

# THE RALEIGH STAR AND NORTH CAROLINA GAZETTE.

THOS. J. LEMAY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

"NORTH CAROLINA:—POWERFUL IN MORAL, INTELLECTUAL AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES—THE LAND OF OUR BIRTH AND THE HOME OF OUR AFFECTIONS."

[THREE DOLLARS A YEAR—IN ADVANCE.]

Vol. 37.

RALEIGH, N. C. WEDNESDAY AUG. 12, 1846

No. 33

## Franklin Medical College OF PHILADELPHIA.

THE annual course of Lectures in this institution will be opened on Monday the 12th October, (the second Monday in October,) and will be continued till the end of the ensuing February.

### PROFESSORS.

PAUL BECK GOBARD, M. D., Anatomy and Histology.  
C. C. VAN WICK, M. D., Principles and Practice of Surgery.  
MERRITT CLYMER, M. D., Principles and Practice of Medicine.  
JOHN BARKLEY BIDDLE, M. D., Materia Medica and Therapeutics.  
DAVID HUNTER TUCKER, M. D., Obstetrics and Diseases of Women and Children.  
LEWIS S. JONES, M. D., Physiology and Legal Medicine.  
JAMES B. ROBERTS, M. D., General and Organic Chemistry.  
Demonstrator of Anatomy—JOSEPH LEIDY, M. D.  
The Franklin Medical College is incorporated by the Legislature of Pennsylvania, with general privileges equal to those enjoyed by any similar institution, and is authorized "to grant the degree of Doctor of Medicine, to any such persons as shall possess the qualifications usually required of candidates in other Medical Colleges in this State."

### FEES.

For each of the seven courses of Lectures, \$15 00  
Matriculation Fee, to be paid once only, 5 00  
Diploma Fee, 10 00  
Additional information respecting the course of instruction can be obtained upon application to  
J. B. BIDDLE,  
Dean of the Faculty,  
N. E. corner of Spruce and Quince streets,  
Philadelphia,  
32—2t.  
Aug. 5, 1846.

## A. G. BAGLEY'S CELEBRATED IMPROVED EVER-POINTED GOLD PEN. WARRANTED.

THIS Pen received the highest premium at the last Fair of the American Institute, and has been pronounced by the first Teachers of Penmanship in the country, to be infinitely superior to any Gold Pen ever before introduced to the American public. These Pens are indelible except by actual violence, no ink will injure them—retain their elasticity, and the peculiar shape of the nibs, (which was first introduced by Bagley) makes it more pleasant to use, renders it less liable to damage, more easy to repair, and prevents the necessity of the great care that other articles of the kind require.

Manufactory, 189 Broadway, N. Y.  
Also, Bagley's "Patent Extension Pen Holder and Pencil," which is the most compact article in use.  
July, 1846. 33—14t.

### ANOTHER FRAUD.

It has been discovered that a most stupendous fraud was committed in the election of Mr. BRADBURY (Democrat) as Senator from Maine to succeed Mr. EVANS. The "Peterson Intelligence" gives the following particulars as taken from the "Boston Atlas":

It appears that only forty-nine ballots were returned for Mr. Evans, when fifty-three Whigs have signed a solemn declaration that they voted for Mr. Evans; and four other Whigs have testified that they voted for Mr. Allen, of Bangor, and W. P. Fessenden, of Portland; this, together with the votes of the independent democrats, makes seventy-four against Bradbury, which, with the abolition vote, would have defeated him by several votes.

Mr. MAGOUN, of Bath, a gentleman of the highest respectability and character, testified that he went into the committee room and there found his ballot, which was not returned, as also the ballot of Mr. Kingsberry.

An investigation was demanded in the House of Representatives on the 29th, and it was declared if Gov. ANDERSON gave Mr. B. a certificate of election (which is said he has refused), the seat would be contested.

The scattering votes, it is said, were all put down to Mr. Bradbury. What may we not expect next?

### MR. CALHOUN.

We find in the South Carolina papers the following letter from this gentleman, written, as will be seen, in reply to a series of resolutions recently transmitted to him:

Washington, 19th July, 1846.

Dear sir—I have received your communication of the 9th inst., covering the preamble and resolutions of the citizens of Georgetown District, and am highly gratified with their approbation of my course in reference to the Oregon and Mexican questions.

I adopted the course I took in reference to both, under a deep sense of duty, and with full knowledge of the responsibility involved; and I am confirmed by your approbation in the conviction that nothing more is required to gain or retain the confidence and support of the people of South Carolina, but an honest, faithful and fearless discharge of duty, regardless of the excitement of the moment, be it ever so great. Entertaining this opinion, I have never hesitated in a long and eventful period of public service, to act on it, without, in a single instance, losing their confidence or support. I may well be proud of representing such constituents, too enlightened to be deceived, and too just and patriotic to condemn or discard a public servant, without a calm, impartial and thorough examination of his motives and reasons. What mine were have been fully explained as the course I took in reference to the Oregon question, while under discussion; but such is not the case in reference to the Mexican. It was hurried through, without affording an opportunity for explanation; and now that we are involved in war, the sense of duty that would have compelled a free and full expression of my objections to the course of policy by which we are involved in it, compels silence now, when it can

be of no avail, and might tend to retard its speedy termination—a consummation, which all who love their country must desire.

**SPEECH OF MR. D. M. BARRINGER,** Of North Carolina, on the Tariff. Delivered in the House of Representatives of the U. S., July 1, 1846.

The bill reported by the Committee of Ways and Means, providing for a reduction and modification of duties on foreign imports being under consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BARRINGER said: That he was at all times very averse to enter the arena of regular debate in this House. His experience here had satisfied him that those who were most frequently desirous of occupying the floor were not regarded as the most useful or influential members of this body. He was especially reluctant to address the committee at this stage of an exhausted debate. But the subject was one of the greatest importance; it was called by some the great question of the day. He had some views on this subject, regarded as so deeply interesting to every section of the Union, and every class of the people of this great nation, which he desired to present to this committee and to the public. He was not in the unfortunate position of the gentleman who had just addressed the committee, (Mr. Stanton, of Tennessee,) and who seemed so greatly embarrassed in the effort to reconcile the differences of his Democratic friends in this House. Mr. B. had nothing to say to their quarrels, which seem to threaten such serious collisions in their ranks, but which he was satisfied would be healed by the proper efforts and appliances, if it be necessary to pass this bill. He was well aware of the facilities his Democratic friends always possessed in reconciling their apparent and sometimes real differences; and he counted nothing as to the fate of the bill before the committee from the existing collisions of opinion which, on the surface only, indicate such violent disruption among the members of the party on the final vote on this great measure. He had no such unpleasant task to perform on his side of the House. He had no conflicts of opinion to reconcile. On this side we shall present very nearly an unbroken phalanx on the final vote. But he did not mean to make a party speech; and though his views on this question differed materially from those held by a majority of the Democratic party in this House, as now organized, (he was glad to say not by all of that party,) he freely accorded to gentlemen advocating the other side quite as much honesty in their convictions and purposes as he claimed for himself.

The two bills now before the committee, Mr. Chairman, as well as the commonly called McKay's bill as the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York, (Mr. Hungerford,) propose entire changes in the whole fiscal policy of the Government from its earliest organization to the present time—changes not gradual, but immediate, sweeping, radical; for although in some slight degree they both recognize the principle of protection to American industry, (and this too, where, as it is done, in its most odious form,) yet coming to us as they do, under the sanction of the Executive message of December last and the official report of the Secretary of the Treasury, and based as they are on the doctrines of that famous report, which has received such consideration both in this country and England, especially in the House of Lords, from whom it received the unusual compliment of having been printed for their use, both these measures, especially the former from the Committee of Ways and Means, amount to a virtual and total abandonment of the whole protective policy. Indeed, sir, that object is distinctly avowed on this floor. I assert, without the fear of successful contradiction, that the policy, which is now supported by the opponents of this bill to repeal the act of 1842, has been maintained since the foundation of our Government to the present time. We should always hesitate long to disturb a policy which has received the constant approbation of the nation. To the principles and practice of our revolutionary statesmen, who were conversant with the early wants of our country, and established the constitutional forms of free Government under which we have so long lived and prospered, do we owe an especial deference and respect. The most imperative reasons, founded on considerations of absolute national independence, demonstrated the necessity of an early adoption of the principle of a fair and reasonable encouragement to domestic industry. The preamble of the second act passed by the first Congress declared that "whereas it is necessary for the support of the 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," &c. This act was approved and signed on the 4th of July, 1789, by George Washington, the Father of his Country, and voted for by James Madison, the ablest and best expounder of our Constitution.—On the 8th of January, 1790, General Washington used the following language in his first annual address to Congress:—"The safety and interest of the people require that they should promote such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others for essential, especially military supplies." And in his last address,

on the 7th of December, 1796, General Washington, in continuation of the same policy he had always supported and urged before Congress, used the following language: "Congress has repeatedly, and not without success, directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to ensure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible."

The following is an extract of the message of Mr. Jefferson to Congress on the 15th of December, 1802:

"To cultivate peace, maintain commerce and navigation in their lawful enterprises; to foster our fisheries as nurseries for navigation, and for the nurture of man, and to protect the manufactures adapted to our circumstances, to preserve the faith of the nation by an exact discharge of its debts and contracts, to expend the public money with the same care and economy we would practise with our own, and impose on our citizens no unnecessary burdens; to keep in all things within our constitutional powers, and cherish the Federal Union as the only rock of safety; these, fellow-citizens, are the landmarks by which we are to guide ourselves in all our proceedings."

In his message of the 5th of November, 1811, Mr. Madison says:

"Although other objects will press more immediately on your deliberations, a portion of them cannot but be well bestowed on the just and sound policy of securing to our manufactures the success they have attained, and still are attaining, under the impulse of causes not permanent; and to our navigation, the fair extent of which is at present bridged by the unequal regulations of foreign Governments. Besides the reasonableness of saving our manufactures from sacrifices which a change of circumstances might bring upon them, the national interest requires that with respect to such materials at least as belong to our defence and primary wants, we should not be left in a state of unnecessary dependence on external supplies."

Mr. Madison never failed to enforce similar sentiments on the consideration of Congress and the country, whenever a fit opportunity presented itself. I shall not detain the committee by further extracts from that distinguished source. Mr. Monroe, distinguished for his devotion to the best interests of his country, in his inaugural address expresses himself thus:

"Our manufactures will like wise require the systematic and fostering care of Government. Possessing as we do, all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend, in the degree we have done, on supplies from other countries; while we are thus dependent, the sudden event of war, unthought and unexpected, cannot fail to plunge us into the most serious difficulties. It is important, too, that the capital which nourishes our manufactures should be domestic in its influence, as its influence in that case, instead of exhausting, as it may do in foreign hands, would be felt advantageously in agriculture and every other branch of industry."

On the 3d of December, 1817, in his message to Congress, Mr. Monroe said:

"Our manufactures will require the constant attention of Congress. The capital employed in them is considerable, and the knowledge required in the machinery and fabric of all the most useful manufactures is of great value. Their preservation, which depends on due encouragement, is connected with the high interests of the nation."

In his second annual message, he uses this language:

"It cannot be doubted that the more complete our internal resources, and the least dependant we are on foreign Powers, for every national as well as domestic purpose, the greater and more stable will be our public plenty. By the increase of our domestic manufactures will the demand for the rude materials be increased; and thus will the dependance of the several parts of the Union on each other, and the strength of the Union itself, be proportionable augmented."

Again, in his message of the 3d of December, 1822, he says:

"Satisfied I am, whatever may be the abstract doctrines in favor of unrestricted commerce, (provided all nations would concur in it, and it was not likely to be interrupted by war, which has never occurred, and cannot be expected,) there are other strong reasons, applicable to our situation and relations with other countries, which impose on us the obligation to cherish our manufactures."

General Jackson repeatedly recognised and enforced the same suggestions of public policy. In his message of the 7th of December, 1830, he employs the following emphatic and unanswerable argument:

"The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States.—The right to adjust these duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry, is so completely incidental to that power, that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the General Government, without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relative to the inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them; and, consequently, if it be not possessed by the General Government, it must

be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of their right to protect their own industry, and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely cannot be the case. This indispensable power, thus surrendered by the States, must be within the scope of the authority, on the subject, expressly delegated to Congress. In this conclusion I am confirmed as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people."

I will not refer to the votes of General Jackson and other of the leading statesmen of the opposite party in favor of the act of 1824; nor to his remarkable letter of April 23, 1824, on this subject, to Dr. Coleman, of our own native State. I could cite line upon line, and extract upon extract, from the solemnly recorded and expressed opinions of the great statesmen of all parties in our country, and at all times in our history, to show both the right and duty of Congress, in proper cases, to give a fair and reasonable encouragement to American labor. The sentiments I have quoted are the opinions of those who have had the fullest confidence of the country, and especially of the South. The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that no President or party Whig or Democrat, Federal or Republican, had omitted, when in power, to maintain both the constitutionality and expediency of the doctrine contended for by our side of the House. It was a chief element of success in the election of General Jackson. It had never been disputed in a Presidential message until the annual communication of the present incumbent in December last.

Even Mr. Polk admitted it, or at least desired it to be understood that he was in favor of the doctrine up to that period. You all remember, sir, his celebrated Kane letter, which was made to assume all the hues of the chameleon, and which has been so severely commented on in this debate.—Every gentleman from the great Democratic State of Pennsylvania, who has yet taken part in this discussion, has admitted that Mr. Polk could not have gotten the vote of that State but for the belief produced by that letter that he was in favor of the tariff, and was even a "better tariff man than Mr. Clay."

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Tibbatts] has here publicly admitted that Mr. Polk could not have received the votes of the western States, except for the belief that he recognised the constitutionality and expediency of incidental protection within the revenue range, and of discrimination to protect all the great interests of the country. Even in the inaugural address of the President on the 4th of March, 1845, we have the strongest recognition of the power to legislate with a view to the encouragement of the great industrial pursuits of the country. He said:

"The power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, was an indispensable one to be conferred on the Federal Government, which, without it, would possess no means of providing for its own support. In executing this power, by levying a tariff of duties for the support of Government, the raising of revenue should be the object, and protection the incident. To reverse this principle, and make protection the object and revenue the incident, would be to inflict manifest injustice upon all other than the protected interests. In levying duties for revenue, it is doubtless proper to make such discriminations, within the revenue principle, as will afford incidental protection to our home interests. Within the revenue limit there is a discretion to discriminate; beyond that limit the rightful exercise of the power is not conceded."

Mr. Chairman, I shall not multiply, as I could, authorities on this subject. It would be an anomaly, if the Government did not have this indispensable power. It would be suicidal. Without its exercise, we should not be an independent people. It was one of the chief objects of our separation from the mother country, whose policy had been so inimical to the development of our resources, and who desired to restrain us from the power to manufacture even a hob-nail in the colonies. It was incorporated in our federal Constitution, and has been sanctioned by the practice of every Administration, under every diversity of party. Even now a large portion of the ascendancy party in this House will not admit that it is, in any sense, the test of party allegiance; and on this express their amazement at the theories of those who hold political communion with them on other subjects. And yet, Mr. Chairman, after all this weight of argument, and precedent, and practice, gentlemen throughout this debate, on the other side, have been horrified and startled at the idea of the least discrimination, even within the revenue range, in favor of the essential interests of the nation. It is represented, especially by some of our opponents from Virginia and Alabama, as a modern violation of the plain provisions of the Constitution. It is no new thing, sir, to legislate for the protection of par-

ticular interests, when their preservation and advancement are connected with the general welfare of the nation. By what authority have our navigation laws been passed? What right had we to give a preference, in the whole coasting trade, to American shipping, without regard to the rates of transportation offered by foreign vessels? The constitutionality or wisdom of these laws has never been questioned.—Is not this a violation of the principles so zealously urged by gentlemen here? Is this "buying where we could buy cheaper?" Or is it not, on your principles, "an odious, grinding monopoly, in favor of a set of bloated, purse-proud American manufacturers?"

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be misunderstood. I am not in favor of a "high protective tariff." I am not for a Tariff for "protection merely." I do not contend for that system of "legalized plunder and robbery" that gentlemen so eloquently declaim about in this hall. What I insist upon and what I think the highest interests of the country demand, is such a tariff as has been the subject of good sound Whig doctrine from the beginning, sanctioned by the principles and practice of the fathers of the true republican faith; such a Tariff as has been recommended over and over again in the messages of our best Presidents, and advocated and virtually promised in the inaugural address of Mr. Polk himself, viz: a tariff which, while it imposes duties on foreign imports for the necessary revenue to support an economical administration of the Government as its prime object, shall be so arranged and adjusted in its details as to afford a just and reasonable encouragement in favor of all the great interests of agriculture, commerce, manufactures, and the mechanic arts. While revenue should be the object discrimination should be the incident. Sir, you never will conduct the affairs of this great nation successfully on "any country doctrine." This is the well established revolutionary principle for which our forefathers contended; this is necessary for the prosperity of the great interests of the people and indispensable to us as a free and independent nation. A tariff of some sort we must have. The Government must be supported. No influential American statesman has ever seriously declared himself in favor of direct taxes as a permanent system of revenue in time of peace. We can not, however, have a permanent revenue; these are obvious. A tariff of duties on foreign imports must therefore be laid. Such duties have been laid from 1783 to this day; and, sir, I predict that whatever may be the fate of this bill proposing a revolution in the whole financial system of our country, experience will continue to point out the beaten track of our fathers as the best course for us to pursue. We shall soon get tired of this untried experiment. I am not for any hot house stimulus to industry and I admit that true policy requires that legislative protection should be confined in a wise discrimination to such productions as our situation, capital, and resources enable us to make successfully to supply the wants of the country.

On the 30th of August, 1842, Congress passed a Tariff law now in force. This bill proposes to repeal it. Is this proposed change right? Nothing can be more pernicious to the labor and capital of the country than this vacillating policy—this constant fluctuation both in the trade of the country and the revenues of the Government. I do not pretend to say that the act of 1842 is perfect; or that it should be like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unalterable. If it be imperfect, as it doubtless is, let it be amended in such particulars as experience may have indicated as necessary. Let it be amended in a proper way and on thorough examination and not at the instance and upon the statements of British importers and their agents. The regulation of a Tariff of duties is necessarily complicated and one of great difficulty. It is a question of facts and details, ramifying themselves through every interest of society. We never have and, in a country like ours of such diversified pursuits and interests, we never can pass any general Tariff law which will give satisfaction to all. The thing is impossible. Our true course is to come as near this end as possible. I have freely admitted that the existing law might be wisely amended. I should like to see that indispensable necessity of life, salt, made duty free. The duties and minimums on coarse domestic might be lowered, if not entirely abolished; and on raw cotton, the duty which was once important but now useless, might well be abolished altogether. By this course we should wrest from the hands of demagogues instruments by which they are constantly trying to deceive the people. There are other instances in which the act of 1842 might well be amended and the free list might be decreased. But, in the main that law had operated well and, after all experience is the best teacher; it is worth all your theories. The act of 1842 had completely refuted the predictions of its enemies and fully realized the best hopes of its friends. Under its operation the country was prosperous. Under what circumstances had that act been passed? I need not dwell on what all must so well remember. The objects of that law were to raise a sinking revenue; to restore the public credit; to pay the public debt and

liabilities; and last, though not least, to give incidental protection to interests essential to our national welfare and independence. Towards the close of the operation of the celebrated compromise act of 1833, the expenditures constantly exceeded our income. Even before the reduction had reached the lowest point of twenty per cent., it had utterly failed to produce the necessary revenue. This fact is admitted by the most ultra free trade men. Yet gentlemen are for returning, not gradually, but suddenly, to the same system. Who can believe that the bill before us will raise sufficient revenue for the wants of the Government? Curtail your expenses; abandon your magnificent scheme of internal improvements, passed by this Democratic House, under the name of the harbor and river bill; reduce your annual expenditures to seventeen millions, and perhaps then an average rate of twenty five to thirty per cent. ad valorem may prove sufficient. But sir, does any one here believe that this reduction will be brought about? We must legislate for an existing state of things. The expenditure of the Government, instead of being restricted by economy to seventeen millions a year amounted on an average to near twenty six millions. It has stood at that rate for years past. It will be increased. The acquisition of Texas and the establishment of new Territorial Governments, the most expensive appendages of your Government, and the necessary enlargement of your army and navy will enhance your expenditures. They will be from twenty eight to thirty millions per annum. I do not speak of a state of war, but of a peace establishment. The gentleman from New York, (Hungerford) has demonstrated, by a most searching analysis, that this bill will not produce more than seventeen millions net revenue in a time of peace and less in time of war. How shall we supply the deficit? Shall we resort to loans or Treasury notes? I fear they will soon again become fashionable. With the aid of the Little Tariff Bill, as it was called, passed in 1841, which my colleague, now before me (Mr. Graham), well remembers, the compromise act still failed to raise the necessary income. It sank to less than thirteen millions a year. The Treasury was empty—the Government bankrupt—and general ruin stared us in the face. Experience spoke with a voice that could not be mistaken. We promptly resorted to it. The compromise act prostrated the credit of the Government; the act of 1842 restored it. Who does not remember with a blush of patriotic shame the low point to which the credit of our nation had been brought? How your Government scrip was hawked and peddled about in every money market of the world with out a bidder. The Congress of 1842 had of necessity to revise the whole revenue system. But gentlemen say the rates of that law were too high, because they are above the revenue standard. "The revenue standard!" What do gentlemen mean by these cabalistic phrases? Is the amount needed for revenue a fixed quantity? Or does it not fluctuate with the state of the nation and the necessities of our public affairs? It must necessarily depend on the state of trade and the public exigencies. We want one amount in peace, another in time of war. There is, therefore no such thing as a fixed revenue standard. Mr. Secretary Walker asserts that it is twenty per cent. We have tried that, or at least we had approached it at a time too often our importations were very large and our expenditure had proved that when we got down in the scale as far as twenty five per cent the revenue failed, and the Government was pressed in the most trying and perilous crisis. Under the act of 1842 the annual average net revenue is from twenty six to twenty seven millions of dollars—about sufficient to answer the wants of the Government in ordinary times. But Mr. Chairman it is objected to the existing law that its operation is most injurious to the consuming portion of the community, especially to the farming and planting interests; that it raises the price of all the people have to buy, and lowers the price of all they have to sell; that it is a system of plunder and injustice and that it puts into the pockets of the manufacturers two dollars for every one it places in the Treasury—fifty four millions to enrich them, and only twenty seven millions in the national coffers? This representation, which in truth is mere declamation opposed to the case, is based on the idea that in all cases this tax is paid by the consumer. Now, sir, I utterly deny this position. It may be true, as a general rule, but it is not only has many exceptions, but there are many cases where it is decidedly opposed to the truth. On those articles from which we derived the greatest part of our revenue the duty did not raise the price, and was not a tax to the consumer; because nearly enough of the articles were produced in our own country to meet the demands of consumption without resort to the foreign supply. Do inelastic competition was induced and lowered the price. When the article is not made at home in sufficient quantities to answer our demands, the duty was often divided between the consumer and producer or importer, in which case the foreign importer pays a part of the tax for the privilege of selling in our markets. Where we do not make the article at all the whole duty was strictly a tax and paid by the consumer.