

From the *Philippine Courier*.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROTEST.

The more we have thought of it the more we have been surprised at the message of the President protesting against the inquiry instituted by the House of Representatives into the alleged employment of money or patronage to influence the action of Congress, and the alleged attempt to interfere with due execution of the laws. We may indeed understand how he may feel annoyed at the appointment of his successor, Mr. Gwinett, as Chairman of the Committee of Investigation; and, though it is the almost inevitable practice to appoint the mover of a committee as its chairman, we think it would have been better in this instance to appoint some one else, or that Mr. Gwinett should have defined to be chairman. There is a propriety in his being a member of the committee, but not its chairman. This consideration, however, is not of sufficient importance to justify the protest. We doubt, indeed, whether it is not favorable to the President to have his successor in such a position; for it will undoubtedly weaken the force of any report the committee may make, and afford the President's partisans material which they will not be slow to avail themselves of to defend him.

It seems to us that an innocent public officer, so far as the President claims to be, should not, and would not, object to have his official conduct investigated.

He had been openly charged by testimony taken before a committee of the last Congress, with a corrupt use of the government money in the navy and army contracts, (testimony which we published at the time, and the truth of which has not even been denied, so far as we know.)—He is now charged on the floors of Congress with other corrupt uses of the public money; and members of his own party, the recipients of office and honors and emoluments from that party, and intimately associated with him, have testified on oath before the printing committee that he has disposed of the Post-office printing, worth about \$5,000, for about \$45,000, in such a way as to secure \$30,000 a year for the support of his own feeble organs at Washington and Philadelphia, and further large sums to operate upon elections in Philadelphia and New York. If innocent of these charges, it seems to us that the President would court investigation. But instead of that, he protests against investigation. We do not see how any one can reconcile this with a conscientiousness of innocence and purity.

We cannot see the force of the distinction which the President makes between himself and his Cabinet officers.—He is quite willing that their conduct shall be injured into, but utterly opposed to have his own investigated. This, however, amounts to them, in a concession since the Jacksonian era, when that mass of iron-will contended that they were only responsible to him—they were his officers. Gen. Jackson did, however, contend, as Mr. Buchanan does now, that he was not responsible to Congress, but only to the people. "To them, and to them alone, is he responsible," says Mr. Buchanan. This is a convenient doctrine, especially for an officer who, like Mr. Buchanan, cannot be made responsible to the people. They cannot try him, and he will never again be before them as a candidate. A candidate must not submit to his conduct, except such a committee as we may think most suitable, say the Judiciary committee, which has so much else to do that it could not probably do that. It results from all this that a President is irresponsible. He may do what he will.

The Peck precedent, cited by the President, is not in point; for the proceeding of the present House is not an impeachment, but merely one of inquiry—necessary to the ascertainment of facts upon which to found an impeachment, should one be demanded by those facts. It is nonsensical, however, to talk of impeaching any President, for any amount of corruption. It requires two thirds of the Senate to convict him when impeached; and the very fact that the President has just been elected makes it almost certain that he will have a majority of friends in the Senate. We all know that the President, generally, commands his friends in Congress, right or wrong. The impeaching power, therefore, is as complete a nullity as is the responsibility to the people.

The President complains that the investigation is vague and general. If he is innocent of any corruption, we do not see that it is material whether it is vague or particular. It would be otherwise if an impeachment were pending. Then the charge should be specific. As little as he is, so, we think, to assert that he has not endeavored to sustain the charge, and made it their own, as he has endeavored to sustain the charge, and made it their own.

The *Philadelphia Enquirer* says:—"For the credit of the country, we are gratified to find that the Mexican party were clearly in the wrong. The persistent act of improvidence in not honoring any compact, but after the action commenced, followed by the frantic demonstration on the part of Commodore Marín, can only be viewed in one light by all those who judge of the event. Virtually and clearly, the act was aggressive and vindictive, proceeded from the forces of Miramón, who is answerable for the consequences. We may explore the circumstances, as tendency to bring this country into a collision with Mexico, and involving the political expenses of a war, out in the present condition of Mexico, and with or irresponsible man as Miramón directing the fragrant emergence of that Republic, the problem before the country issue that must be speedily solved."

One of the steamers Hingman's boats has been sold to Port Lator, bottom up, and the cars laid aside, the rings loose, but not a scratch about her. It appears as if the persons had time to prepare themselves for the work, and a strong current was at the time setting off her, it is thought they must all have been carried off to sea. No one there can account for the loss of the ship, except that the officers mistook one right for the other.

"Some time in January, 1853, and not long before the election of president of the United States by the house of representatives, the Hon.

James Buchanan, then a member of the house, and afterward many years a senator of the United States, from Pennsylvania, who had been a sincere and infatuated supporter of General Jackson in the preceding career, and was supposed to enjoy his unenvied popularity, was at the lodgings of Mr. Clay, in the city of Washington. Mr. Clay was at the time in the course of his only moments in the house, his intimate and confidential friend, the Hon. E. P. Teller, then governor of Kentucky, then the member of the house. Shortly after Mr. Buchanan's entry into the room, he introduced the subject of the approaching presidential election, and spoke of the certainty of the election of his favorite, adding, that "beyond form the most prominent that the country had ever had." Mr. Teller asked, "How would you have one more distinguished than that of Mr. Jefferson, in whom were both Madison and Gallatin?" Whereupon Mr. Buchanan replied, that "he would not go out of this room for a secretary of state," adding of Mr. Clay, "This gentleman (Mr. Clay) playfully remarked that he thought there was no number three fit for a cabinet officer, unless it were Mr. Buchanan himself."

Democrats have always contended that there was a bargain and corruption in that matter. It is evident that Mr. Buchanan was the guilty agent.

Mr. Colton adds to the above by Mr. Clay:

"The author has understood at several times, it has been intimated to Buchanan, that it might be to his (Mr. Clay's) advantage to publish these facts, and that he was discussed over it by Mr. Buchanan."

THE N. ORLEANS POISONING CASE
Death of another Victim.—Miss Emily Young, another guest at the poisoned dinner party in New Orleans has since died. On Friday last, the negro Ann and her son Harry were carried from prison to the residence of their master, Col. Lemley, who still as invalid from the effects of the poison, for examination. The doctor:

In the room lay the corpses of Mr. Lemley and the little boy, son of Mrs. Young, and nephew of Mrs. Lemley. The woman Ann had a haggard and unfavorable appearance, and the boy Harry confirmed by his looks the last character given to him. They were told to back upon the corpse, which they did without any sign of conscious guilt, or any expression of a suspicious character. "Look there," remarked Col. Lemley to the women, "Ann, is this all your work?" The women replied promptly and firmly that she knew nothing about it, that it was strange to her as to any body else, and after a pause, and looking at the face of her domestics, visible through the glass case of the metallic coffin, she added: "You know, master of 4 I don't want to do such a thing. I could have done it any time for you, master." The women and Ann were then examined apart. The boy was asked if he had not been seen stirring up the components of the Charlotte Ross. Her reply, "Yes, that Ann told him to stir it for the result."—*Washington Herald.*

OUR CANDIDATE.

It is with unabated satisfaction that we notice with what unanimity and cordiality the nomination of John Pool has been received by the Whig press of the entire State of North Carolina. Not a single one of them has raised an objection to him—or a single one given expression to sentiments otherwise than complimentary to the man and his cause.

This we say, is truly gratifying. His nomination has been ratified in the extreme east—it has been ratified in the extreme west, and in fact every section of the State is preparing to do battle for him—to fight nobly, and we confidently believe to win. Shakspere knew a thing or two of human nature, and he was not dreaming when he wrote—“Heed not he who has his quarell’d.” If there ever was—not exactly a quarrel, but a cause which has a claim to first place, then the cause of John Pool and equal taxation is that one. It is right that the rich should pay their proportion of taxation as well as the poor; and the man who opposed *ad valorem* or equal taxation, can scarcely be a friend to his State, or willing that the poor and the rich should be led from the same spurs. We are in favor of *equal taxation*; that is, for the man who has no property, to be exempt. (Of course this has no reference to the poll-tax. We do protest against this *Democratic* way of taxing poor laboring men and clerks the sum of five dollars upon every five hundred dollars of wages or salary they get. What man can support a wife and family upon five hundred dollars a year; and yet a *Democratic* Legislator makes each recipient of a salary of five hundred dollars he receives for his services. If a clerk gets fifteen hundred dollars wages, he pays to the State fifteen dollars taxes, and then has no property to be protected by *State Legislation*; whereas another man may own a negro boy, perhaps a good mechanic, who is worth the same amount or more, and who gets two hundred or two hundred and fifty dollars, and he pays to the State but 80 cents. Can any sane man—can any honest man say this is just or right?) We have yet to see that man, and still *Democrats* oppose *equal taxation*. What will not some men sacrifice for the harmony and success of their party?

“Thrice armed is he who has his quarrel just,” and believing this, we go into the battle with a stout heart and without a tremor—the lead particle of fear for the result.—*Washington Herald.*

JOHN POOL, Esq.

John Pool, Esq., recently nominated by the Opposition party for the Governorship of North Carolina, is a native of Pasquotank county. He was born on the 16th day of June, 1826, and is therefore not yet quite 34 years of age. He graduated at the University of North Carolina in 1847, returned to Elizabeth City, his native town, and immediately entered upon the practice of law, in which he has been eminently successful. He was admitted to the bar in 1850, by the Whig and American parties, to represent the 1st Congressional District of North Carolina, in the National Convention held in Philadelphia, and labored industriously to secure the nomination of Hon. Millard Fillmore. As the nominee of the American party, he was elected to the State Senate from Pasquotank and won.

He was re-elected to the legislature in 1856, and re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the Congressional District and in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858. His name is frequently mentioned in connection with the nomination for Congress in the State Convention of 1858, he again voted with the Hon. William H. Harrel Smith, the present representative to the 1st district, which comprised a part of the constituency of Prof. C. W. Darrow, who was re-elected by a large majority in 1858