AN ADDRESS

TO THE

PEOPLE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

FELLOW CITIZENS:

We deem no apology necessary for inviting your attention to the present political condition of our country. No citizen of a Republic should content himself with merely complaining of the corruption and mismanagement of his rulers.—The remedy for all such evils is in the hands of THE PEOPLE, and now, if ever, their country calls for the greatest vigilance and the most active exertion. In every department of the Federal Government there are abuses great and undeniable. The Public Treasure has been squandered with a profusion and shamelessness unexampled in our history—the patronage of the President has been used for the most unworthy and corrupting purposes; defaulters have gorged themselves with money which was earned by the hard hands of industry, and have laughed to scorn those who expressed their indignation at such a system of plunder and peculation. (See appendix A.) When some of these corruptions have been brought to light, the President and his Secretary have closed their eyes, or winked at and permitted them. Has a receiver confessed his defalcation, or been detected in his pilferings? he is still continued in office as a fit tool to do the dirty work of party. Millions of dollars have been lost, which a reasonable prudence and impartial discharge of duty might have saved; and while these public plunderers are rivaling in their banquets and luxurious living, even royalty itself, the Government is compelled from time to time to borrow money by the issuing of Treasury Notes—to anticipate a revenue which is constantly decreasing, from the effects of mischievous experiments upon the business and currency of the country. We charge, Fellow Citizens, this Administration with pursuing a policy which is degrading to the character of the nation—at war with the principles of the Constitution, and subversive of our dearest rights. We charge Martin Van Buren with introducing a system of vile corruption and low partizan tactics, which has given birth to characters and pursuits before unknown to the American People, and degrading to their national honor,—with making political desert consist in devotion to *him*, and the advancement of *party*. Hence, no sooner is one of his devotees rejected by the people, than he is caressed and compensated by the President. Hence, too, the boldness and spirit which are infused into the warfare of his party; as not only leaders, but the rank and file are taught to believe their reward is sure, that offices and honors are reserved for their faithful services in behalf of their master, and that to the party triumphant—"to the victors belong the spoils." Are you willing to entrust the PURSE and the SWORD to men of such principles? The control over the former has been repeatedly claimed by the President and by the passage of the Sub-Treasury Bill, has been virtually placed at his disposal; and we charge that he is now attempting to seize the latter, by recommending the establishment of a large

STANDING ARMY,

under the guise of organizing the militia; and that you may the better understand this monstrous scheme which is to place at the disposal of the President TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND ARMED MEN, we will lay before you a sketch of it, that you may form your own opinions, and act as your judgments may dictate.

Our forefathers, wisely jealous of Standing Armies, deemed in all ages of the world dangerous to the freedom of the People, provided in the Constitution for those cases in which Congress should have power to call forth the Militia, and these are "*to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions;*" and while they allowed Congress to provide for "*organizing, arming and disciplining* the Militia," they reserved to the States "the appointment of the Officers and the authority of training the Militia, &c." The Secretary [illegible] is to be divided into TEN MILITARY DISTRICTS, a force of two hundred thousand men is to be drafted from the body of the Militia, between the ages of 20 and 45, one hundred thousand of whom is to constitute the ACTIVE FORCE, liable to be called forth to any part of the great Military District in which they may reside, and when so called forth, to be deemed *in the service of the United States*, and shall be subject to such regulations as the PRESIDENT alone may think proper to adopt for their instruction, discipline, &c. Consider for a moment what vast discretionary powers are conferred by this scheme upon the President. He is authorized to call forth and assemble the ACTIVE FORCE—where? Why, at such places, within their respective districts, as he may select! When? At such times, not exceeding twice, nor —— days in the same year as "*he may deem necessary.*" Each district, (with the exception of Mr. Van Buren's own State) embraces several States; that in which you reside being composed of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and the Territory of Florida. So that by the President's *mere will*, a citizen of this State, may be marched from his family and home, many hundreds of miles—even into the glades of Florida, at any season of the year, HE may think necessary, and this too, not to *execute the laws*—not to *suppress insurrections*—not to *repel invasions*, but in a time of *profound peace*, when none of the cases which the Constitution contemplates, require that the Militia should be so called forth! Consider too, that by this scheme the Constitutional provision, that the States' respectively shall retain the right of training their own Militia, is in effect abolished; for not only would their authority be feeble if not inoperative, in another State, but the Constitution makes the President Commander-in-Chief of the Army and *Militia* of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States. This scheme, so extravagant, so dangerous to our liberties, and so marked with all the features of despotism, was approved by Martin Van Buren, and recommended to Congress in his last annual message.—This is his language:—

"*I cannot recommend too strongly to your consideration the plan "submitted by that officer* (Mr. Poinsett) *for the organization of the "Militia of the United States.*"

Now remember, Fellow Citizens, that by the provisions of the Sub-Treasury Bill, which has at last been forced upon the People by a very lean majority, after having been repeatedly rejected, the Secretary of the Treasury, an officer dependent on the President, and removable at his pleasure, has power "to transfer monies in the hands "of any one depositary constituted by this act, to any other depositary "constituted by the same, at HIS DISCRETION, and as the safety of "the public monies and the convenience of the public shall seem to him to require." Now think for a moment of the condition of this great Republic—its citizens and its treasure! According to a plan which the President says "*he cannot too strongly recommend*"—*he* can transfer the persons of the citizens at such time, and to such place "as he may deem necessary" in the large Military District, while HIS Secretary, Levi Woodbury, can transfer the public money from one depositary to another, "*at his discretion.*" HOW COULD THERE BE A MORE COMPLETE UNION OF THE PURSE AND THE SWORD?

But let us look at another feature of this monstrous plan.—It provides,

"That every citizen so enrolled and notified shall, within three months thereafter, "PROVIDE HIMSELF with a good musket, bore of capacity to receive a lead "ball of eighteen in the pound; a sufficient bayonet and belt; two spare flints; a "knapsack; cartridge box, to contain at least twenty-four cartridges suited to the "bore of his musket, and each cartridge to contain a ball and three buck-shot, and "a sufficient quantity of powder; or with a good rifle, knapsack, shot pouch, and "powder horn or flask, with sufficient powder and ball for twenty-four charges, and "two spare flints; and that he shall appear so armed, accoutred, and provided when "called out for exercise or into service."

Here then would be a *direct tax* upon every poor man in the country between the ages of 20 and 45! These equipments cannot cost each citizen less than $15 and this amount is to be raised *within three months* after notification!—Who does not know that such a tax as this would deprive many a poor man of his only horse or cow? Many too would be wholly unable to purchase the equipments. What then?—He is to be FINED, and if unable to pay, IMPRISONED!—Are the People ready for this? Again:—According to the most accurate information we can obtain, there are about 60,000 persons in North Carolina between the ages of 20 and 45, on whom this tax of $15 dollars each would fall. This would make $900,000 to be collected from the pockets of the people of this State, within three months after notification! Would this not bring distress unexampled in our history? And who knows but this may be demanded IN SPECIE? We would also ask to whom would this immense amount of money go? Not to encourage our own industry, for such equipments are not generally manufactured in the South. But it would go to the benefit of the manufactures of the North!—We ask again, People of North Carolina, are you prepared for the adoption of such a tyrannical scheme—such a cold-blooded plan to grind you to poverty and to prostrate your liberties!—Examine it, we entreat you, before it be too late to retrace your steps!

LIEUT. HOOE—THE NEGRO WITNESSES!

Here is one subject to which we would solicit your most earnest attention. It is a matter ultimately connected with the happiness—yea, the very safety of the South. During the year 1839, *George M. Hooe*, a lieutenant in our Navy, was tried before a Court-Martial held in Pensacola Bay, Florida, on several charges which had been alleged against him. Two NEGROES were introduced as WITNESSES, to which he objected. His objection was overruled by the Court, and the *Negroes* were permitted to give in their evidence. Lieut. Hooe, was found guilty on some of the charges, and sentenced to be reprimanded, and dismissed. The proceedings of the Court were approved by the Secretary of the Navy, and sent to the President for his sanction, the laws of the United States requiring that HE should pass upon them, before a commissioned Officer could be dismissed. Lieut. Hooe, addressed a remonstrance to Mr. Van Buren, and brought to his notice the fact that the negroes had been permitted to testify against him, alleging that it was ILLEGAL and ERRONEOUS, and should vitiate the whole proceedings. What course did the President take? Did he step forth to rescue our gallant Navy from the disgrace which would likely be brought upon it by such a practice, and to shield the institutions of the South from the insult which had been offered them? *No*—NO! With shame, with indignation, let it be spoken—he returned the proceedings with the following endorsement; (see appendix B.)

"THE PRESIDENT FINDS NOTHING IN THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE CASE OF LIEUTENANT HOOE, WHICH REQUIRES HIS INTERFERENCE." M. V. B.

These facts the friends of the Administration dare not deny; they have indeed already admitted them, and what should arouse the astonishment and indignation of the South, they are endeavoring to JUSTIFY THE PRESIDENT. His official organ, and his hireling presses, in every section of the country, are either attempting to conceal or to palliate this indignity to the South—this indecent and outrageous attack upon the prejudices and usages of the Slave-holding States. The Globe of the 25th of June, has the following language:

"Were negroes debarred from giving their testimony on Courts "Martial, it is easy to predict the consequences both to the guilty and "the innocent, who may be accused of the commission of crime.—"We have been told by an old and experienced officer of the Navy, "that in Southern latitudes, it was his custom to have two boat crews, "one composed exclusively of blacks who were employed on occa-"sions, where exposure to the heat and sun, would have been danger-"ous to white men. *Suppose, that while absent from the Ship, en-"gaged in watering, or any other pursuit, some offence, however "aggravated, were commitied by an officer in charge of the Party, "in the presence of no other witness but these blacks, and the Offi-"cer brought to a Court Martial on board the Ship, to which he "belonged. By excluding the only witness to the transaction, the "offender would escape, and the crime go unpunished.*"

And are the People of this Country prepared to sanction such reasoning as this? The same process of argument would establish the power of introducing NEGROES AS WITNESSES [illegible] negroes, commits crime—and this organ of the administration would admit THEIR evidence, because, forsooth, *the master would go unpunished!* An overseer of a road has under him no hands but negroes, he commits a crime,—assaults one of the blacks, for instance,—should he be convicted on *Negro testimony?* The Globe, it seems, would think so!—Suppose there are but two white men present, the negroes, having some grudge against one, *kill him*, and inform against the other, what can save him? We repeat there would be no safety for property, character, or life, under such a practice. If NEGROES can, and ought to be WITNESSES, in the Naval Courts Martial, why not in the Military also? Why not in the Federal Courts? Is an officer of the Army to be entitled to more respect, than an officer of the Navy? Will any man exhibit the effrontery to contend for the introduction of such a practice in our Federal Courts? We say, therefore, as the laws of the Union were silent on the admission of negro evidence, as the trial occurred in a slave-holding territory—in the neighborhood of slave-holding States—as they were introduced against a *Southern man*—a Virginian, whose feelings had been taught to revolt at such a practice,—it was the duty of Martin Van Buren to disapprove the proceedings!

What son of the South will ever join your Navy, if he knows that under, this practice thus approved by the President, he can be deprived of his fair fame, or his life? Who would have stood such an indignity to the American People, as the introduction of a NEGRO Witness against the gallant Lawrence, the intrepid Decatur—the chivalrous Blakely, and a host of others, who have shed a halo of glory around their Country's name! Why then should they tamely submit to this, act thus sanctioned by the President? Is Lt. Hooe entitled to less sympathy, because he is more humble? Should justice be denied him, because he is less great? Insulting indeed would that man be considered, who would propose one set of rules to try the great and powerful and another to try the humble and the weak! But say the friends of the Administration, Lt. Hooe, could have been convicted witout the NEGRO TESTIMONY, and some have boldly asserted that he was not found guilty on any of the specifications in which they testified; but what says the District Attorney, Mr. Key, in his letter to the President, which was published in the Standard of July 1st? "*They* (the negroes) *were examined on the fourth specification of the first and third charges, and no other specifications of either of these charges.* THE ACCUSED WAS FOUND GUILTY OF THOSE SPECIFICATIONS TO SOME EXTENT."—But even admitting that their evidence was not necessary to convict him, does this alter the principle? Does it make the practice less dangerous? No! If the Negro testimony was not necessary, why was it admitted? To insult the South? To insult and degrade the Navy? No other reason can be given.—We pronounce then that this act of Martin Van Buren IS AN INSULT TO OUR GALLANT NAVY—AN INDIGNITY TO THE WHOLE SOUTH, and proves conclusively, that though he is a "Northern man" he can lay no claim to "*southern feelings.*" Now, Fellow Citizens, we ask you to contrast with this conduct of Mr. Van Buren, the law which was approved by General Harrison when Governor of Indiana. *Read and judge for yourselves!*

"CHAPTER 46—PAGE 311.

"AN ACT regulating the practice in the General Court, and Court of Common "Pleas, and for other purposes.

"SEC. 24. No negro, mulatto, or Indian, shall be a witness, except in Pleas of "the United States against negroes, mulattoes, or Indians, or in civil pleas, where negroes, mulattoes or Indians alone shall be parties.

"JESSE B. THOMAS,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"B. CHAMBERS,
"*President of the Council.*

"Approved, Sept. 17, 1807.
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

MR. VAN BUREN AND ABOLITIONISM.

The Van Buren Central Committee, in their late address, assert that "*one fact is worth a hundred professions.*" This is certainly true, and we desire no other criterion by which to test the soundness of *their* Candidate for the Presidency, on that subject which so vitally concerns the whole South. In 1819–20 he was a member of the Senate of New York. The Missouri Question was then before Congress, and Mr. Van Buren voted for the following Preamble and Resolutions instructing Rufus King, then a Senator of the United States, to oppose "the admission of any State into the Union without making the prohibition of Slavery therein an *indispensable condition*:

"Whereas, the inhibiting the further extension of slavery in these United States, "is a subject of deep concern to the people of this State; and whereas, we con-"sider slavery as an evil much to be deplored, and that every Constitutional bar-"rier should be interposed to prevent its further extension; and that the Constitution of the United States clearly gives Congress the right to require of New "States, not comprehended within the original boundaries of the United States, "the prohibiting of Slavery as a condition of their admission into the Union;

"*Therefore Resolved*, (if the honorable Senate concur therein,) That our Sena-"tors be instructed and our Representatives in Congress be requested, to oppose "the admission as a State into the Union, of any Territory not comprised as afore-"said, making the prohibition of slavery therein an indispensable condition of ad-"mission.

"On the 29th day of January, 1820, the Senate took up the Resolution and pass-"ed the same unanimously."

Mr. Van Buren voted, YEA!

Here then is one fact!

In 1821, Mr. Van Buren was a member of the convention which amended the Constitution of New York. The following entry appears on the Journal, as certified to by Mr. Blatchford, the Governor's Secretary viz:

TUESDAY, 10 o'clock, A. M., September 21, 1821.

The Convention met pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Mr. Sanford,

The Convention then resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Report of the Committee on the right of Suffrage, and the qualifications of persons to be elected; and, after some time spent thereon, Mr. President resumed the Chair, and Mr. N. Williams, from the said Committee, reported, that, in further proceedings on the said report, the first amendment proposed by the Select Committee was again read, in the words following, to wit:

Every white male citizen, of the age of twenty-one years, who shall have resided in this State six months next preceding any election, and shall, within one year peceding the election, have paid any tax assessed upon him, or shall, within one year preceding the election, have been assessed to work on a public road, and shall have performed the work assessed upon him, or shall have paid an equivalent in money therefor, according to law; or shall, within one year preceding the election, have been enrolled in the militia of this State, and shall have served therein, according to law, shall be entitled to vote at such election, in the town or ward in which he shall reside, for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Senators, Members of the Assembly, and all other officers, who are or may be elective by the people.

Mr. Jay moved to strike out the word "WHITE, in the first line of the said amendment.

Debates were had thereon; and, the question having been put, whether the committee would agree to the said motion, it was carried in the affirmative.

The yeas and nays being called for by Mr. R. Clark, seconded by Mr. Tallmadge, and having been required by ten members, were as follows, to wit—Ayes, 63, Nays 59.

Martin Van Buren voted *YEA!*

Under this amendment which Mr. Van Buren supported, A FREE NEGRO could have voted, *though he possessed no property qualification*—and even though he may have been *found guilty of some crime!* This then is *another* fact!

In the year 1821–2, Mr. Van Buren was a member of the United States Senate, and on the 169th page of the Journal of that session we find this entry, viz:

The Senate resumed, as in committee of the whole, the consideration of the bill for the establishment of a territorial government in Florida; and, the bill having been amended, it was reported to the House accordingly; and,

On the question to concur in the amendment to the 11th section, to strike out, after the word "freedom," in the 13th line thereof, the residue of said section, as follows:

"No slave or slaves shall, directly or indirectly, be introduced into the said territory, except by a citizen of the United States removing into the said territory for actual settlement, and being, at the time of such removal, bona fide owner of such slave or slaves; or any citizen of the United States travelling into the said territory with any servant or servants, not exceeding two; and every slave imported or brought into the said territory, contrary to the provisions of this act, shall, thereupon, be entitled to and receive his or her freedom."

It was determined in the affirmative,—Yeas 23, Nays 20.

MARTIN VAN BUREN voted NAY!

Behold then a THIRD "*fact!*" And let it be remembered this vote was given *after* the solemn compromise on the Missouri Question!

Again: So recently as during the last year, Mr. Van Buren, whose *professions* are so profuse, approved the introduction of NEGRO EVIDENCE against WHITE MEN as stated above; for he proclaimed, *over his own signature*, that he saw "NOTHING" in the proceedings to require his interference, even after Lieut. Hooe had particularly called his attention to that very objection which appeared on the face of the record! Here then is a FOURTH "*fact!*" If, after all these FACTS, each of which the friends of Mr. Van Buren say is worth "an hundred professions," fail to convince you that he is not sound on the subject of abolition, then indeed are professions *every thing*, and acts *nothing*—then truly should public men be judged, not by what they *do*, but by what they *profess*, when interest or fear may dictate to or sway them!

[To be continued in our next.]

CHAS. MANLY, WILL: H. BATTLE,
JNO. H. BRYAN, WESTON R. GALES,
GEO. W. HAYWOOD, THOS. J. LEMAY,
HUGH McQUEEN, HENRY W. MILLER,
Whig Central Committee.

MR. GRAHAM'S CIRCULAR,

To the Freemen of the twelfth Congressional District of North Carolina.

Fellow Citizens: Before the last Congressional election, when I publicly addressed the people in my district, I informed them that I would at the polls vote for General Harrison if he were nominated for the Presidency. I did not then intend or expect again to address you on that subject, believing, when the people had all the principles and services of the candidates *fairly* before them, they would make a judicious choice. But to my surprise and regret I have seen a circular letter signed and published by the Hon. W. Montgomery and the Hon. M. T. Hawkins, two of the Van Buren Members of Congress from North Carolina, grossly misrepresenting the opinions of Gen. Harrison, and deceiving the People, while they pretend to refer to his recorded votes and public acts.—Now, I think those who fill honorable stations (like witnesses in law) should tell the whole truth, and not publish a part of a law approved by Gen. Harrison, and withhold and suppress a part, and a very important part, too, on the same subject, and approved by him on the same day.—For instance, in their circular, letter, they publish two sections (the 30th and 31st) of the Indiana laws, leaving out and entirely omitting the 9th section of the law in the same book, on the same subject. Now to the law and the testimony.

The only part of the Indiana law published by W. Montgomery and M. T. Hawkins in their letter is the following:

Extract from the Laws of the Indiana Territory, printed at Vincennes by Messrs. Stout & Smoot in 1807, *and now in the Library of the State Department, Washington city.*

CHAP. VI. AN ACT RESPECTING CRIMES AND PUNISHMENTS.

Sec. 30. When any person or persons shall, on conviction of any crime or breach of any penal law, be sentenced to pay a fine or fines, with or without the costs of prosecution, it shall and may be lawful for the court before whom such conviction shall be had, to order the sheriff to sell or hire the person or persons so convicted to service to any person or persons who will pay the said fine and costs for such term of time as the said court shall judge reasonable. And if such person or persons so senteuced and hired or sold shall abscond from the service of his or her master or mistress before the term of such servitude shall be expired, he or she so absconding shall, on conviction before a justice of the peace, be whipped with thirty-nine stripes, and shall moreover serve two days for every one so lost.

Sec. 31. The judges of the several courts of record in this Territory shall give this act in charge to the grand jury at each and every court in which a grand jury shall be sworn.

JESSE B. THOMAS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
B. CHAMBERS,
President of the Council.

Approved, September 17, 1807.

WM. H. HARRISON.

After they copy A PART of the Indiana law, (and one vote from the journals of Ohio, on which, I believe they lay no stress, and make no comment,) they obtain the following certificate:

"At the request of the Hon William Montgomery and Hon. M T Hawkins we certify that the foregoing copy of an extract from a law passed in the Territorial Assembly of Indiana, and signed by William H. Harrison, as Governor of said Territory, and the extract from the journal of the State of Ohio, are truly copied

CHARLES FISHER, HENRY W. CONNOR,
ROBERT STRANGE, JOHN HILL,
BEDFORD BROWN, JAMES I. McKAY,
CHARLES SHEPARD, J. A. BYNUM"

Well, after W. Montgomery and M. T. Hawkins have got a part of the laws of Indiana in their letter, and procured the whole of their political friends from North Carolina to bear witness that the extracts which they set forth "are truly copied," they begin to assail and charge Gen. HARRISON with holding sentiments he never expressed, and supporting laws he never approved, but in connection with another material part which they omitted and jumped over. I will give a *sample* of the most unfounded and unjust charges contained in their celebrated circular letter. They ask the people in tones of deep distress and long lamentation:

"How would you feel to see one of your respectable and good neighbor-women sold at auction by the sheriff of your county as a slave under the Harrison law to some free negro? And only think what would be your feelings to see one of your fair but respectable neighbor-women knocked off by the sheriff's hammer to a free negro as his slave, to be under his commands, and compelled to obey him whatever they might be; and should she resist to obey, and leave her black master's service, and should apprehend her and drag her before a justice of the peace, and under this Harrison law receive thirty-nine lashes inflicted upon his white female slave, and then compel her to serve two days for one she had lost from her black master's service? Would you be willing to vote for such a man as President?"

We have authority as high as HEAVEN itself for saying the truth is great and shall prevail. Now, let me give you the 9th section of the law which was omitted and not published by W. Montgomery and M. T. Hawkins in their letter, and then you will see the whole law and the whole truth, and see how triumphantly General Harrison will stand acquitted of the charge so unjustly made against him, of having approved a law whereby poor white men and poor white women might be sold at public auction as slaves to free negroes.

"9 No negro, mulatto, or Indian, shall at any time purchase any servant other than of their own complexion; and if any of the persons aforesaid shall, unless pre-emptor to purchase a white servant, [illegible] vant shall immediately become free, and shall be held, deemed, and taken."

Now see, with your own eyes, the gross imposition practised on the people and the rank injustice done to General Harrison by publishing a part and not the whole of the Indiana law; all of which sections were approved and signed by him on the same day, when he was, in 1807, acting under the appointment of Mr. Jefferson, the Governor of that Territory.

This one-sided-evidence and one-half practice of proving propositions is very dangerous, and would lead to deplorable consequences. Suppose a cunning artful infidel, or rather an atheist who was desirous of sowing and spreading his own pernicious sentiments, should assert and publish to the People that "there is no God," and call upon eight witnesses to certify that he had truly copied and taken the extract from the Bible itself; if the People had no other method of deriving information, and relied upon that, the proof would be positive and uncontradicted; but if they would search and read the Bible, they would see a very important part had been omitted and left out; and when the whole sentence was read correctly, it was thus, "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God." So that the meaning and sense of divine truth is totally changed by reading the whole sentence together.

[illegible] whitewashing, when jails were scarce, when money was scarce, and taxes very low, the Legislature of that Territory, just fresh from the People, passed a law declaring, when a grand jury found a bill of indictment against any person, and he was convicted thereon by the petit jury before the court, and sentenced to pay a fine and costs, as a punishment for his sins and crimes, if they were not paid, then the court might order the sheriff to hire or sell the convicted defendent to labor and work a reasonable time with some person, (no blacker than himself,) to pay the fine and costs of prosecution. General Harrison approved and signed this law, as Governor of that new Territory, and W. Montgomery and M. T. Hawkins censure him for it. Well, now, I want to know what is to be done with rogues? Are they to steal without conviction or punishment? or, if convicted, who shall pay the costs—the hard-working tax-payers of the country or the idle rogues? When a felon has been caught with his neighbor's sheep on his back, and fairly convicted of stealing, who shall pay the costs, the honest farmer or the sheep thief? That is the question. I think it unfair and unjust that the farmer should lose his property and then be compelled to pay the cost of the indictment. That would look like paying the thief for stealing the sheep. Gen. HARRISON is an honest man, without any fellow-feeling for rogues & thieves, & when they steal, & are convicted of it, he has said they must pay the costs; and if they have found stealing a bad business, and have nothing to satisfy the costs, they shall be hired out to some individual to work for the amount of the costs and charges of the indictment. Is what honest man in America thinks that is not right and just? If every rogue was compelled to work his passage, to pay his fine and costs, taxes would be lower, and villains would be more scarce. Every body approves of making a convict work in the penitentiary; yes, white men and white women, too, there confined by iron bolts and bars, must work hard and live hard, or receive *the lash* of the stern overseer. Well, now, is it not easier and better for a convicted felon (who, like the owl, feeds upon his neighbor's poultry) to be hired or sold for a month to a clever farmer, until he works and makes money enough to pay his jail fees and court costs? Surely it is much more just that the infamous rogue should go into the field and work and pay the jailer for his meat and bread, than he should sit quietly in the prison (perhaps playing cards with some fellow-sinner) and occasionally peeping through the grates and overseeing some honest farmer toiling to feed his family, and obliged to pay high taxes beside, to support and maintain lazy rascals who starve their own families and steal from their neighbors. The virtuous People of North Carolina (who are in the habit of calling things by their proper names) will not be deluded by calling a sinner a saint, or deceived by tenderly calling a hog-thief "a poor but respectable and good neighbor man." Surely there is nothing respectable and good neighbor-man like in catching a slippery fellow with your hog on his back but an honest poor man may be broken up by having many such neighbors.

I think Harrison's enemies and Van Buren's friends must be hard run for objections when they charge and censure an old soldier for approving