

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NORTH-CAROLINA.

I have just received the address of Mr. A. H. Arrington, published in the Republican of July 6th, and although I am bound to fulfill the appointments published heretofore, I snatch a few moments to reply to the attacks the gentleman makes on me and to expose a few of his monstrous absurdities.

It will be remembered that at an early day, I respectfully requested Mr. Arrington to inform me where he was going, and that I would take his own time—that we might, in a manner becoming those not afraid of the truth, meet before the people. In reply he informed me that he should reserve to himself the 'privilege' of visiting such portions of the district, as suited his 'convenience and interest.' On the 18th of May we separated. Being unable to ascertain where he was going, unwilling to dodge about these ten counties, looking for one in pursuit of his 'convenience and interest,' I made appointments and published them. For some weeks, four or five, he remained in Nash County, his friends surprised at not hearing from him. What could be the matter? The mystery is solved. After a month's labor, with the assistance of—I know not how many—he has published a new edition of that same old 'little speech,' which he read out of his 'little book' in Newbern, Greenville, Washington, Hyde, &c. &c. &c. The mountain in labor, brought forth a mouse—a mouse in labor, has brought forth a worthy offspring.

Had Mr. Arrington confined himself in this address to a mere publication of what he has tried to say before the people, I should not have deemed it necessary to waste time by replying to him—but he has seen proper under circumstances not very creditable to him, to attack me, when it was more than probable, I might not see what he had written, time enough to reply to it. He is mistaken: a few hours are quite enough to expose all that he has written—parts of which he has been trying for two years to commit to memory, part of which he had written down in that well known 'little book,' which he brought from Washington City. Let not Mr. Arrington or any of his friends accuse me of dealing harshly. He has misrepresented my course, he has unworthily attacked an absent man—he is firing from behind a tree at a foe, willing to meet him, in the open field—and while I cheerfully admit his right to examine my votes, I claim for myself, for my old constituents, the right of self-defence.

Mr. A. H. Arrington, (I do not know what his middle name is—possibly Holland.) There was once a candidate for Congress, of that name, whose speeches, Mr. Arrington must have studied and whose conduct he endeavors to imitate. So for the sake of brevity I shall call him Mr. Holland Arrington.) Mr. Holland Arrington seems to think that his name 'was brought before the people by a respectable portion of the Republican party.' He is mistaken. He forced his name before them, and could not have been nominated had he not refused to abide by the nomination, unless 'a uniform and consistent democrat' were nominated. He was not the choice of the convention that nominated him.

Instead of giving a 'plain and concise statement' as he promised, of measures to be acted on, at the next session of Congress, he parades a long list of charges selected from newspapers, abusing the last Congress. He tells us of much that he is 'opposed to,' but little or nothing of what he favors. He objects to a high tariff, but contends for a 'moderate tariff.' So do I.

He is opposed to a Bank of the United States, but omits to state that he contends for the odious sub-treasury already condemned by the people. He is opposed to a Bank of the United States, although Washington, Madison, and the Republican party in 1816 were in favor of such a Bank. He is opposed to internal improvements by the General Government whether they are in Michigan, or on the seaboard of North Carolina, or in our own Rivers. He seems to be opposed to every thing national: he is especially opposed to me, and the only thing about which he seems to be concise, plain and explicit is, that he 'contends' that Mr. A. Holland Arrington, ought to represent the eighth Congressional district in the next Congress—big rivers, wheel-horses and all! He communicates to the public new and interesting information, when he announces, that he has represented a district in our State for two years. It would not have been known generally, had he not published it.

It gives him pleasure to state that he has met the 'entire approbation of those' whom he has represented. He is mistaken. He was not, as I understand, elected by democrats: he was taken up by a portion of the democrats and the whigs to beat Mr. Hawkins. He has never been a favorite with his party.

He is very faithfully remembered in Nash for his skill in managing the election in that county—taking an active part against his own political friends.

Before commencing his attack on the whigs for the expenditures, he says 'the whig party had a President of their own choice.' He neglects to say that President Tyler, in the darkness of the night, to thank him for vetoing the Bank of the United States, which he had promised to approve—Yes, he confessed in Newbern, he went to thank Capt. Tyler, and in Washington, he said before several hundred witnesses, that the democrats would have nothing to do with him, that he (Tyler) 'was a traitor to the democrats before he was a traitor to the Whigs.'

Mr. Arrington says "an allusion has been frequently made to the thirty seven millions of dollars, appropriated in 1836 and the impression produced, that the whole of that sum had been expended." &c. &c. I don't know where and when the allusion was made. But the people of this whole country know, that in Mr. Van Buren's time, the expenditures of this government exceeded 30 millions of dollars yearly. They know when the reform administration commenced the expenditures were about 13 millions a year. But Mr. Arrington shall not dodge the truth in this manner, by referring to the appropriations of 1836. Mr. Van Buren's time commenced on the 4th of March 1837. Now let us see how he left matters. Mr. Arrington is, he presumed, voted for Mr. Van Buren and though he 'prefers' Mr. Calhoun, the honest nullifier, he is 'equally fond of Mr. Van Buren—an Irish preference truly. He favors Mr. Calhoun and yet he likes Van Buren, just as well!!

But I am able, without any great labor, to refute Mr. Arrington's charges against the Whigs, to expose his misrepresentations after a month's retirement. The intelligent people of this district understand this better than Mr. Arrington. In fact his charges are already answered. On the 17th of March, 1842, I delivered a speech in the House of Representatives in answer to charges made against the Whig party, in which the truth was told and has never been contradicted. This speech was recently published in the North State Whig, and those who have or will read it, will find an ample refutation of Mr. Arrington's charges. I make the following extract, to which I invite the attention of fair-minded men. The facts are obtained from public documents and will not be denied—part of them from Mr. Woodbury, not a Whig but a Van Buren Democrat.

Before I proceed to speak of the alleged increase of expenditures of 1841, I will give a statement of our financial condition in 1837, the first year of Van Buren's administration, and contrast the state of affairs then with our condition in 1841:

Table with 2 columns: Description and Amount. Includes Treasury on 1st of January 1837 (\$16,337,688 38) and Treasury on 1st of January 1841 (\$18,236,043 39).

(The fourth installment withheld in October, 1837, amounting to \$9,367,214 99, is part of the sum in the Treasury in January 1837.) Then the bank of the United States paid on account of the stock owned by the Government between January, 1837, and March, 1841, the sum of 7,675,591 46

All this over and above the ordinary receipts from customs and lands. The whole of this twenty-five millions was expended during Mr. Van Buren's administration.

Now let us see what were the ordinary receipts and expenditures during the years 1837, 1838, 1839, and 1840.

Table with 2 columns: Receipts and Expenditures for years 1837, 1838, 1839, and 1840. Shows receipts increasing and expenditures decreasing over the period.

Exhibiting an expenditure of more than twenty-three millions over and above receipts from customs and lands in four years of Mr. Van Buren's administration—expending every year more than they received, and taking no means to raise revenue. And what makes the picture more dark is the fact that, under the compromise act, the duties were continually decreasing. In 1840 Mr. Woodbury said in his report:

"The progressive reduction of the present tariff, which has been going on since 1833, will, after December, 1841 take effect to a much larger extent than heretofore. Nearly two millions and a half will then be deducted at once. On the 1st of July afterwards at least two millions and a half more of duties will be deducted, making an aggregate in six months of quite five millions."

And yet no measures were taken to raise revenue, except to borrow money, by issuing Treasury notes, as they did in 1837, 1838, 1839, and 1840.

Now, this statement cannot be impeached. What a sad picture it presents of Mr. Van Buren's administration! From this it will be seen that he had more than 18 millions in the Treasury when he took charge of affairs: How did he leave the government? According to the Reports of two Secretaries of the Treasury, on the fourth

of March, 1841, when Gen. Harrison commenced, there was not one million of dollars in the Treasury! Mr. Arrington admits Mr. Van Buren left a debt of more than eight millions—[\$8,381,555]—to quote his own words, "the whole amount of the public debt, on the 4th of March, 1841,—when the Whig party took possession of the Government." What became of all these 18 millions Mr. Van Buren found in the Treasury? Where is it? Echo answers, where? Ask Swartwout, Boyd, Harris, Hoyt. Will Mr. Arrington tell us what became of all this money? How many thousands did the "Democratic" Multicaulis Colonel, now the Democratic Treasurer of the last Legislature, spend at the Branch Mint in Charlotte?

According to the Document No. 185, to which Mr. Arrington calls "particular attention," there were 26 millions of outstanding appropriations on the 4th of March, 1841. According to Doc. No. 259, House of Representatives, 2nd session, 27th Congress, there were more than 33 millions of outstanding appropriations; and yet with a decreasing revenue, under the compromise act, as the extract just now made from Woodbury's report, fully shews, we are told there were only 8 millions of debt! If the compromise act bro't less than 15 millions a year into the Treasury, if the public lands yielded less than 2 millions a year, what was to be done to meet 33 millions of charges, demands, liabilities against the Government? Suppose the Government by the appropriations of a Van Buren Congress, was bound to meet payments amounting to 33 millions, and had less than 15 millions coming into the Treasury during the year. What do you call this deficit, if debt is not the proper word? Away with such nonsense. The people cannot be thus deceived.

It will be observed from the extract from Mr. Woodbury's report in 1840, that 'after December, 1841, the duties under the compromise act would be less and less.' Speaking of December, 1841, he says: 'Nearly two millions and a half will then be deducted, at once. On the first of July afterwards, at least two millions and a half more will be deducted, making an aggregate, in six months of quite five millions.' This explains how the debt seemed to increase in 1841 and 1842, after the Whigs came into power.

Mr. Arrington most unfairly refers to what he calls the 'first' year of the present Whig administration. He knows the Whigs could not be blamed for the laws passed for the acts of the Van Buren Congress, before March, 1841. We, the Whigs, are not responsible for the 'first year.' But why does he keep back the truth? Why does he confine himself to the first year? Because the truth will tell against him. By reference to the 9th page of the circular which I issued to my constituents some months since, it will be seen from an extract taken from the report of the Committee of Ways and Means, that in 1842, the second year, the appropriations were less than in 1841; and in 1843, the third year, the appropriations made by a Whig Congress, but little exceeded 18 millions of dollars!—half the amount appropriated in 1839, by Mr. Van Buren's party! Yet all this Mr. Arrington carefully keeps out of sight!

When I read Mr. Arrington's address, I came to the conclusion that he had allowed too many of the Committee who prepared it, to put their fingers into the pie. Compare the two extracts which I now quote. In the first column of his address, as published in the paper, he says: 'The Democratic party just before they went out of office, made appropriations for the year '1841, which amounted to \$20,844,561, and to avoid the necessity of an extra session of Congress, gave authority to issue five millions of Treasury notes, amounting to \$25,844,561 (twenty-five millions, eight hundred and forty four thousand, five hundred and sixty-one dollars) for the service of the year 1841.' Here Mr. Arrington says that the outstanding appropriations when the Democrats went out of office amounted to \$25,844,561. In the next column of his address, he says: 'By reference to the official document last referred to (House Doc. No. 185, 3d session, 27th Congress) it will be seen that the outstanding appropriations, on the 4th of March 1841, (the day on which Mr. Van Buren's administration terminated) amounted to \$26,977,611.' Here is a difference of more than one million of dollars!! Who is right, the Secretary of the Treasury, or Mr. Arrington? The Secretary of course. The Secretary don't know every thing. He don't know that we North Carolinians have a River,—(the paradise of Terrapins, since the Democratic Legislature passed the law)—flowing between Hyde county and the banks, twenty-five or thirty miles wide!

But Mr. Arrington will be as remarkable for his fairness as for his extraordinary discoveries in finding big Rivers, and large public debts. Hear him:—Immediately following the extract just made, Mr. Arrington, quoting from Doc. No. 185—says,—"And on the 4th of March 1843, the outstanding appropriations amounted to \$31,589,337, (thirty one millions, five hundred and eighty nine thousand, three hundred and thirty seven dollars)—a larger amount left outstanding by the Whig administration, on the 4th of March last, than by upwards of four and a half millions, than at the close of Mr. Van Buren's administration." Now what will the honest democrats think of Mr. Arrington, when they learn, that in Doc. 185, from which Mr. Arrington quoted, immediately after the statement of the 31 millions outstanding, the Secretary adds the following remark: "Note. The amount of outstanding appropriations on the 4th day of March, 1843, includes appropriations for the half calendar year, ending the 30th June, 1843, and also for the fiscal year ending the 30th of June 1844."—And yet Mr. Arrington, by garbling a public Document, wishes to make the public believe, that the 31 millions outstanding appropriations on the 4th of March, 1843, were for a single year!! Oh shame, where is thy blush!—Surely Mr. Arrington in his figuring, could not have refer-

red to the table on the outside of his little book. Or did some of the Committee write this, while he went to get his trunk from the boat, on its way to the Banks, after he understood he would have some one with him?

After this exposure, I take leave of Mr. Arrington's extravagant expenditure of labor, for so many weeks, in blundering through Doc. 185, to find out how much debt the whig party created. I wonder Mr. Arrington did not suggest, as he did in his speech in Plymouth, that the whig Congress in 1841, ought to have repealed the laws of the previous Congress, and thus saved the public money! Of such a suggestion, the celebrated Mr. Holland senior, might justly have been proud.

Mr. Arrington proceeds to explain his vote against the appropriation for Fort Macon, and what does he say?—Listen: "As a separate measure, I should have given my vote cheerfully, for the small appropriation for Fort Macon, &c. but I could not vote for the appropriation for Fort Macon, without voting in favor of the entire bill." Amazing indeed! Whoever before heard of voting for one fortification in a separate bill? The same bill contained appropriations for forts in Maine, Massachusetts, Virginia, South Carolina and Louisiana. What would the members from all these States say to such a proposition, if a member of Congress could be simple enough to make it? He would be laughed at, and some wag would ask him, "Does your mother know you are out?" The thing is too ridiculous to speak of seriously. Why not vote in a 'separate bill,' for the pay of every company in the army of the United States? Why not vote in a 'separate bill,' for the pay of every vessel or every sailor in the Navy? At the Extra Session, when there was constant expectation of war with England, Mr. Arrington voted, according to my recollection, against a bill appropriating money for repairing fort Caswell, in North Carolina.—One would have thought that, at such a moment, patriotism would have prompted a North Carolinian to vote money for Forts, bearing the time-honored names of Caswell and Macon.

Mr. Arrington, after wading through figures and making quotations from Documents, which he never read, and could not comprehend, if he had,—after wandering, like a lost child in the woods,

"Where wilds immeasurably spread, Seem lengthening as we go,"

Proceeds to the consideration of the Tariff. I have heard of a wild pony on the Banks, that when closely followed, ran into Campico sound, and attempted to swim across. Possibly, he thought he was in 'the River';—and I felt the same sympathy for the pony as I did for Mr. Arrington, when I came to that part of his address, where he makes a plunge, with "regular desperation," into the Tariff. The water is evidently too deep for him. But he does his best. He serves up the old worn-out arguments of the South Carolina disunion papers, in the best style he can. The same arguments we see in the party newspapers daily. While discussing the Tariff, too, Mr. Arrington must refer to my votes,—to what his 'opponent' did, as he calls me. For my part, I do not feel like one who has an 'opponent.' I have met him once since the 18th of May, (and this is the 7th of July.)—about 7 weeks ago,—and then he came to Greenville, after riding as he most affectingly said, 'half the night.' He had heard he was afraid to meet me; so he comes to Greenville, just to show he is not afraid, and forthwith goes right back again!

Referring to the Tariff law, he says:—"But for the passage of that odious measure, the receipts from customs, for the year 1842, would have amounted to nineteen or twenty millions of dollars." The Tariff law, (he correctly says,) went into operation on the 30th of August, 1842, and although not one year has passed, he can tell how much it has lost to the Treasury! He says he is opposed to a high Protective tariff. So am I. The present Tariff is not a 'high protective Tariff.' It gives protection, as all Tariff laws have done, but it was passed for Revenue. Mr. Arrington says "but for the passage of the Tariff law, the Treasury would have received nineteen or twenty millions of dollars." He does not know what he says. After the 30th day of June, 1842, we had no law for the collection of duties. A large majority of Congress, of both parties, thought so, and many of both parties said so; and if Mr. Arrington will look at the Journals of the second session, he will find that on the 29th of June, the acting President vetoed one Tariff bill, and on the 30th June, Mr. Weller, a democrat, moved a suspension of the rules, to enable him to introduce a bill, to extend the present laws for laying and collecting duties on imports,—and Mr. Arrington voted in the affirmative. He then thought, (if he thought at all,) that there was no law to collect revenue.

Mr. Roosevelt, another democrat, one of Mr. Arrington's friends, (who presented to the House of Representatives several petitions from negroes) made a motion similar to Mr. Weller's; and again, Messrs. Weller, Arrington and Roosevelt, voted in the affirmative! Various other motions of a like character were made by democrats and whigs—all concurring in the opinion that we had no law for the collection of duties!—When I voted for the tariff we had no law to raise money to pay the army or navy, the soldiers, pensions, or even to repair forts!—The country seemed to be on the verge of dissolution. And yet a law, which is paying the debts and supporting the honor of the nation, by bringing money into the Treasury, is said by Mr. Arrington, to have caused 'a loss' to the Government!

It was a Tariff law,—a law imposing duties on articles, made in Foreign nations, that first enabled our government to support a respectable station among the nations of the earth. In 1789, our Government went into operation, under our present constitution, George Washington was President: he

had taken an oath 'to support, protect and defend the Constitution.'

Here is a copy of the title of the first Tariff law, approved by George Washington, on the fourth day of July, 1789.

"Whereas it is necessary, for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares and merchandise imported;—Be it enacted &c. &c. Genl. Washington thought the mechanics of our country ought to be protected—the framers of our Constitution thought so. But the soap-locks—the dandies of the present day think Washington was mistaken.

Mr. Jefferson said in 1816: "He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures, 'must be for reducing us either to dependence on foreign nations or to be clothed in skins, and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am not one of those.— Experience has taught me, that manufactures are now as necessary to our Independence, as to our comfort.'

Mr. Arrington professes great love for Jeffersonian doctrines. If Jefferson was right, Mr. Arrington is wrong:—(a question which, I think, will bother a wheel-horse to settle.)

Genl. Jackson said in his letter to Dr. Coleman, in 1824, when he was in the Senate of the United States, and voted for the tariff of that year,—a higher tariff than that of 1842:—"In short, we have been too long subject to the policy of British merchants. It is time we should become a little more Americanized, and instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of England feed our own; or else in a short time, by continuing our present policy, we shall be rendered paupers ourselves. We spoke the Hero of New Orleans, who protected American laborers, by voting for the Tariff of 1824, as he protected the Beauty and booty," of British bayonets, in 1815.

The tariff of 1824, which Genl. Jackson voted for, imposed higher duties on salt, boots and shoes, iron, nails, brown sugar, &c. &c., than did the tariff of 1842. But says Mr. A. Holland Arrington, "if Mr. Staley was right, then the whole delegation from North Carolina were wrong." Indeed! Then if Genl. Jackson was right, Mr. Staley was right. If Genl. Jackson was right, Mr. Arrington is wrong.

Mr. Buchanan voted in the Senate for a bill of 1842. So did states Wright of New York. Buchanan is before the democrats, as one of their candidates for the Presidency, to be nominated, or if Silas Wright be nominated as Vice-President, with Calhoun, Mr. Arrington is pledged to support him.—If Buchanan and Wright were right, so was Mr. Staley. Or does Mr. Arrington intend to say, his opponent was wrong—any how! If a soft gentleman like Mr. Arrington, looking so 'bewitchingly simple,' as he does, can stand the comparison, does he intend to stand up the stream, like the wolf in the fable, and tell the lamb below, he muddies the water?

But I wish the democrats of the district to ask Mr. Arrington—was General Jackson right or wrong in his war upon Mr. Calhoun, in nullification days? Is Mr. Arrington in favor of nullification, unless the tariff is repealed at South Carolina dictation? In the month of April, Mr. Arrington had 'two first choices' for the Presidency—afterwards he 'preferred Calhoun, but liked Van Buren equally well.' The nullifier democrats are in favor of plain dealing; so Mr. Arrington had to say, he preferred Mr. Calhoun—was his first choice. Mr. Calhoun boasts he is still a nullifier. Does Mr. A. approve of that? South Carolina still threatens to dissolve the Union. Is Mr. Arrington ready for that? I do not intend to speak with unkindness of all the nullifiers. Some of them were as honest and honorable men as any in the country. Many of them now know that their opinions were wrong. Many of them I respect; but they have not "two first choices" for the Presidency. General Jackson was in favor of the Tariff and the Union—Oh, what shall Mr. Arrington do? Run with the hare and hold with the hounds, get back, to his 'two first choices,' read out of his little book, say the whigs are Federalists, refuse to support any nullifier for Congress, say he is 'a farmer,' lay low and keep dark, attack his opponent when he is not present, and try to make his way to Congress by the strength of his purse!

Mr. Arrington says, under the present Tariff law, the tax on 'sugar, iron, salt, coarse cotton,' &c. &c. has 'been increased.' If he means to say, there was an increase after 30th June, 1842, when there was no Tariff, he is right, but if he means to say there was an increase, comparing this with the Tariff of 1824 or '28—he does not speak truly. I again invite attention to a table published on the 8th page of my circular, for the proof of my assertion.

Mr. Arrington selects a few articles, to prove the injustice of the Tariff law, in laying duties on such articles as he says are principally consumed by the South. How does he prove they are consumed principally, by the South? A Northern or Western State, that has a population of several hundred thousand more people than ours, must consume more.

But to show the fallacy of, and expose this attempt at deception, I give below a table which shows the duties on certain articles consumed by the South. Let the facts speak for themselves. Let it be borne in mind that the following distinguished persons voted for the Tariff of 1824: Andrew Jackson, Martin Van Buren, Richard M. Johnson, John H. Eaton, and Thomas H. Benton. The following voted for the Tariff of 1828, (called the bill of abominations by the Nullifiers)—Martin Van Buren, Richard M. Johnson, Thos. H. Benton, and John H. Eaton. 1832, the Tariff of '28 was reduced. The following persons voted for that law and it is fair to suppose they were satisfied with the reduction. Henry W. Connor, Thomas H. Hall, M. T. Hawkins, Jesse Speight.

Here is the table, containing some of Mr. Arrington's articles 'consumed by the South.'

Table with multiple columns listing various goods (Sugar, Cotton, Iron, etc.) and their respective duties under different tariff laws (1824, 1828, 1832, 1836, 1842).

Several of the North Carolina politicians recommending "direct taxation,"—and other democrats in Congress, have favored it. I never heard of a Whig yet who approved it. Without a Tariff, which taxes foreigners, and the rich consumers of foreign articles, we must have direct taxation, which will bear, with intolerable force, on the poor.

Mr. Arrington says I voted for a tariff, which increases the tax upon all the common necessities of life. If Mr. Arrington wrote that, he is guilty of a departure from the truth. He is in favor of a moderate duty, such as will reduce the tax, upon all the common necessities of life,—encourage agriculture and commerce, thereby bringing into the Treasury, twenty millions a year." If he will only encourage agriculture, commerce and manufactures, I will agree with him. Why not "encourage" all? What strange arguments these moderate Tariff men advance! The tariff of 1814, 1824, &c. were high Tariffs, because the country was in debt, high tariffs to raise money. Yet, the Tariff of 1842, passed when the country was in debt, although lower than the Tariff of 1824, &c. is too high to raise money!!! Consistency, thou art a jewel!

Mr. Arrington seems to think I ought to have voted as my colleagues did. That course would suit him, better than me. Mr. Arrington is a happy man, to save himself the trouble of thinking and acting for himself. It is enough for me to say, in answer to this charge, that I voted as I thought best for the country, for the interest of my constituents and the State.

But my colleagues did not differ with me, because they thought the tariff was too high, but because they hoped to be able to prevent Mr. Tyler from cheating us out of the public land money. I thought differently, I knew, or believed I knew, that a majority of Congress, Northern and Western Whigs and Democrats, were determined to have a tariff. Many of both parties said so. I respected the motives of my Whig colleagues,—they, I know, respect mine. Satisfied with the approbation of my own conscience, and of my constituents, I have no apologies to make.

After struggling desperately like one trying to grasp, in water too deep for him, this coil (of a Tariff) by the tail, Mr. Arrington branches off, to the Bankruptcy law.

He thus misrepresents that law—"A prominent measure of the Whig Congress was the passage of a Bankrupt law, which authorized debtors, to repudiate at will, their honest debts."

This is an unworthy misrepresentation. In obedience to public opinion the law was repealed. It was for the benefit of honest debtors, and prevented fraudulent assignments, in favor of favored creditors.

Mr. Arrington says an attempt was made by the Whig party at the last Congress, to destroy, by the Veto power, this is untrue. No such attempt was made, that I ever heard of, by the Whig party. It comes with a good grace from a 'farmer,' republican, &c. &c. always governed by Republican principles, &c. &c.—to suppose any modification of the Veto power,—the power which enables the President to defeat the will of the Representatives of the people, which gives one man, in this Republican Government, the power of a King!

Mr. Arrington is opposed to a U. S. Bank, both on the grounds of expediency and unconstitutionality. Well as Mr. Arrington "has always been governed by true Republican principles," as he tells us, he ought to know what is constitutional, what not. But George Washington differed with Mr. Arrington. One was right, the other wrong—George Washington was the President of the Convention which formed the Constitution. Possibly, if he had read Mr. Arrington's arguments, he might have thought differently.

James Madison, acting under oath, said a Bank of the United States was constitutional. Mr. Arrington differs with him. If Mr. Arrington is right, Mr. Madison was wrong. Mr. Madison was a Republican, governed by Republican principles, and his Administration, history tells us, met the 'entire approbation' of a large majority of the country. The Supreme Court said, more than once, a bank of the United States is constitutional, but Mr. Arrington says it is not. Of course the Supreme Court was 'wrong,' if Mr. Arrington is 'right.' In 1816, Gen. Turner of Warren, in the Senate from North Carolina, voted for a Bank, and in 1816, when the Bank was chartered, the vote of the North Carolina delegation in Congress stood 9 for the Bank, 3 against it. Caswell, W. of Edgecombe, Bartlett, Yancy, & W. Clark, of North Carolina, (now Senator from Alabama,) and W. R. King, (now Senator from Alabama,) voted for the Bank in 1816. Then it was a Republican measure. If so then, why do you, Mr. Arrington, right, in saying—"the questions now at issue are the same as were between the Federal and Republican parties, in the days of old John Adams?" What nonsense!

Mr. Arrington informs us, he is a strict constructionist—that he is opposed to the exercise of all powers by the General Government except those expressly granted. Will he say where he finds power in the constitution to build light-houses, light-boats, and hospitals? Of course, he must be opposed to the exercise of these powers, by the Government. He would allow the 'constitutional stump' to remain in our oysters, until a school of 'shovel-nose sharks' could remove them!