

THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

BRUNER & JAMES,
Editors & Proprietors.

KEEP A CHECK UPON ALL YOUR
IS SAFE.



RULERS: DO THIS, AND LIBERTY
Gen'l. Harrison.

NEW SERIES,
NUMBER 38, OF VOLUME III.

SALISBURY, N. C., FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 1847.

TERMS.—Two Dollars per annum in advance.
Advertisements inserted at \$1 per square for the first.
of 35 cents for each subsequent insertion. Court or-
ders charged 25 per cent higher.

DEBATE IN THE SENATE.

On Wednesday, 23rd December, 1846.
On the Preamble and Resolution, appropriating ten Thousand Dollars, to aid the North Carolina Regiment of Volunteers.

Mr. Francis opened the debate. He said to have done the thing after his own peculiar fashion. We were not in the Senate Chamber during this speech, and on entering, found

Mr. Waddell on the floor, maintaining the truth of the assertion in this Preamble, that the war was brought on by the action of the Executive. He maintained that the treaties with France and Spain, in regard to the boundaries of Texas, had nothing to do with the question. Mexico revolted from Spain—Texas revolted from Mexico. What Texas required by the sword, and could keep by the sword, she could call her own. She never had been able to reduce the territory between the Neches and the Rio Grande to submission. It has always been in the possession of Mexico, except a small district beyond the Neches limited by the Desert, and which Mr. J. C. Ingersoll called the "Natural Boundary."

Suppose, said Mr. Waddell, that South Carolina had succeeded in her scheme of Nullification, and afterwards had been annexed to England, with the exception of a few Counties on her Northern border, which she never could reduce, and which still remained part of the Union? Could England pretend that the old boundaries of South Carolina should still be regarded as the true boundary?

But 2nd. Suppose Texas had by her Declaration in Convention, or in Congress, pronounced the Rio Grande to be the true boundary. The Congress of the United States have since admitted in various ways in the intercourse with Mexico; that the boundary was still an open question. Was it not to be the subject of future negotiation? Was it not so resolved? And can the United States in the face of their own solemn Resolution, now claim the Rio Grande as a settled boundary? This is Punic faith with a vengeance.

But 3rdly. Suppose the United States was not stopped by this solemn act of hers, how has she regarded the subject since? Have not all our Secretaries of State—and John C. Calhoun among them—authorized our Ministers to Mexico to treat on the question of boundary as an open one?

4th. Mr. Polk, himself, by sending Mr. Slidell to treat on this very question, together with our pecuniary claims, makes it yet an open question.

5th. The first orders given to General Taylor were "not to go beyond the Territory in actual possession of Texas" and bid her authority, and cautioned him against invading the territory in dispute.

Still, in the face of all these admissions and orders, the President ordered the "Army of Observation" to move across this disputed ground to Matamoros, and point their Cannon into her very streets and blockaded the mouth of the Rio Grande. Is not this an aggression? Did not the war begin "by the act of the Executive?" Why, the very act of blockading her, is of itself such an act.

This is what the Executive has done. Now where does he find his authority?—This Preamble only states that the War is by the act of the Executive. That is a simple assertion of a fact. But I go farther and say that the Act was unauthorized. The power to declare War—to adjust boundaries, and determine the limits of Territory as well as to annex, belongs to the Treaty-making power under the Constitution—and this is given to the President and Senate, two thirds of whom must concur.

If there is no authority to cover the case in the Constitution, was there any act on the part of Mexico that justified this hot haste in commencing hostile operations? Was our Territory invaded? No Sir. Not until our troops had pointed their Guns into Matamoros, and blockaded their River, did she order an armed man to that quarter. If then the President performed these acts, if he had no authority for so acting in the Constitution, and if the action of Mexico did not render this course necessary, then the aversion in the Preamble is more than proved.

This was the substance of the argument of Mr. Waddell, which was relieved by many apt illustrations, and enlivened by occasional bursts of indignant feeling upon the horrors of the war into which we have been so rashly involved.

Having thus disposed of the argumentative portion of his speech, and proved, as he hoped conclusively, by a plain statement of facts and logical deductions therefrom, that the aversion in the Preamble is true, to the letter, Mr. W. said he felt it incumbent on him to reply, as he best might, to some things which had fallen from some of his friends over way, which he feared could not be dignified by the name of argument. He was restrained by Parliamentary usage, and that high courtesy which generally so distinguished debates in that Hall, from calling these ebullitions by the name which might be given out of doors by persons who felt themselves aggrieved.

Sir, it has been said on this floor, by those whose hearts, I am sure, are more to be trusted than their heads, that we the Whigs are opposed to the War; that we are Federalists, and that we are traitors, but they have reiterated, somewhat softly and daintily to be sure, the language lately used by one in high places about aiding and comforting the enemy.

Opposed to the War Sir! Who intro-

duced this very Resolution which we are debating? Was it not done by a Whig? Has it not the hearty support of every Whig in this Senate? Have we not labored to press it through the Senate, that we may not be too late in giving the necessary aid and comfort to those who are to fight our battles?

Does this look like opposing the War? No, Sir, our friends have done us notorious wrong. We have not opposed the War. I say here, in my place, and I speak not only my own individual feelings, but I doubt not the feelings of every Whig within the sound of my voice, when I say that in our opinion, we have ample cause for War with Mexico. I but speak the sentiments of those with whom I have the honor to act, when I say, that the War must and ought to be vigorously prosecuted, until we bring the enemy to terms, and conquer an honorable peace. But we say this War was wrong in the manner of its inception. We say that it belongs to Congress, only to declare any War, and that the President commenced this War without consulting Congress, even while Congress was in Session. We say that the Executive, in so doing, has given a vital stab to the Constitution.

And when we urge the vigorous energetic prosecution of the contest, and will go far as the farthest, in furnishing men and munitions, we protest against the mode in which it commenced. The British, in our Revolutionary War, were forced to fire at a body of American Soldiers, who were pouring into them a most destructive volley, through a corps of their own best troops. They shot their own foes through the hearts of their friends. We are not willing that the President should fire even at our enemy through the heart of the Constitution. No, Sir. The President may command our arms, our purse, our hearts' blood in this contest, but he must leave us freedom of thought and of speech. Of what worth to us is the name of liberty, if our thoughts are to be fettered and suppressed, and our tongues allowed only to echo the praises of the President, upon a piece of branded woe and of patriotism!

Is this your boasted land of liberty? Have we not indeed fallen upon evil times, when the offer of our hands, our means, our lives, in our Country's cause, is counted as nothing—may not even relieve us from the foul charge of aiding and comforting the enemy, unless we add soft praises to the man, who, in our souls we believe, has trodden in the dust our glorious Constitution? Sir, I speak with pain of the acts of the President. He is my personal friend. An intimacy commenced in boyhood, and continued for twenty-five years with the distinguished man, whose acts I am forced to condemn, must render this opposition personally most painful. He has honored me with his friendship. Of his kind feelings, I have very late proofs. He knows I cannot and do not approve his course, in the inception of this War. And while I will not, and cannot impute to the Executive the corrupt motives from which some of my friends do not spare him, I do from the bottom of my heart disapprove the act. Were it done by my dearest friend on earth—by my father, I must be allowed to enter my solemn protest against it, as a palpable and mischievous attack upon the Constitution. And am I to be told, that I oppose the War which the Government—aid and comfort the enemy? God save the mark! Who now commands your Armies? Whose blood has flowed like water on the plains and mountains of Mexico? Who compose the majority of those, who are now under arms in a foreign land, panting for combat with the perfidious foe? Who fill your ranks of Volunteers at home? Are there none of those much abused Whigs in the number? And will you tell these glorious patriots, the tale that you told yesterday—that they oppose the War—that they give aid and comfort to the enemy?

We are told, Sir, by one Senator, (Mr. Thompson,) that if he thought as we did of the War, that he could never be induced to fight its battles. Perhaps he would not. But little knows that Senator of true Whig patriotism. If in his opinion, the War was improperly begun, or unjustly continued, he could not give it his support! Sir, Whigs repudiate such doctrine as unworthy of them, and unpatriotic. This War, however begun, has now the "Sanction of Congress," the only power that has the Constitutional right to decide this question, and they ask no more. It now commands their support. It may do for the Democratic Senator from Wake, to act upon his individual opinion, against the Constitutional authorities of the land. If he should deem a War unconstitutional, as he understands it, he could not give it his aid! Thank God! no Whig can be found bold and arrogant enough to stand to that doctrine. In Heaven's name, what would it lead to? Would not each man, who happened to find himself disinclined to actual service, be suddenly filled with doubts of the Constitutionality or justice of the War? How would Constitutional qualms be multiplied! And how much the ranks be filled by reprobate Whigs—who are not so conveniently troubled with conscientious scruples, but only ask to know that their Country is engaged in a War and needs their aid to respond to the call.

Mr. Waddell next alluded to the attempt made by some Senator to cast odium on the Whig party by sneeringly calling them Federalists. It seemed to be tauntingly used as a term of reproach.—"Sir, said Mr. W., that name conveys no reproach to me. It was given to us pure a band of patriots as ever lived. Federalists! who were the Federalists? George Washington and his glorious compatriots were all Federalists. The holy band, who sacrificed their fortunes and many of their lives, for that liberty which we now enjoy, were Federalists, and shall we blush to be called by the name? I, said Mr. W., (drawing himself up, and assuming an attitude of proud defiance,) I am the son of a Federalist, and I glory in it. Most of my relations were Federalists during that severe struggle which achieved our Freedom. One of them yielded his heart's blood and his life at the head of his army on the plain of Germantown. A purer, or braver heart, never gave itself up to its Country. And shall I be reproached as a Federalist? No, Sir. Palsied be the tongue that dares say aught against that purest band of patriots that this Country, or any other Country, ever knew!

Mr. W. deprecated with great earnestness the mad ambition which we seem to have inherited with our Saxon blood, to extend our territory. He had much confidence in American virtue as well as valor. He knew that what man can do, is within the reach of true hearted Americans. The nation at heart was right. But Americans were men and not Angels—and even the Angels fell, from ambition. He awfully feared that our innate love of conquest, would lead and allure us to our ruin. This should not be a War for the acquisition of Territory, but for a redress of our national wrongs. Our very national pride—a feeling so cherished among us—may lead us astray and become a passion for foreign dominion.

He closed by a most beautiful picture, of the proud American Eagle, brought to the ground from his lofty flight, by an arrow feathered from his own wing. A few of the thoughts of Mr. W. are here recorded, and so far as possible, in his own words; but his fine glowing features, his graceful action, his clear, sonorous voice, his air and attitudes, so expressive of pleasure, of tenderness, generosity, pride and lofty disdain, are beyond the art of pencil or pen. He must pardon this poor sketch, and escape similar inflictions hereafter, by doing himself the justice to write out his own efforts.

Mr. Gilmer took the floor. He remarked that he would not have asked the indulgence of the Senate to be again heard on this Resolution, had not the gentleman from New Hanover (Mr. Ashe) made an attack on his constituents, the citizens of old Guilford, who had honored him with a seat in that Hall; and who, for their honesty and intelligence, purity of purpose, and steady loyalty to the Constitution, would compare with the constituents of any other Senator on this floor. Although the gentleman, in reply to the Senator from Orange, has disclaimed all intention to utter any thing personal or offensive to Ex-Governor Morehead, one among the purest and best men in the State, and who, he was proud to say, was one of his constituents, yet his remarks were too nearly assimilated to certain other observations, which he saw in a certain paper on his desk, called "The North Carolina Standard," to escape a reply.

In this paper, the Editor, reviewing the debate on this Resolution, uses the following false, slanderous, and insulting language: "On Monday, able and conclusive arguments were delivered on the American side of the question by Doctor Cameron, of Cumberland, and Gen. Wilson, of Edgecomb. The Senate was also addressed on Monday, by Messrs. Gilmer, Woodfin, Ehringhaus and Russell, in favor of the Preamble." What does the Editor of this paper mean, when he styles the debate on the other side, "American"—the word italicized, to attract particular notice? He attempts to do indirectly, what his cowardice would not permit him to do openly, directly and boldly. Let us read a little further: In speaking of the loss of the amendment to the amendment, offered by Gen. Hawkins, of Warren, he says: "What did they (speaking of Whig Senators) say by that vote? Why, that Mexico is not in the wrong, and that as a consequence, our country is!! We leave the Federal members of the Senate to get out of the predicament the best way they can." Here, Mr. Speaker, the Editor of that paper tells a willful and deliberate falsehood. A falsehood, knowing it to be so when he penned the article. A simple statement of Gen. Hawkins' amendment, voted down by Whigs, will prove it. How does the Preamble commence? Thus: "Whereas, by the action of the Executive, and the subsequent sanction of Congress, the Republic is involved in a foreign War." The amendment of the Senator from Edgecomb, proposes to strike out the words "by the action of the Executive, and the subsequent sanction of Congress," and would make the Preamble read—"Whereas, the Republic is involved in a foreign War." &c. The gentleman from Warren, proposes to amend the amendment, by adding of the word "Whereas," the words, "by the action of the Mexican Government." How would the Preamble

have read, had this amendment prevailed? Thus—"Whereas, by the action of the Mexican Government, and the subsequent sanction of Congress, the Republic is involved in a foreign war." True, the last amendment would leave out of view the President altogether, and throw the whole matter on the Mexican Government and Congress—an assertion untrue and ridiculous—and yet Whig Senators are charged with being enemies to their own country, and friends of Mexico, because they voted down this nonsensical amendment. Some gentlemen do not understand, for the want of mental ability; others, for the want of honesty. What candid, honest man, having reasonable sense, could have put such construction on this vote?

Mr. G. remarked, that it was useless to attempt to get off by simple disclaimers. It has become too common to attack the motives and character of gentlemen, by using offensive and unpopular epithets.

Suppose, said Mr. G., in alluding to the views which the Senator from New Hanover had submitted on this question, and in doing which, he is doubtless as honest as gentlemen on this side—he should, in every instance, when his name occurred, add, by way of meaning nothing, the words—Anti-American, Tory, Federalist and the like? would he be content with the polite disclaimer, that he meant nothing personal? Such politeness had the less excuse in this debate, for the reason, that it had been conceded in the outset, that Mexico had nothing to plead in her favor; that she had not kept her faith; that she was grossly at fault, and had slighted our claims, contemned the authority of our Government, and had not, and was not likely to receive, a stripe amiss. And Mr. G., said, that in order to avoid misrepresentation as to his true position, he had supposed the case of a sheriff, who should overtake his prisoner, one acknowledged to be guilty of barbarous, willful murder, and without awaiting the forms of a legal trial, should hang him. Would any honest man say that the sheriff would not be guilty of murder? Should he be deterred from speaking this truth, for fear of being thought friendly to the first offender? The murderer dies as he deserved, and yet his execution is a felon—conduct of both, to be condemned by all who consider it of importance to society, to preserve inviolate the Law and the Constitution.

Mr. G. asked, why had the Senator dragged into this debate, his constituents, the Editors of the "Greensborough Patriot," and Gov. Morehead? He would be much obliged to know, what lying tongue had told him that Gov. Morehead had any interest in, or control over that paper? What had the Communication in that paper, read by him, to do with this debate?—Where is the connection? Suppose said Mr. G., I should read extracts from some Northern Democratic paper, in which this war is denounced, out and out, and then insist that the gentleman and his whole party entertain the same sentiments? Would he conceive it just? The gentleman again disclaims charging Gov. Morehead and my constituents, with entertaining the views contained in the communication published in the "Greensboro Patriot." What did he mean by naming Gov. Morehead in connection with the "Patriot"? Had not the Senator assured him, that he had been told that Gov. Morehead had some interest in this Press, he should have concluded it had originated in his own imagination. He knew the Editors of that paper—they controlled their own columns—they suffer no man, or men, to govern their actions, and have no partners in interest, or in their management. Although he considered the publication of the communication impudent and ill-advised, and so far as the Editor may have endorsed its sentiments, Mr. G. admitted them to be at war with the true Whig feeling and sentiment, yet he felt authorized to say, for the Editor of that paper, that he was a gentleman of elevated worth, good and true—one, that loved the institutions of his country, and one, who would sacrifice as much to sustain them, as any individual in the State. And Mr. G. further declared it as his honest opinion, that Lyndon Swain, although he differed with him, so far as he may be considered as endorsing the views of his correspondent, that in this he was in error, doubtless honestly so, yet he sincerely believed he would, in the end, do more to encourage Volunteers, and sustain the honor of his country, than many, who are now so clamorous against his patriotism. If the gentleman had been as industrious to do this Editor justice, as injury, and had examined other columns of his paper, he would have found him calling on the country to contribute their labor and means towards sustaining and equipping our Volunteers—exhortations to do something effectual and substantial—to aid in such way we may be judged by our deeds, and not by sounding, but hollow exclamations of patriotism. Mr. G. said, that he considered the gentleman's use of unpopular names and allusions applied to his constituents, as a feeble effort to join chorus with that insulting and contemptible expression, discovered in the late Message of President Polk, wherein he, with effrontery, charges all who will not say that he commenced the war by Constitutional authority, with giving "aid and comfort" to the enemy. Although they stand ready to shed their blood and treasure to sustain his war, yet they give "aid and comfort" to the enemy, if they refuse praise to him in all that he has done or caused to be done. If they have the independence to say his Majesty erred, he immediately applies to them the words that define high treason—"aid and comfort." Who said Mr. G., has been so guilty in giving "aid and comfort" to the Mexicans, as the President himself? In that same message he admits, that Santa Anna, that bloody tyrant, Mexico's most experienced and war-like General, was by him permitted to return to the head and command of this very enemy. In speaking of the return of this treacherous and perfidious warrior, whom to mention, is to hate and despise for his barbarity and cruelty to our own countrymen, (many of whom he permitted to be murdered in cold blood, when prisoners of war,) the President uses the following language: "When orders were issued to the Commander of our Naval forces in the Gulf, on the 15th day of May last, only two days after the existence of the war had been recognized by Congress, to place the coast of Mexico under blockade, he was directed not to obstruct the passage of Santa Anna to Mexico, should he attempt to return." After this, how dare any syphocantic worshiper of James K. Polk, slip unintelligible jargon, in a fruitless effort to touch the enviable reputation of JOHN M. MOREHEAD, whose name the Senator from New Hanover has so incessantly dragged into this debate. For all know that sterling man, will join readily in the belief, that had he been the Executive, instead of Mr. Polk, rather than to have permitted Santa Anna to pass in safety our Naval forces, to "aid and comfort" the enemy, he would have ordered him to be hung—yes strung up by the heels. Mr. G. said he valued the political character of his constituents as he did his own, and that he would, as he hoped in a becoming manner, resent all imputations against their integrity. They had never failed, on proper occasions to come to the rescue of their country. They furnished their soldiers, good and true, in the memorable struggle of the Revolution—a period when Whiggery was admitted by men, who would now treat it with reproach, as being more than a name. Then, as now, had Guilford Whigs to contend with enemies within, as well as without; and, in that bloody strife at Guilford Court House, when most of our Militia chose rather the part of prudence, than that of honor, one Company from Guilford, among whom were many of Mr. G.'s blood relations, alone stood on ground that shook with the enemy's artillery to receive the first charge and execute the order given—a company commanded by one, who died of the wounds then received, and in whose veins flowed blood common with his own.

Mr. G. said, he imputed no bad motive, or want of patriotism, to those who differed with him in political opinion. He was ready and willing to express his confidence in their honesty—after all they might be right and he wrong, but it was the pride of his heart to know that all his relations, were Whigs in the Revolution, and that there was no human being, whose blood had community with his, to his knowledge who was not now a Whig, and that it was an opinion which he honestly entertained that when Whigs fail to rally around the National Flag to defend infractions as well upon the Constitution as our rights, our liberties are gone—that when to defend the Constitution there should be a draft for men to pass to the bloody fields of Marathon, that draft will be honored mainly by Whigs; that when to keep back myriads of its invaders, it shall become necessary to renew the scenes of Thermopylae; and only a few have the daring to make the sacrifice, that few will be Whigs, and when the last and final struggle is over, and the field of blood is inspected, among the slain will be found some whose home was Guilford.

THE SLOW, BUT SURE STEPS TO A MONARCHY.

Monarchy seems naturally to run after a democracy, and hence monarchy has become the prevailing government among mankind. Perhaps there is no help for it, but a great effort was made against it by Washington, and other Fathers of our Republic, and will yet be made by all who have imbued their spirit. The phrase one-man power, which we believe is of our own coining, more expressively defines what is understood by monarchy than any other definition we know of, and hence we shall continue to use it, while we call attention to its "progress" (the only sort of progress we have made these last years) in the U. States. Our one-man power is named President, which is now synonymous with Emperor, or King, although never intended to be so in our constitutional Republic. Thus, the power to declare war, existing in Kings and Emperors, now, it is contended by what calls itself democracy, exists in our President. It is not to be sure, so contended in express words, but the principle is laid down, that in the armed occupation of the territory west of the Neches, without an act of Congress, a disputed territory, Mr. Polk was right, although that occupation necessarily involved us in the war with Mexico. So when our government has a dispute with another government, it is now settled as a democratic principle, that an Executive can go to war about it, without consulting Congress, even though Congress be in session! The power to involve us in that, is to declare war, therefore, now exists in our President, just as it does in a King, or Emperor, or an Autocrat. It is a folly, then, hereafter to speak of our country as a Republic; it is a monarchy, but the head of it is softened down by the name of President, because King is unpopular yet.

War thus existing, in spite of Congress, but necessarily waged by Congress when the nation is thus forced into it by its monarchy—it is again laid down as a democratic principle, that what is conquered is annexed, and thus becomes part and parcel of our Union. Hear Mr. Douglass of Illinois, a noted democratic leader, when speaking in Congress on that point. We quote from the Union:

"Now he (Mr. D.) maintained that that territory (New Mexico) was a part of the territory of the United States before the general (Kearney) issued the proclamation of all. It was a part of the United States by virtue of the act of Congress which annexed it. It required no proclamation—a required no other act than that of conquest itself. And he maintained furthermore, that if a treaty of peace were made with Mexico without establishing her limits, all these conquered provinces were part and parcel of the United States by right of conquest, and must so remain forever—unless ceded back to Mexico, or unless re-conquered. It was therefore the act of conquest which annexed the territory, and it did not require the proclamation of Gen. Kearney or Commodore Stockton. They merely declared the existence of a fact which had previously occurred."

Conquest is annexation, and thus Tamaulipas, New Leon, Coahuila, Chihuahua, part of Vera Cruz, New Mexico, and the vast territory of Upper and Lower California, not only become "part and parcel" of the United States, but are annexed to the United States. Here, we see, first, the monarch starting a war on his own authority, and then, under that war, annexing to the Union Territories so vast as the Union itself,—and all without an act of Congress. Reasoning in this spirit, it is that Mr. Polk, in his message, says:—

"It may be proper to provide for the security of some important conquests, by making an adequate appropriation for the purpose of erecting fortifications, and defraying the expenses necessarily incident to the maintenance of our possession and authority over them." Here the monarch speaks as all monarchs intended to keep (in the vein of Frederick the Great, or a Napoleon,) and expresses his desire to have permanent fortifications erected at our expense, for permanent "maintenance of our possessions and authority over them." The violence done to free Government in such assumptions by the one man power as these, Mr. Polk himself has become so aware of, that it is painful to him to have a discussion of them. Hence in his Message, he says:—

"The war has been represented as unjust and unnecessary, and as one of aggression on our part against weak and injured enemy. Such erroneous views, entertained by but few, have been widely and extensively circulated not only at home, but have been spread throughout Mexico and the whole world. A question of fact means could not have been devised to embolden the enemy and protect the war, than to advocate adherence to their cause, and thus give them aid and comfort."

This imputes treason to any man who has dared to question the propriety and justice of the manner in which the Executive had originated and carried on the war. Mr. Polk has quoted the words "aid and comfort" from the constitutional definition of treason, with the evident intention of intimating that no man could question, or in the remotest manner express a doubt, of the propriety of the war, or the manner in which it has been waged, without proving himself a traitor to his country, and disposed to "aid and comfort" its enemies.

Let us pause here, and see the strings of monarchy in the Republic. First, the Executive creates a war, then under it annexes his conquests, and after all is completed, he tells us, it is treason to discuss his doings, because, we presume, the American Monarch has the presumptive prerogative of other monarchs, that doing no wrong.

Monarchy is thus complete in its alleged prerogatives in these United States. The King can do no wrong, and it is treason, therefore, to impute wrong to him. War exists in consequence of his orders, and there must be no discussion of it. The old thirteen States of the Union, formed a constitution for their own Government, are swamped by the annexation of vast territories they had never heard of; when their constitution is formed, and when they are sinking, they are told it is treason to complain of the causes that have overwhelmed them.

A very able discussion is going on in the House of Representatives respecting the Proclamations of General Kearney, of Com. Stockton. Mr. Polk has undoubtedly stimulated, and probably, sanctioned them. The Monarchists there are maintaining all that has been done, in the spirit of the language we have quoted from Mr. Douglass. Such is "progressive democracy." It knows no medium of a constitutional Government, but as a pedestal, is ever vibrating from anarchy, despotism, and from despotism to anarchy.—New York Express.

The Right to Speak.—Now that Mr. Polk has demeaned himself enough to speak of us, who are denouncing his constitutional and illegal act, in involving us in a war, without the authority of Congress, and in creating governments in distant lands, without like authority, traitors giving "aid and comfort to the enemy,"—it is time to hang some such banner as this on our outward wall.—Y. Express.

"Living, I shall assert the right of Discussion; dying, I shall assert that I should I leave no other inheritance to my children, by the blessings of God, I leave them the inheritance of Free Principles, and the example of a manly independent defence of them."—[Washington]

BEWARE OF AN IMPOSTOR.

A man by the name of MELVILLE visited place a few days ago, and endeavored to upon the sympathy of our citizens by presenting himself off as a deaf mute. It was soon out, however, that he was a rank impostor, that he had as free use of his tongue as men. He cleared himself off when the situation was discovered, as we are to suppose, upon some community more credulous than this. From a notice in the Greensboro Patriot, it seems he attempted the same situation upon the citizens there, and proposed lessons in penmanship; but from his stay, we judge he did not succeed in bringing many besides the editors of the Patriot. MELVILLE is a man of ordinary size, and of a genteel appearance; and we hope the owners of the Patriot, (now as he has proved self an impostor) will give him a mark which will stick to him, and by which the public be guarded from his impositions.—Hills Recorder.

MR. ADAMS.—The Boston papers state the Hon. John Quincy Adams, in his eagerness to get well enough to take his seat in Congress, tried his strength too far, and fell while walking in his room, bruising his person somewhat. His physician has forbidden him to think of going to Washington this winter.

Commodore John Frost has blockaded the ports on the Hudson from Newburgh to the Gulf of navigation.