

POLITICS OF THE DAY.

EXTRACTS FROM THE SPEECH OF MILTON BROWN IN REPLY TO EX-GOVERNOR POLK, At Jackson, (Tennessee), on the 4th of April, 1843.

The following are the Extracts from Mr. Brown's Speech referred to in the Letter of Mr. Hardin which was published in the National Intelligencer a few days ago :

To understand properly the merits of the controversy between Gov. Polk and myself, it is important to refer to the precise facts and history of the case. This is the more necessary because Gov. Polk, knowing he was wrong, and fearing exposure, seems to have exerted himself continually to involve the whole affair in clouds and mystery. His own friends, it seems, cannot understand him, and are driven to the mortifying and humiliating alternative of either acknowledging that he has mistaken facts, or else that they misunderstand his statements upon the very points which constitute the hinge on which the controversy turns.

On the 17th of October, 1841, Mr. Laughlin introduced into the Senate of this State a string of resolutions, condemnatory of the course of the Whigs at the extra session of Congress.—Among other things, a vote in the House of Representatives to impose a duty of 20 per cent. on tea and coffee was severely censured. These resolutions were designed for party effect, were destitute of all fitness, and calculated, if not designed, to make a false impression as to the facts and votes to which they referred. A few days afterwards, Gov. Polk made a speech in Nashville, in which, with a little more caution, but with the same illiberal and unfair purpose in view, he pressed the same assault on the Whig members of Congress, especially on the subjects of tea and coffee. He did not pretend that any duty had been actually laid on these articles, but only that the Whigs of the House of Representatives had voted for such duty. He denounced the measure as a federal measure, and voted for only by those who designed to sustain federal principles. To give his own language, as written out and published in the Nashville Union of the 1st of Nov., 1841, when speaking of the vote of the extra session, in regard to tea and coffee, he said :

" A dominant majority in the popular branch of Congress, by a solemn vote, imposed a tax of 20 per cent. on tea and coffee also ; and in that form the bill passed the House. In the Senate those two articles were struck out by the votes of Democratic Senators, and a small portion of Federal Senators ; Mr. Clay of Kentucky, and other Federal Senators recording their votes to retain the tax upon them, and against making them free articles."

These resolutions of Mr. Laughlin and this speech of Gov. Polk were heralded over the State, as containing choice political capital, especially on the subject of tea and coffee. This vote on the subject of tea and coffee was held up by Gov. Polk's friends and the newspapers in his service as a political sin of the greatest magnitude, and only to be expiated by the political death of all who had given it. In various parts of the State the charge sound all manner of exaggeration. In some places it was asserted not only that the duty had been imposed, but that tea and coffee were rising in price on account of it !

Being one of those whose political death was to be sealed, I of course desired to be heard in my own defence before final sentence was pronounced upon me. I therefore embraced an opportunity, presented on the general tariff bill, when the subject properly came up, and entered a defence of myself and friends. Gov. Polk has no right to complain that one so humble as myself took up the subject. Had one of more ability taken it up, he would only have felt the weight of his votes and speeches and humbugs the more.

As to the facts and arguments urged by me in defence of myself and friends, I refer to my speech on the general tariff bill, which has been circulated among my constituents. It is only necessary to notice the points so far as the controversy between Gov. Polk and myself may require it.

It must be borne in mind that when we met in extra session the Government was in debt, and the Treasury was exhausted by a system of expenditures pursued by Mr. Van Buren's administration. Mr. Woodbury, Mr. Van Buren's Secretary of the Treasury, by his report of Jan. 1841, in anticipation of a deficiency of revenue, had recommended a duty on tea and coffee.—The South had always regarded the duty on tea and coffee as less objectionable than on what are called protected articles. The reason of this is not now necessary to explain, as it is fully done in the speech to which I have referred. Add to this, Gov. Polk, Cave Johnson, and nearly the entire Tennessee delegation, had in 1832 voted for and sustained a duty on tea and coffee, of the same amount as that proposed at the extra session. The only difference in the two cases was this :—When Gov. Polk, and those acting with him, voted for and sustained a tax on tea and coffee there was a large surplus in the Treasury, and this tax was not needed for revenue. But when the same tax was proposed at the extra session the Treasury was empty, and the public credit in danger of disgrace on account of it. Knowing these facts I stated them in my speech on the floor of Congress, and sent them among my constituents.

That I may not vary one word from what I said in my speech on the floor of Congress, I will read from that speech precisely what I did say. In speaking in defence of myself and friends, and of the illiberal and unjustifiable assault of Gov. Polk upon us, in regard to the tea and coffee question, I said :

" The committee, perceiving insufficient revenue, and the consumers of foreign luxuries should not pay their shares of the public burdens, propose to raise the rates of duties upon such luxuries to the average rates of duties imposed by the bill that they now are under the act of 1832. They also propose to fix a moderate specific duty, equal to about 50 per cent. on the value upon tea, and also upon coffee, which were made wholly free of duty by the act of the last summer."

Out of Governor Polk's own mouth, then, I have said this point, that tea and coffee were " wholly free of duty " at the time he proposed to tax them. The next statement in my speech is, that at that time this duty was not necessary for revenue, that there was a surplus without it, and that Gov. Jackson had recommended a reduction of duties generally. This I will also prove out of his own mouth. Gov. Polk, in his speech in defence of the bill, (see Congressional Debates, volume 9, part 1, p. 1163,) puts this question explicitly to rest. He says :

" Permit me to remark, before I advance the testimony which I allude to, that in framing this bill the committee were the great fact staring them in the face that the present rates of import duty would yield to the Treasury an excess of six millions of dollars annually over what would be required in subsequent years to meet all the necessary and proper expenditures of the Government." The President, in the annual message, had recommended a repeal of the public burdens to this amount ; the Secretary of the Treasury had also recommended it. " The necessity of the reduction seemed to be conceded by all ; and indeed, in all the speeches we have heard, it has not been controverted."

Then it was not necessary for revenue, for a surplus of six millions annually, which was admitted by all, " was staring them in the face." And not only the President (General Jackson) had recommended a reduction, but his Secretary also. And yet Gov. Polk voted to tax tea and coffee, which were then free articles ! And that, too, at the very time they were reducing the duties on other articles, many of which were not of prime necessity, as foreign spirits, brandy, &c. That is, he voted to reduce the duties on such articles as these, and at the same time to take tea and coffee out of the list of free articles, where they had been placed by the act of July, 1832, and imposed a tax on them !

That Gov. Polk was a member of the Committee of Ways and Means during the 2d session of the 22d Congress, of which Mr. Verplanck was chairman. [See journal, p. 22.] That that committee through the chairman, reported a " bill (No. 641) to reduce and otherwise alter the duty on imports." [See journal, p. 105.] That they made a report to accompany said bill, which is the one I have referred to. [See page 110.] That this bill included a duty on tea and coffee. [See the bill itself, items 31 and 2. Journal, pages 298 and 297.] This brings me to the last thing in my statement, which is, that on a direct vote to strike tea and coffee out of the bill and make them free articles, Gov. Polk voted against striking them out, or, in other words, voted for taxing them.

The question on Mr. Huntington's motion to strike out tea and coffee and make them free articles was taken in the Committee of the Whole and carried. On the 21st of February, 1833, the question was taken in the House concurring in the amendment of the Committee of the Whole House, first on striking out coffee. On this vote stands for striking out 117 ; against striking out 57. Among those against striking out, and of course against making coffee free, stands the name of JAMES K. POLK.— [See journal, p. 390.] Next, the question was taken on striking out tea, and there were for striking out 108, and against striking out 57.—Among the names against striking out, and of course making them free, stands the name of JAMES K. POLK. [See journal, p. 391.]

I have now gone through with statements as made on the floor of Congress, for which I have been threatened with Gov. Polk's vengeance, and I have by the journal, and by his reports and speeches in Congress, proved every word I said. And does he deny any one of these facts ? No ! He dare not, for he knows they are true, and that the proof is here ! What does he do ? He tries to escape by misleading the public mind—by making false issues and leading off on questions wholly unconnected with the points in controversy when the vaunting threat of meeting me at Philippi was made.

Gov. Polk, during my absence for Washington, came into this district, and assailed me before my constituents on the tea and coffee question. What he did say on the subject of course I can only learn from others. But I well know the grounds on which his friends were assailing me all over the district on my return home. It was, that when Gov. Polk voted for a duty on tea and coffee, that there then existed a higher duty on these articles than the one he voted for, and that the effect of his vote was to reduce the existing duty on them. This was the ground which I learned he had taken in his speech at this place and elsewhere through the district. I found my friends, many of them, actually uneasy lest I might be mistaken. And I found my enemies chuckling and rejoicing at the hope of prostrating me. One Democrat was offering the bet largely on the existence of the fact that there was a duty on tea and coffee, and that Gov. Polk's vote was to reduce that duty—basing his offer to bet on his confidence in the statement of Gov. Polk. And I here state the fact, that all with whom I conversed, Whigs and Democrats, (and I conversed with many,) who professed to know what Gov. Polk did say, gave me the same version of it. I told them that he would not so state in my presence, and if he did I would fasten the proof on him. I now have my eye on an honest Democrat, who told me that Gov. Polk so stated, and to whom I made this reply. To him I appeal, and call on him and others to bear witness whether Gov. Polk does now stand up to his statement or not.

But another fact I here desire to mention. I called on the chairman of the Democratic meeting at this place, at which Gov. Polk made his speech, supposing he had, both from personal intercourse and his position as chairman during the delivery of the speech, the very best opportunity of knowing what Gov. Polk did say, and he gave me the same statement. Let my memory should fail me as to the precise statement, I wrote it down in his presence and read it to him, and he said it was correct. The statement of his understanding of the grounds which Gov. Polk assumed was as follows : That Gov. Polk, in his speech at Jackson, took the ground that when he voted for a tax on tea and coffee, as charged against him by Mr. Brown, this duty on these articles, imposed by former acts, remained unwarped ; and that the effect of his vote was not to put on but to reduce the duties then existing on these articles."

I hold in my hand the Nashville Union, which contains his Giles county speech on this subject. His exposition of this question seems to be designedly obscure, yet the speech taken altogether is evidently framed so as to make the same impression which he seems to have made at this place and elsewhere in this district. In proof of this I will read from the speech itself. In answer to me he says :

" If Mr. Brown had pursued his remarks a little further back he would have found that (Gov. P.) had voted to make tea and coffee free articles. He would have found further, that the rates of duty on these articles, by the several tariff acts of 1816, 1824, and 1828, had been on coffee 5 cents per pound, and the different kinds of teas from 50 to 12 cents per pound—duties five times as great as the small duties embraced in the bill of the Committee of Ways and Means of 1832-3. He would have found, too, if he had examined the debates on that bill, that it was brought forward as a bill of compromise, so understood by the whole South, and so expressly declared to be in the speech which he (Gov. P.) had made on that occasion. As a bill of compromise it reduced the duties to the rates of the act of 1816, and on tea and coffee but one-fifth of the rates of that act."

Here is a statement of the rates of duty on tea and coffee under the acts of 1816, '24, and '28, closing with the declaration that the bill of 1832-'3 (which is the one in controversy) " reduced " the duties on tea and coffee to one-fifth of the rates fixed by the act of 1816. He says that " as a bill of compromise " (that is the bill in controversy) " reduced " the duties to the rates of the act of 1816, and on tea and coffee but one-fifth of the rates of that act." The next paragraph goes to confirm this impression. He goes on to say :

" This was the best bill which the South

hoped to be able to pass, and though it was far from being such a bill as they would have desired, the whole South stood together in its support, and if Mr. Brown had examined the journals carefully he would have found that his friend Mr. Bell had voted, with Cave Johnson and himself on the tea and coffee item. He would have found, further, that at the close of the debate on the bill of 1832-'3, he (Gov. P.) had voted with all his colleagues for the compromise act, which actually made tea and coffee free articles."

Now, observe he had before stated that he had voted to make tea and coffee free, but did not explain when or in what act ; but he now says it was the compromise act. He says, too, that it was at the close of the debate on the bill of 1832-'3. Now, if the compromise act actually made tea and coffee free articles, and he voted for this " at the close of the debate on the bill of 1832-'3," then it irresistibly follows that they were not free articles until the compromise act made them so. And yet the fact is that the compromise act never touched tea, and coffee in any way. The subject is not mentioned in the act. And he himself admitted yesterday and his own report shows, that they were made free articles as far back as the summer of 1832, when the compromise act was not passed until 1833.

These facts all go irresistibly to fasten the conviction that Gov. Polk has labored with great tact and a studied purpose to escape exposure by misleading the popular mind. But truth has been on his heels until he can hold out no longer ; and yesterday he came out and actually admitted that when he gave his votes to tax tea and coffee they were " wholly free of duty !"

As to how this confession was wrung from him I have a word to say. I had procured the report of the committee of which he was a member, which directly stated the fact, from which I have already read an extract. At Trenton, after I had declined speaking, I handed this report to Gov. Jones, who read it to him and dared him to controvert it. And what do you think he said in reply ? He exclaimed, " I see my competitor has new documents ! " And when again dared to answer or contradict the fact, he replied :— " I will not show my hand ! " and added, " I will reserve that for Philippi ! " And so he stood mum—neither admitting or denying the fact as charged and proved by Gov. Jones. To all this the people of Gibson county will bear testimony.

Now, if Gov. Polk had not been conscious that, in his speeches at this place and at Pulaski and elsewhere, he had sought to mislead public opinion as to the facts of the case, why did he hesitate to give a direct and frank response to a plain question of fact in which he was so deeply interested ? Why this trick—this evasion—this concealment ! I submit to every candid man of sense if his conduct did not betray a consciousness of having imposed a fraud on the public mind, and an apprehension of immediate detection and exposure !

The ex-Governor, on reaching this place, having had time to get a little over the shock produced by reading this report on him at Trenton, and finding he could keep up a deception no longer, resolved " to acknowledge the corn," and actually read from the report the fact, that at the time he joined, in reporting a bill including a tax on tea and coffee, these articles were " wholly free of duty ! " Why did he not read this when he made a speech in this place before ? Why did he not read it when he made his speeches at Lynnville, Pulaski, Dresden, Paris ? Ah, it was because he knew no one was present to read it for him ! But the mask has now fallen from him, and he stands exposed in his naked depravity.

I desire one thing here borne in mind, that all I have heretofore said is in print, and had been before the public for months. I have never before this spoken from the stump of this controversy. This the people will remember that in my speech at the Whig barbecue at this place I never alluded to it. It seemed to me improper that a stump controversy should exist between two not running for the same office, especially as his range was all over the State and mine was confined to a district. If I was worthy of his notice at all it should have been on paper. I had with entire frankness showed " my hand," and referred to the very pages of the documents which prove my statements. Why then this concealment on the part of Gov. Polk ? Was he not as much bound to speak out the truth and the whole truth to the people of Gibson and other counties through which he passed as to the people of this county ? Ah, has it come to this, that politics is to be regarded as a game of cards, where each blacking has a right to conceal his hand and practice all manner of trick and deception !

But Gov. Polk, finding himself at last caught has resorted to excuses for his votes. In this, also, he is unfortunate. In attempting to excuse his direct vote against striking out tea and coffee, he says the bill was a compromise bill and he was bound to vote against all amendments. In the defence made for him in the Nashville Union, 29th November, 1842, it is said the friends of the bill were bound to " vote against every alteration of it as reported." This excuse is an afterthought, and not sustained by facts. First, Gov. Polk did not vote against all amendments. For example, the bill as reported imposed a duty on blankets at the rate of \$25 for every one hundred dollars value until the 2d of March, 1834, and thereafter at \$15. An amendment was offered by which the duty as proposed by the bill was to be increased, and the time during which the higher range of duty was to run lengthened as follows, viz : \$30 for every one hundred dollars value until the 2d March, 1834 ; and thereafter \$25 until the 20th March, 1836 ; and thereafter \$15.— [See the journal, p. 293-'4.] This amendment passed, and was adopted by a vote of 113 to 69. Among those voting for it, stands the name of James K. Polk !— [See journal, p. 353.] Gov. Polk says he could not vote for an amendment striking out tea and coffee, because he says it was a compromise bill, yet he would vote for an amendment increasing the tax on blankets !— All documents are dangerous things !"

In the next place, the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, of which Gov. Polk was a member, shows that tea and coffee were not inserted by way of compromise, but on the contrary states what was the reason. This reason, given at the time by the committee who reported the bill, must be conclusive. The report says that the committee proposes to fix a moderate specific duty, equal to about 20 per cent. on the value upon teas and also upon coffee, which were made wholly free of duty by the act of the last summer. This has been added (say the committee) from a motive of financial prudence, lest the revenue from the customs should, from any modification of the bill or other causes, fall short of the estimate, or lest the proceeds of the public lands should be in part diverted to some other channel ; in either of

which cases an increased revenue would be derived from this source of about one million dollars, calculated on the rather short importation of tea in the last year. Should this sum not be needed for the public service, it may be repealed without affecting the other parts of the system.

Here is the reason for inserting tea and coffee. It was " a motive of financial prudence " in anticipation of either of two events—deficiency of revenue " from any modification of the bill or other causes," or " lest the proceeds of the public lands should be in part diverted to some other channel."

Tea and coffee, then, were not inserted by way of compromise. The report and the votes on the bill show the contrary. If a compromise, with whom did Gov. Polk make this compromise ? With the North, as he pretends ? The North generally voted against taxing tea and coffee, and were, of all others, the most opposed to it. With the South ? Gov. Polk's interests were identified with the South, and needed no compromise of interests that were the same. Was it necessary for the passage of the bill ? The insertion of tea and coffee in the bill was the thing, above all others, that endangered its passage, as it rendered it obnoxious to the protective tariff interests. The excuse, therefore, that he voted for this tax as a matter of compromise is without even the shadow of foundation, and is sheer pretence through which he is trying to escape.

From the Richmond Whig. BENTON'S SPEECH.

We learn from all quarters that this Speech has made a deep and powerful impression ! There is no withholding the array of facts, which he brings to bear upon the question under discussion. The Correspondent of the Charleston Courier, writing from Washington, says :

" It would be uncandid not to acknowledge that Mr. Benton's speech made a deep impression on the Senate. Senators of both of the leading parties were so declared. The impression made by the publication of the first part of the speech here is very strong. You may hear every one speaking of it, and among them the most influential and decided Clay whigs."

One of Mr. Benton's arguments seems to have struck home even with some of the friends of annexation. He shows that the Louisiana treaty does not constitute a fifth part of the Republic of Texas which we propose to annex. He argues that it will be extremely unjust in regard to Mexico to seize a territory of two thousand miles in extent, which belongs to her. He goes for the annexation of the original province of Texas, when it can be done without an unjust war.

The number of those who are now ready to vote for the treaty as it is, is said to be eighteen. Others are doubting, one doubtful. There is a majority of the Senate in opposition to all the main arguments urged against the annexation of Texas, viz:—the extension of territory and the extension of slavery."

This is but an echo of a thousand voices, all concurring in ascribing an overwhelming effect to this Speech.

We continue our quotations in order to give an example of that want of common, every day sense which peculiarly distinguishes Mr. Calhoun :

" Hence it is, that Mr. Calhoun : in his private intercourse with Senators, lays so much stress upon the postponement of action on the treaty until he shall receive advices from Mexico. Mr. Calhoun has strongly expressed his conviction that his advices will be favorable. He is so sanguine as to believe that Mexico will, at twelve hours' notice, agree to sell her claims upon Texas and upon the vast territory claimed by Texas and the Californias besides."

The man who really entertains such an opinion as the one here ascribed to Mr. Calhoun, seems to us fitter for a Lunatic Asylum, than for the office of Secretary of State. One thing at least is certain ; that he is totally unacquainted with Spanish History, and Spanish Character. The tenacity with which Spain held on to the Low Countries for seventy years is most assuredly a point in History of which he has no knowledge. He might however have known something of her obstinate refusal to recognise the Independence of the South American Republics. Mexico is the true child of Old Spain ; retains all her prejudices, and is equally conspicuous for a degree of obstinacy amounting almost to brutality."

Mr. McDuffie understands the Mexican character better. The same letter writer says :

" This may be so, and we shall see how the chances of a renewal of domestic strife, in Mexico, may affect her course. But I must say that public rumor in this city ascribes to Senator McDuffie a very different opinion, Mr. McDuffie does not believe that Mexico will notice, in any friendly manner, our propositions. The first impressions made on the public mind in Mexico, as to the treaty, appear to be adverse to it. Mr. J. P. Kennedy says that Mexico will treat it as a flagrant outrage. We shall know by the middle of June or before."

Yet notwithstanding this opinion of Mr. McDuffie, he is willing by his joint resolution to annex this territory, knowing that war without the formality of a declaration, must inevitably follow.

NEW and Splendid Assortment of Confectionaries and GROCERIES! SUCH as fine English Cakes, Soda Biscuit and Water crackers, almonds, English walnuts, raisins, prunes, lemons, fine Spanish cigars, candles of all sorts, and of the best quality; very fine China toys, French cordial assorted, such as Anis seed, rose do., cinchona do., dry do., perilla herb do., peppermint do., and several other kinds; also, Fish, such as sardines, salmon, and herring, superior Olive Oil and tip top shoe Blacking! I have also the finest WINE AND LIQUORS, such as French brandy, Holland gin, Jamaica rum; Madeira, Port, Benedictine, Claret, Champagne, Muscat Malaga and domestic wines. Also, some splendid Porter, Scotch Ale and Albany Ale, New Ark cider, lime juice, lemon syrup, &c. I have also, a good supply of superior mustard, scissidz powders, essence of peppermint and cinnamon, Scotch and Macaboy snuff, and a large assortment of fancy snuff boxes, fish books and lines, saddle strings, spears and talow candles; and above all, a splendid lot of BAOBY BRAND, and a great variety of other articles in my line of business too tedious to mention ; and which I will sell as low as they can be sold for cash, or on credit to punctual dealers. All the above fine articles will be found at the Salisbury Confectionary and Bakery, opposite J. & W. Murphy's store, or at the Salisbury Grocery and Confectionary. F. R. ROUCHE. Salisbury, June 8, 1844. #6636 N. B. All those that have old accounts standing since last year, would do well to settle either by cash or note by August 1st, as longer indulgence cannot be given, and as they will have to pay cash for the rest of the time. June 8. F. R. ROUCHE.

THREE NON-SLAVEHOLDING STATES TO BE FORMED OUT OF TEXAS.

Have our readers taken this fact into serious consideration ? The vast territory, which the treaty of Annexation proposes to tack on to us, has its Northern limit in the latitude of Marblehead and Cape Cod. From an inspection of the map, it will be seen, that while five States can be formed out of the Territory proposed to be annexed, only two of them will be Slave States, the other three being non-slave holding. A great argument, used by many of the supporters of the Treaty, is that, by the Annexation of Texas, the Southern interest will more nearly balance the Northern in the councils of the Nation, than it does at present ! Let us examine a little into this matter, in order to see if the position be tenable. In the Senate we shall have an increase of four votes ; they will have an increase of six, so much for the Senate.

In the lower house, the disproportion must be still greater, because the population of the free States increases with three times the rapidity of the slave. Kentucky, for instance, is older than Ohio ; she has to the full as many advantages of soil, climate, and position ; yet Ohio had, in 1840, a population of 1,519,000 souls, while Kentucky only numbered 780,000 ; that is to say, Ohio was at that time doubly as populous as Kentucky ! There may be some difference of size, but there is very little, and we are rather disposed to think it in favor of Kentucky. Of that however, we are sure. Kentucky sends, we believe, 11 representatives to Congress ; Ohio 21—that is within a fraction of two to one.

It will be perceived, upon examination, that the ratio of increase is about the same in the other free States in comparison with the non-slave States. Indiana, for instance, had 680,000, while Missouri has only 380,000. Illinois has 370,000, while Mississippi had only 97,000, &c.

Now, do not our readers see at once the tremendous power this treaty will throw into the hands of the Free States. Suppose them to have continued under this Government as long as Kentucky and Ohio ; suppose them to have progressed pari passu with these States: at the end of forty years, then, we shall have [taking the present basis of representation] twenty-six representatives, while they will have sixty-three ! That is to say, we throw into their hands nearly three times as much power as we retain ourselves.

Yet this is the treaty we are called on to adopt—this is the scheme, which certain men calling themselves the peculiar guardians of the South, are engaged in pressing upon the people ! This plan, which is proposed to stride down forever the power of the South, to stifle forever in the National councils this Southern voice, to chain the slaveholding States to the car of their Northern brethren,—this plan Southern men are called on, in the name of the South, to adopt ! We hope the people of this State will thank them kindly for their consideration, and tell them they don't choose any of what they are so good as to offer them. The voice of the slaveholding States is weak enough now—their power is sufficiently shorn—their pride sufficiently mortified. They do not wish to lie down voluntarily and ask that a foot be put upon their necks.

We never hear of any of the Texas orators touching upon these facts. What is the reason they do not dilate on them ? Are they afraid of them ? Do they dread the people ? Why are the people not told, that they are called on to concur in establishing three new non-slaveholding States ? We ask for information !—Richmond Whig.

STRANGE.—A letter is written in England, by a citizen of the United States, appraising the Secretary of State that the Government of Great Britain is pursuing measures deemed hostile to the interests of this country. This letter is made the ground work of official correspondence of grave import—its information is credited and acted on by our Government—and yet, when this letter and the name of the writer are called for by the Senate, the Secretary of State gravely returns for answer, that no such letter is to be found in his Department, and that he presumes it to be amongst the private papers of his predecessor, and of course inaccessible to the Senate. Nor can the name of the writer be ascertained. Now it strikes us that this is an extraordinary procedure. If the letter was of a purely private character, there should have been no reference to it ; but as it was made the basis of complaint against a foreign Government, it should have been filed as a public record, to be forthcoming when required. The name of the writer of the letter should be made known to the Senate, that, if necessary, he might be examined touching the sources of the information which he communicated ; and, as the Secretary of State professes ignorance, perhaps the President could give the information, as it is not to be presumed that he would authorize complaints to be made against a Government upon the assertions of a letter the writer of which was unknown to him. Let the Senate try the President, as it is of some importance that the whole matter shall be made known.—Baltimore Clipper.

A great foot race took place over the Hoboken Course, New York, on the 3d. The sum ran for was \$300 ; \$500 to the first person who performed 10 1/4 miles within the hour ; \$200 to the second best, provided the two latter performed 10 miles or upwards within the hour ; and if 10 1/4 miles was not performed within the time, only \$300 would be given to the best in the race. Nine started—all but three gave in at different points. Major Stannard, of Connecticut, came out ahead, but failed to perform the feat in an hour, being one hour and four minutes and 35 seconds on the course. He ran ten miles in a great race in 1835 in less than an hour.

Don't be Ashamed.—Let no man be too proud to work. Let no man be ashamed of a hard fist, or a sunburnt countenance. Let him be ashamed only of ignorance and sloth. Let no man be ashamed of poverty. Let him only be ashamed of idleness and dishonesty.

Happiness.—An eminent modern writer beautifully says : " The foundation of domestic happiness is faith in the virtue of woman ; the foundation of political happiness, a confidence in the integrity of man ; the foundation of all happiness, whatsoever, temporal and eternal—reliance on the goodness of God."

A gentleman was one day composing music for a lady to whom he paid his addresses.—" Pray, Miss D.," said he, " what time do you prefer ? " " Oh ! " she replied, carelessly, " any time will do ; but the quicker the better." The company smiled at the rejoinder, and the gentleman took her at her word.

See that your daughters rise early, and that they employ themselves about such domestic affairs as are suited to their years and capacities.

THE WATCHMAN. Salisbury, June 15, 1844. Republican Whig Ticket :

FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, HENRY CLAY, OF KENTUCKY. FOR VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN, OF NEW JERSEY. FOR GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA, WILLIAM A. GRAHAM, OF ORANGE.

THE HON. WM. A. GRAHAM, the Whig candidate for Governor, will address his Fellow-Citizens at the places & times following, viz :

At Greensboro' Saturday 15th June, " Germantown, Tuesday 18th, " Lexington, Thursday 20th, " Salisbury, Friday 21st, " Mocksville, Saturday 22d, " Rockford, Monday 24th, " Jonesville, Tuesday 25th, " Wilkesboro' Thursday 27th, " Howard's Mill, Friday 28th, " Lenoir, Caldwell co., on Saturday 29th June, and will proceed thence further West.

COTTON BLOOM.—Mr. Robt. L. Hargrave of Lexington, sent us, on yesterday, a Cotton blossom, which bloomed on Tuesday last. It is probably the first of the season in this part of the Country ; and earlier than any we recollect ever being produced here.

We refer the attention of the reader, to an extract of the Speech of Mr. Milton Brown, in answer to Ex-Governor Polk at Jackson, Tennessee, on the 4th of April, 1843. It is exceedingly said by some politicians that Mr. Polk is a candidate against whom nothing can be said. Grant it to be true : Is he a candidate of whom much can be said any way ? Can they boast of his achievements in the field or in the councils of his Country ! He is a common politician, possessing no grand distinguishing traits whatever—without deeds of honor, and without the qualities of mind or capacity for high achievements. But he is a candidate against whom nothing can be said ! How much better, if he were one for whom something might be said. But in this connection read Mr. Brown's speech in this paper. He has ventured to say something against Mr. Polk, and we leave the public to judge how he has established his words.

ANNEXATION OF TEXAS. While the friends of immediate annexation are urging this rash project upon the People, as the only measure which can prevent the Slaveholding States from being overwhelmed by the non-slaveholding States of this Union, the advocates of annexation at the North are pushing its adoption forward upon the ground, that instead of four slaveholding States being added to the Union, there will only be one slave State and two Free States. If this is so, what becomes of the argument of the friends of this scheme for strengthening the South ? Is it not idle and foolish for any man to favor such a scheme ? We think it is ; and earnestly ask the People to pause and think before they commit themselves upon a measure fraught with so much mischief, to the tranquility of the union of these States.

In corroboration of what we have stated above, we see that a report has been made by C. J. INGERSOLL, of Pennsylvania, (an advocate for immediate annexation), to the House of Representatives on the 4th ultimo, in which he denies that the extension of slavery will necessarily follow the admission of Texas into the Union ; and says, " three-fourths of that fine region " are upland, with soil and climate adapted " to agriculture and pasture, where cotton and sugar will not thrive, and where slave labor cannot be profitably employed." " THREE STATES WITHOUT SLAVES, AND ONLY ONE WITHOUT THEM, can be founded there, and such your committee understand, is the wish of the present inhabitants of Texas." Slavery, forbid by nature, may be " interdicted by organic law there ; and the annexation, instead of increasing the " power or representatives of slavery in the " Union, will, on the contrary, certainly " and greatly diminish their relative weight."

If the arguments here advanced by Mr. Ingersoll be true, what is there to be gained to the South by adding Texas to the Union ? But on the other hand, will it not greatly injure us, as is clearly shown in the above extract, by giving the Free States an increased majority in the National Legislature ?

POLK AND COFFEE. All will remember what an outcry was raised against those Whigs, who, in 1841, we believe voted for a slight duty on Tea and Coffee. How they were charged by this vote, with wishing to enhance the price of those articles. Now, these very men—who were so loud in their denunciation of the Whigs have presented to the People a man who voted in 1833, not for a Tax of four or five per cent., but for a duty of TWENTY PER CENT. As honest men, can these People-loving democrats support James K. Polk ?

All will remember what an outcry was raised against those Whigs, who, in 1841, we believe voted for a slight duty on Tea and Coffee. How they were charged by this vote, with wishing to enhance the price of those articles. Now, these very men—who were so loud in their denunciation of the Whigs have presented to the People a man who voted in 1833, not for a Tax of four or five per cent., but for a duty of TWENTY PER CENT. As honest men, can these People-loving democrats support James K. Polk ?