

TERMS OF THE WATCHMAN.

Two dollars in advance, and two dollars and fifty cent at the end of the year. No subscription received for a less time than one year, unless paid for in advance.

THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

BRUNER & JAMES, Editors & Proprietors.



KEEP A CHECK UPON ALL YOUR BUSINESS. RULERS, DO-FIB, AND LIBERTY. Get L. Harrison.

NEW SERIES, NUMBER 14, OF VOLUME I.

SALISBURY, N. C., AUGUST 3, 1844.

EXTRACTS From the Speech of Mr. J. J. HARDIN, of Illinois, reviewing the principles of Jas. K. Polk and the Leaders of Modern Democracy.

THE SUB-TREASURY.

Not tired yet of trying experiments, your party, with the "Great Rejected" in the lead, proposed the adoption of the Sub-treasury. This was then held forth as the sovereign remedy for all the diseases of the body politic.

It is well known that Gen. Gordon, of Virginia, was the first person who proposed the sub-treasury scheme in Congress. This was in the session of 1834-5, and the locofoco party then went en masse against it.

Mr. Hardin requested Mr. Hudson to read for him, who declined, as he could not read loud enough.

Mr. C. J. Ingersoll volunteered to read for Mr. H. Mr. Hardin replied good humoredly, I beg to be excused for your kindness, as I do not like to get a man to read for me, whose countenance I, and no one else, can ever understand.

As then, between the responsibility of a public receiver and bank corporations, as banks do exist, and are likely to exist, under State authority, the latter, upon the ground of safety to the public, are to be preferred.

It may happen in the fluctuation of the amount of revenue and expenditures, that there will be at some times a considerable surplus in the treasury; which, though it may be temporary, if it is withdrawn from circulation, and placed in the strong box of a receiver, the amount of circulation will be injuriously disturbed, by hoarding the deposit, by which the value of every article of merchandise and property would be affected.

either hoard it, by keeping it locked up in a strong box, or use it at their own risk in private speculation or trade; or they must, for their own security, and on their own responsibility, place it at last on deposit in banks for safe-keeping, until they are called on by the Government for it.

This temporary use of the money on deposit in a bank, constitutes the only compensation, which the bank receives for the risk of keeping it, and the services it performs. If receivers be employed, they can perform no other service than to keep the money, and must be paid a compensation from the treasury.

It is interesting to know what are the views of Col. Polk on the subject of the currency. Not satisfied with the opinion of Washington, and those who made the Constitution, as expressed by their acts in 1791; nor of Madison and the republican party of 1816; nor of the Supreme Court of the United States, the tribunal of final resort for the determination of such questions; Mr. Polk has declared himself against a National bank, on constitutional grounds.

I take it, then, as an admitted fact, that Col. Polk is for State banks. According to Col. Polk's plan, we are always to have a paper currency. Now it is for the people to decide, and this issue is presented to them; if we are to have a currency regulated by banks, which does experience, and the wisdom of the past point out, as the safest for the people and the Government; or unnumbered quantities of State banks, which are chartered and regulated at the whim and caprice of twenty-six independent States.

OREGON.

I shall read now another of the resolutions of this Polk Convention: Resolved, That our title to the whole of the territory of Oregon is clear and unquestionable; that no portion of the same ought to be ceded to England or any other power; and that the re-occupation of Oregon and the re-annexation of Texas at the earliest practicable period are great American measures, which this Convention recommends to the cordial support of the Democracy of the Union.

And so it seems Oregon is to be pressed into the service, and its re-occupation is to be made a party hobby for locofocoism to ride. The United States is not big enough, and has got rather too hot to hold the mighty leaders of locofocoism; and so they must add Oregon and Texas, to give them breathing and dodging space, and room to display their grandiloquent powers.

But, sir, if gentlemen will only hold still, I intend to tap them for this Oregon inflation, and will relieve them of some of this surplus Rocky mountain wind, before it gets troublesome on their stomachs. Permit me first to ask, if this is so important an American question, why is it that the bill and resolution on this subject have been permitted to sleep in quiet on the table of this House for six months past, when you have so large a majority here? I will press this question further presently. But I suppose now, since the Baltimore Convention have added these new articles to the political creed of locofocoism, you are all first-rate, dyed-in-the-wool Oregon men. Is your candidate an Oregon man? And has he always been so? Don't look astonished, gentlemen, although you should find I already know more about your four-days old candidate than you do yourselves.

Do you not know that in December, 1828, there was a bill before this House extending the jurisdiction of the laws of the United States over all the people in Oregon Territory, and directing the officers of Government to take possession of the mouth of the Columbia river, and establish a fort there, being just such a bill as is now before this House? And do you not know that on the 29th day of that month, this same James K. Polk delivered a lengthy speech against that bill? I have not the time to detain the committee by refreshing these new Oregon converts with the reading of that speech; but I will advise any member who desires to make a speech against the Oregon bill now pending in this house to take up this speech and read it, and it will suit his case precisely. It will be found in vol. 5, pages 129 and 132, Congressional Debates. Mr. Polk states that he considers our title to Oregon better than that of Great Britain, a point about which there is no difference of opinion

among Whigs or Locos. He then sets out our treaty stipulations with Great Britain, which still exist, the same now as then, by which the country was to be occupied jointly by the citizens of both powers until one year's notice was given of an intention to abrogate the convention; that no such notice had been given; and then argues against the legality and propriety of passing the bill. I will now read a few sentences, that gentlemen may see the purport of the speech.

These are the stipulations of the existing treaties between this Government and that of Great Britain. Whilst they continue in force, they are declared by the Constitution to be the supreme law of the land. Now we have not given the notice of twelve months to annul or abrogate them, and unless we do, or receive such notice from them, they are in full force, and are obligatory upon us.

Such of our adventurous citizens as are disposed to penetrate into the unexplored wilds west of the Rocky mountains, have the right to do so. Great Britain has not, as yet, established any military posts, and has avowed her intention not to do so until we do. Her hunting companies may have private defences and temporary fortifications.

With these facts before us, contained in the official documents on our tables, who can doubt, if we send a military force there, during the continuance in force of these treaties, but that Great Britain will send one also? and if so, collisions between the armed forces of the two countries might, and probably would, be the consequence, and we might thus be compelled to decide by arms that which would be much better settled by negotiation.

We ought, he said, to pause before we passed this bill; not that he would for a moment think of abandoning our title, (for he believed it to be the better one), or of permitting any foreign power to become the owner of the country. We should not act now; but, as the question of title is left to future adjustment by negotiation, until we ascertained that there is no hope of regulating it by the Executive, let us postpone any measure on the subject. In the mean time, he would not permit Great Britain or any other power to take exclusive possession of it. By delay we can lose nothing. By acting now, we may hazard much. If the question of title was settled, and we were the undisputed owners of the country, many would even then doubt whether it would be our policy to extend our population to this distant region. We had yet, on this side of the Rocky mountains, a vast extent of wild unsettled territory, which will probably remain so for half a century to come. But it was not now necessary to decide that question. At all events, he considered it premature now to do so, when we must do it at a vast cost, and at the hazard of being involved in war. Let our citizens who choose, at least for the present, go there and hunt, fish, or traffic at their option. Let the country, at least for the present, remain a waste; it will be time enough to settle it, if we should ever deem it our policy to do so, when the present difficulties are removed, when the dispute as to title shall be settled, and when we shall have acquired more accurate information in relation to it.

Subsequently, during the same session, Mr. Polk offered a resolution having for its object the extension of the jurisdiction of our courts over all the citizens of the United States who may be in the territory of Oregon, (which of course did not include British subjects who might be there,) also for an exploration of the territory. (Cong. Deb., vol. 5, page 143.) There is no person of any party who would object to this proposition of Col. Polk. But, sir, I go farther than he does. I am also for giving the requisite notice to Great Britain; and as soon as we can do so without any breach of faith, I wish to see Oregon taken possession of by our Government. I have entertained these views, not as a party man, but as a western man, who wishes to see that country, which all Americans agree rightfully belongs to us, brought under subjection to our laws, and left free to the occupation of our citizens. In these views I have differed from many of my political friends, who doubt the present policy of the proposed measure; and recently, since I have examined Col. Polk's speeches, I find him occupying the very same grounds and urging the very same reasons which are occupied and urged by those friends who differ from me. And now after this exposition of the views of your candidate, which he has never withdrawn, I ask you locos if you do not feel ashamed of your Oregon thunder? I really commiserate your unenviable condition and if you only feel half as bad as you look, you must be suffering the last agonies of despair.

TEXAS.

But, sir, you also say in your Polk resolutions that you are for the re-annexation of Texas. This I suppose, includes, according to Texas law and Texas boundaries, the re-annexation of large portions of three Mexican provinces, and some twenty or thirty Mexican towns, including Santa Fe. Your new ideas of re-annexation are doubtless enlarging with your new issues. I do not design entering into the discussion of the Texas question at length. An hour

would be a very short time to do so, much less the few minutes I have to bestow on it. But I intend to talk to you locos about this new issue, as we say in the West, "just like a brother." At the recent Baltimore Convention you have consigned to political infamy your old leader, Martin Van Buren. As you had falsely alleged that he was unfairly defeated in 1840, and that he ought to have justice done him in 1844, we were anxious you should afford us an opportunity of giving him ample justice, by giving him and his party another sound political drubbing next fall. But, sir, you have prevented us from bestowing upon him "this labor of love." You have strangled him with your hands, in your own camp. In the complimentary resolution which you passed over his political names, you say he fell a martyr to his principles in 1840, and you should justly have added, he was falsely re-murdered in 1844, by his own friends, on account of the unpopularity of his principles.

You are endeavoring to produce the impression now, that Mr. Van Buren was sacrificed on account of his Texas opinions. Sir, this is not so; but if it were, the only cause of regret for his fate would be, that he was consigned to oblivion by his party friends, for the most honorable and statesmanlike act of his life. The misfortune may be his—the disgrace is his friends. But, sir, you and I well know, that it was publicly proclaimed in this city months ago, that if you lost the Connecticut and Virginia elections, you would withdraw Mr. Van Buren and run some other candidate. After the result of the elections in Maryland and Connecticut, and the special elections in Pennsylvania were known, you became very restless, and began to look around for new issues. Believing that Mr. Van Buren would go with you for the annexation of Texas, those members of your party who resided in doubtful States, especially in the South began to come out for it. The returns of the Virginia election brought the news of your disastrous defeat in that time-honored Commonwealth, at the same time that Mr. Van Buren's letter against annexation was published. This was adding disappointment to defeat. It was too much for your philosophy—and like the little boy who got mad at his wooden hobby horse because it would not jump a branch with him, and who, in his childish anger, got down and broke it to pieces—so your party vexed, disappointed, and maddened at your multiplied defeats, caused not by the acts of Mr. Van Buren, but by the unpopularity of your and his principles, vented their spleen upon your leader, and offered him up a holocaust to the chagrin and disensions of those leaders of your party, who were thirsting for the retreating spoils of office.

I now understand your party are for the annexation of Texas, and that this is designed to be made an issue in the ensuing canvass. Pray tell me, sir, when this became so important an American question? Is it now any thing more of an American question than it was in 1838, when its re-annexation was promptly rejected by President Van Buren and John Forsyth; which act your whole party sustained without a dissenting voice? Was it made a question in the election of any man here? Was it agitated at all before the people when the members of this House were elected? Was it ever mentioned as a great question during the first four months of this session? Was it ever dreamed of as a great political issue until the noise of defeat began to reverberate upon your ears from the first battle ground of the revolution? No, sir, no man imagined such a thing, unless it was John Jones and Captain Tyler.

This scheme of begging Texas to be re-annexed to the United States immediately, was the device and invention of Capt. Tyler. There is no doubt but he considered it a fine hobby to ride into a re-election. If then, any body is entitled to the benefit of the suggestion, it is the Captain. It is his peculiar thunder, and now what are you Locos doing? You have mounted upon this hobby, behind the Captain, and are already manfully striving to push him off and put up James K. Polk in his place. Sir, if I had you before an impartial jury, (and we will have you on trial next November before the grand inquest of the nation), I could convict you of petty larceny in stealing away the Captain's hobby-horse.

So, your design in this, is palpable. Aye, sir, it is for the purpose of drawing off and misleading the public mind from the old issues, on which it is apparent you would be defeated; and with the hope of inoculating the South with the Texas, and the West with the Oregon fever, that you hope again to craze the brain of the people and induce them, in the paroxysm of the disease, to deliver into your hands the reins of government. What right has your party to say that they are the peculiar advocates of this or any other subject, as an American question? And what reason have the people to believe you would even carry out annexation if you had the power? Can we see it in your acts? To leave out of view the old promises of your party—what have you done with your overwhelming majority here, about this Oregon Bill? How have you kept your promises to repeal that black tariff of 1842? And where is your sub-treasury bill, which you were to re-enact, to undo all the Whig

Congress had done, as you boastfully alleged you would do at the commencement of this session? Sir, they all sleep in quiet repose on the table of this House, waiting the action of the Locofoco majority. Perhaps this retort may galvanize some of them into re-existence. Sir, the conduct of your party leaders on this, as on various other occasions, proves that you have no sincerity, and are not to be trusted with power. Place the power of Government again under your control, and Texas may remain independent—be annexed to the United States, or be re-annexed to Mexico, as may seem most advisable, to enable you to hold on to the spoils of office. The history of your legislation still exhibits the verification of the remark of that great Southern chief of your party, that "you are held together by the cohesive power of the public plunder." And now, you are willing to plunder Mexico or Texas, if you can thereby regain the longed for spoils of office.

But your resolution says you are for annexation "at the earliest practicable period." Was that intended to have one meaning for the North and another for the South? The gentleman from Alabama is very particular upon this matter of two faces for two sections of the country. I call his attention to this point. Does this resolution mean, that your party and your candidate are in favor of the present treaty? That is the question of annexation which is presented to the American people. I want no equivocating or shuffling on this point, but a direct answer from the gentleman who has laid so much stress upon this subject of annexation in his remarks. I appeal to the gentleman from Alabama to say whether the Democratic party, or himself, or Mr. Polk, are for the ratification of this treaty?

Mr. Payne explained his meaning when he had spoken of the gentleman's presenting two faces. Mr. Clay had published a letter, and with apparent skill and design, had avoided to answer the question. From a cursory glance of it, any one might suppose he was in favor of annexation.

Mr. Hardin. I ask that gentleman if himself, or the Democratic party, or James K. Polk, were for this treaty; and not with reference to Mr. Clay's views. These were clearly expressed in his letter.

The attempt is vain to get an answer from any of these gentlemen to those inquiries. As to Mr. Clay's opinion on annexation, it is needless for me to explain. They are written so boldly, and plainly, and frankly in his letter on that subject, that a man cannot misapprehend though he may misrepresent them.

The locofoco party are seeking to make a new issue, and now we have a right to know the exact terms of that issue. If you endorse this treaty with the correspondence which brought it into being, say so. If you are against it, and for immediate annexation in any other way, or upon any other terms, proclaim them distinctly. Are you determined to have Texas, even if you have to go to war with Mexico to obtain it? Let the country distinctly understand your intention. We want no more Missouri questions to threaten the dissolution of the Union. And let it not be said by your partisans in the South, that you are for annexation for the purpose of extending the limits and increasing the influence of the slave States, and yet in the North the friends of annexation, stating, as did the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. C. J. Ingersoll) in his recent letter to the Globe, "that Texas would make one slave and three free States, and would thus greatly increase the preponderance of the free States." Here is evidence of further equivocation and shuffling by your party leaders on this "new issue." You are "blowing hot to the south, and cold to the north, in the same breath," on this subject. When evidence of your unfairness and hypocrisy is so apparent, do you suppose you can deceive the American people? And let me tell you southern Texas advocates that, if by any chance, the professed locofoco friends of annexation should ever get the majority in Congress, you will find your northern loco allies deserting you on the details of the measure, as they did on the tariff question, and you will curse them in your hearts with tenfold the bitterness you do the Whigs.

I admit that in some portions of the Union you intend to make a desperate fight. The minority of your party at the south,

have overruled the majority of your party at the north, and compelled them to adopt a southern candidate, and to pack what you term a southern question. The northern Democracy will scarcely make a struggle. The battle is expected to be fought upon Texas at the South, upon Oregon in the West, and upon Dallas in Pennsylvania. You misjudge the gullibility of the American people, if you suppose they are to be misled or deceived by these "hubs thrown out to catch whales." I have already tapped your Oregon tub, and let water enough into it to sink it. The people of Pennsylvania have too much practical sense to be induced to support Dallas, when he is playing second fiddle to the free trade anti-tariff tunes of Col. Polk. And I much mistake the intelligence and devotion to the fundamental principles of our Government, which characterize southern Whigs if you are able to deceive them into your support by the ignis fatuus glare of this Texas issue. Too long have they contended for honest principles against the wily arts of Locofocoism, until they have been purified as by fire. They have won the laurels they so honorably wear, in many hard fought fields, to permit them to be torn from their brows by a stratagem of their enemies. And if I may judge of their constituents, by the noble band of firm and talented representatives which the southern Whigs have on this floor, they are neither to be bought by bribes, deceived by hypocritical pretences, nor driven by bravado threats, from the defence of those principles they have long cherished; nor from the support of that man who has shown himself the true advocate of all sections of our country, and who, in every dangerous emergency, has risen with renewed energy above all party trammels, and towering above all competitors, has grappled and mastered every difficulty, and exhibited before an admiring world the enlightened principles of a true American statesman.

FROM MEXICO.

The ship Vistula arrived at New Orleans on the 16th July, in nine days from Vera Cruz. At last dates from the city of Mexico, the measures for the recovery of the "revolted province" of Texas were still the topics of conversation and legislation. The New Orleans Bulletin says the first act of the extra session of Congress was the passage of a law raising \$4,000,000 to prosecute the war. The Picayune says that the law had not passed—it had been reported by a committee, which also sent in one or two minority reports; but it was very doubtful whether congress would vote the money.

The Mexican press, as well as the minister for foreign affairs, were using every effort to inflame the public mind against the Anglo Saxons, and to fire the Mexicans with enthusiasm in the enterprise of the re-conquest of Texas.

There had been another tilt at arms between Mr. Bocanegra and our charge, Mr. Green. The former renewed with increased severity his charges of "bad faith," "violation of treaties," "usurpation," "atrocities," &c. against our government. Mr. Green continued to remonstrate against the employment of such unsavory and ungentle terms, and declared that he had express orders from his Government not to hold any communication with the Mexican Government not conducted in the terms of courtesy and respect due to the honor and dignity of the United States. The quarrel between these two officials had become quite threatening.

Commenting upon Mr. Green's letters, the New York Commercial says it is a pity we cannot have a representative at the Mexican court who can write a decent note.

The Mexican journals are filled to repletion with the translations of the correspondence which took place some months since between Mr. Packenham and Mr. Calhoun in regard to annexation.

Gonzala Ulloa, commandant general of marines at Vera Cruz, has received the appointment of commodore of the Mexican squadron.

According to letters from Mazatlan, dated 1st of June, it appears that the captain of H. B. M.'s corvette Champion, is accused of infringing on the maritime rights of Mexico in the gulf of California, by forcibly liberating a British bark, taken on the charge of smuggling.

The castle of San Juan de Ulloa, at Vera Cruz, has been put in a complete state of defence, (so say the papers) and amply provided for any emergency that may occur.

From the N. Y. Journal of Commerce. THOMAS W. DORR.

We learn that this person is employed in the State Prison at Rhode Island, wherein for flagrant and manifold treason he has been sentenced to abide for life, in the painting of fins. It is well known that he refuses to sign a petition for his release, or to take the oath of allegiance to the established and rightful Government of the State. He even caused the General Assembly to be informed that the petition presented by his father—a gentleman whose unwavering integrity and manliness of deportment, through all the public troubles, have been the theme of praise from one end of the Republic to the other, and have conciliated the respectful sympathy of every honest Rhode Islander—was presented without his knowledge and in opposition to his desire. In justice to the State's magnanimity, the fact should be universally promulgated, that the government has been through-out inclined to mercy, and that this inclination has been thwarted by Dorrr himself. He remains in prison, (says the Providence Journal,) not the victim of oppression, which he is represented to be, and scarcely the victim of justice, but rather of his own unyielding obstinacy, which refuses the proffered mercy of the Government, unless he can dictate the terms upon which it shall be accepted.

"I have a shell," says Cecil, "in my study for tried authors, one in my mind for tried principles, and one in my heart for tried friends."