 1830, to the house of representatives.

The leading principle then asserted was, that Congress possessed no constitutional power to appropriate any part of the money of the United States for objects of a local character, within the States. That principle, I can not be mistaken in supposing, has since received the unequivocal sanction of the American people, and all subsequent reflection has but satisfied me more thoroughly, that the interest of our people, and the purity of our government, if not its existence, depend on the preservation of the public lands as the common property of the United States, and the moneys arising from their sales, are a part of the public revenue. This bill proposes to raise from and appropriate a portion of this public revenue to certain States, providing expressly, that it shall "be applied to objects of internal improvement or education within those States," and then proceeds to appropriate the balance to all the other States, with the declaration, that it shall be applied "to such objects, as little can it be permitted to be thus expended" through the agency of the State governments.

It has been supposed that with all the reductions in our revenue which could be speedily effected by Congress, without injury to the substantial interests of the country, there might be for some years to come a surplus of moneys in the treasury, and that there was in principle, an objection to returning them to the people by whom they were paid. As the literal accomplishment of such a measure is obviously impracticable, it was thought advisable, as the nearest approximation to it, to hand them over to the State governments, the more immediate representatives of the people, to be by them applied to the benefit of those to whom they properly belonged. The principle and the object was, to return to the people an unavoidable surplus of revenue, which might have been paid by them under a system, which could not at once be abandoned; but even this resource, which at one time seemed to be almost the only alternative to saving the general government from grasping unlimited power over internal improvements, was suggested with doubts of its constitutionality.

But this bill assumes a new principle. Its object is not to return to the people an unavoidable surplus of revenue paid in taxes, but to create a surplus for distribution among the States. It seizes the entire proceeds of one source of revenue and sets them apart as a surplus, making it necessary to raise the moneys for supporting the government and meeting the general charges from other sources. It even throws the entire land system upon the customs for its support, and enters the public lands a perpetual charge upon the treasury. It does not return to the people, moneys accidentally or unavoidably paid by them to the government, by which they are wanted; but it compels the people to pay moneys into the treasury for the mere purpose of creating a surplus for distribution to their State governments.

If this principle be once admitted, it is not difficult to perceive to what consequences it may lead. Already this bill, by throwing the land system on the revenues from imports, virtually distributes among the State a part of those revenues. The proportion may be increased from time to time, without any departure from the principle now asserted until the State governments shall derive all the funds, United States, or, if a sufficient supply should be obtained by some States, not by others, the deficient States might complain, and to put an end to all further difficulty, Congress, without assuming any new principle, need go but one step further, and put the salaries of all the State governors, judges, and other officers, with a sufficient sum for their expenses, in their general appropriation bill.

It appears to me that a more direct road to consolidation cannot be devised. Money is power, and in that government which pays all the public officers of the States, will all political power be substantially concentrated. The State governments, if governments they might be called, would lose all their independence and dignity—the economy which now distinguishes them would be converted into a profusion, dependent only by the extent of the supply. Being the treasury of the general government, and looking to its officers, under whatever names they might pass, and by whatever forms their duties might be prescribed, would in effect be the mere stipendiaries and instruments of the central power.

I am quite sure that the intelligent people of our several States will be satisfied, on a little reflection, that it is neither wise nor safe to release the members of their local Legislatures from their responsibility of levying the taxes necessary to support their State governments and vest it in Congress, over most of whose members they have no control. They will not think it expedient that Congress should be the taxgatherer and paymaster of all their internal improvements, and assign all their officers into one mass of common interest and common feeling. It is too obvious that such a course would