

North-Carolina Free Press.

Whole No. 415.

Tarborough, (Edgecombe County, N. C.) Tuesday, August 14, 1832.

Vol. VIII—No. 51.

The "North-Carolina Free Press,"

BY GEORGE HOWARD,

Is published weekly, at *Two Dollars and Fifty Cents* per year, if paid in advance—or, *Three Dollars*, at the expiration of the year. For any period less than a year, *Twenty-five Cents* per month. Subscribers are at liberty to discontinue at any time, on giving notice thereof and paying arrears—those residing at a distance must invariably pay in advance, or give a responsible reference in this vicinity.

Advertisements, not exceeding 16 lines will be inserted at 50 cents the first insertion, and 25 cents each continuance. Longer ones at that rate for every 16 lines. Advertisements must be marked the number of insertions required, or they will be continued until otherwise ordered. Letters addressed to the Editor must be post paid, or they may not be attended to.

Communications.

FOR THE FREE PRESS.

Mr. Howard: I really tho't, when "A Lightwood-knot-burner" drove "A Carolinian" from the field of honorable and open controversy, to the base means of disgorging the malicious secretions of his irritated stomach on the pure and sacred pages of private correspondence, that I should have heard nothing more of that unfortunate reference to "a virgin effort to clip the wings of his aspiring genius." But alas! the *veto*, which "A Voter" has put on little 'Q's' recommendation, and the order of the worshipful County Court, to build a splendid and fire-proof Court House, so consonant with Q's ardent wishes for ostentation, serves only as a fresh memento of his former presumption, and the withering blast of female Nullification to all his fancied joys. I again disavow any intention of such application of the words at the time I used them, and moreover I wish to be fairly understood, as having no intention to stand between him and any little greatness he may possibly acquire in official promotion, or popular applause; and earnestly hope, that in future, his "morbid sensibilities" will not be altogether so acute, as to apprehend a *post mortem* examination of his mortified ambition, when I may chance to take a pen to assert my rights: or utter such terrible yells, as if he expected another tremendous "lightning stroke" of Nullification, when I endeavor to convince an "old dog" that he has gone astray.

But, Mr. Editor, this pop-gun of 'Q,' alias 'A Carolinian,' happens not to have any thing but wadding this time; tis true, there is a little national black sand, somewhat like mustard-seed shot (small argument) in the "indirect representation," as he calls it, which we have in the 'Squirehood; and I presume, that if this very ingenious gentleman of the Bar had been among the Nullifiers of England previous to the passage of the Reform bill, he might have proved to them beyond the shadow of a doubt, that they had an *indirect* representation in the House of Lords, and might have turned out the opposers of the bill and put in advocates. Thanks to my worthy 'Q'-uizer for the light which he has given me—for if we have an indirect representation among their Worshipps, we certainly have the same among their Honors, (for both belong to the Judiciary department:) and if any bill for

revenue or appropriations, (except by *indirect* taxation,) can be gotten up by our indirect representatives in the Senate of the United States, or among the Judiciary officers of this State, I request that the people will have an appropriation immediately made by the Judges of this State to rebuild the Capital at *Raleigh*, and it will be done; unless their Honors, like our Worshipps, refuse to be "palsied by the will of their constituents." Verily I thought before I saw the *new light* of this blazing star of Nashville, that *direct* taxation and appropriation were reciprocated by *direct* representation only; and that even in England all subsidies must come from the House of Commons, and in the United States, "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives;" both the *direct* representatives of the people; and that no others in this State but our *direct* representatives had the *legitimate* right, according to the 16th section in our Bill of Rights, to tax us or appropriate our money without our consent: But since I have learned from 'Q,' that others in the *Judiciary*, can do as much, and bind us in a contract, (to which we have never *freely* consented,) so securely, that our Legislature itself can give us no redress; I would beg leave to enquire, where is the necessity of our *direct* representatives any longer legislating for us? If my memory is not treacherous, that venerable statesman Lord Chatham said in the British Parliament "As an Englishman I recognize to the Americans their supreme unalterable right of property"—"Property," said he, "is *private, individual, absolute*—the touch of another *annihilates* it." And shall an Englishman, as a disinterested foreigner, contend more zealously for our rights than our brother citizen 'Q'—"Tis strange, 'tis passing strange!"

Whether 'Q,' in his allusion to "Daniel, a second Daniel," meant to intimate that I, in a former controversy with him, on ecclesiastical affairs, had as clearly discovered the tracks of a certain despotic priesthood, as Daniel did those of mighty Bell, I cannot say; neither will I assert that he wished to be understood, that as Daniel was cast into the lion's den for making petition to another God than the Babylonian king, even so might I soon be confined in a deposit for felons and rebels, newly fitted up, a little more convenient than a lion's den to Nashville. But this much I will say, that if such should be my unfortunate lot, even thro' the grated window, I will expound to him "Mene, Mene Tekel Upharsin," which the hand is now inscribing on the wall of this Nashville monarch's palace.

'Q' is not correct in supposing me to be a descendant of the hero of Salamanca; I never heard of such a hero—nor am I the hero of La Mancha fighting useful "windmills" and harmless "sheep;" but whether I be knight or 'squire, I am sane enough to know that I am warring against an old acquaintance who is a very expert *dodger*.

As to what 'Q' says about "parsimony," I assure him the cap does not fit me, for I expect to pay as much as himself towards building this fire-proof Court House, and if a majority of the people say build it, I will not murmur. By a little "parsimony" on my own pride, I have heretofore made out to pay my taxes in due time, and have not disposed of any of my taxable estate to evade taxation; but I ever expect to complain, when I am forced to pay an exorbitant and useless tax, and unlawful usury too on that tax; especially when I have no thousands to farm those taxes to myself with. This much to 'Q.'

In conclusion I will say, that I am no more ashamed of my name or arguments, than Madison, Hamilton, Jay and others, when they concealed their names; if they thought, their high authority might influence men, more than their simple arguments, even so my obscurity might detract from the weight and merit of mine: And if Mr. Boddie, or any other member of the Bench, can find, in the first communication of 'A Voter,' a single word in the least disrespectful or untrue, and will point it out, I will freely withdraw it and apologise for it. Some of Mr. Boddie's votes in the Legislature I have disapproved, but for those I would never have discarded him, because he might be right and I wrong, just as soon as I be right and he wrong; but to cede a *right*, guaranteed to me by the Constitution, I cannot.

I will ask the whole Court, in the honest integrity of their hearts, to say if my *true* and *direct* representative has any right to tax me longer than one year, (viz: from one election to the next!) and if *he*, the representative, has not that power vested in him, for a longer time, how can he confer it on the Justices or any others for more than one year? It is but evasion, to say, this power was conferred by statute before you were born. The British statutes of 1722-'41, and the like, have all *certainly* been set aside by our Declaration in the Bill of Rights at the 16th section, and the 44th section of our Constitution declares the Bill of Rights to be a part of the Constitution, and that it "ought never to be violated under any pretence whatever." The duration of the power of the representatives, since the adoption of that Constitution, has been uniformly the same, and if the present representatives cannot grant the power *now*, it could never have been legally done. If A rents to B a piece of land for one year *only*, can B, by virtue of that lease, confer on C a life estate in the land; or a title better than the one *he* possessed? you know he cannot. Neither do I believe that your good sense, on a moment's reflection, will permit one of your worshipps to say, that you *legitimately* possess more power, or can hold the right to tax and appropriate for a longer time, than the Legislature: for if you as a Court possess any, you must have derived it from that source. The rill can never be greater than the fountain, unless aug-

mented by tributary streams, and there are none here. But mark the confusion and mischief, that may possibly arise from too hastily blending a legislative power in the Judiciary department. With us the whole body of the people are at once sovereign and subject, and all *laws and rules* tantamount to laws, should be enacted by the people or their representatives, and by them *alone*. To the people as subjects the law is a rule of conduct; to the people in a legislative capacity by their representatives, the Constitution alone is a rule of conduct; but the people in a sovereign and conventional capacity have no other rule of conduct but intelligence of head and charity of heart. *Public virtue* is the animating and sustaining principle of our institutions; and that is nothing but a perfect despotism, where the mere will of a few nobles, judges or justices, becomes the *law* of the land, and the people, their children, and their property exist only in subservience to their passions, caprices and crimes. The *constitutional* law, not the mere wish of men, ought to rule.

A VOTER.

FOR THE FREE PRESS.

The Vice Presidency—Mr. Van Buren—and the Tariff.

Mr. Editor: Having politely tendered the use of a part of your newspaper, for the discussion of the politics of the day, I avail myself of your liberality, and a few leisure moments, to express a few sentiments on the occasion, which I design to do as briefly as practicable.

The great and important subjects, which at present agitate the public mind in this section of the country, resolve themselves into the Vice Presidency, Mr. VAN BUREN and the Tariff; and truly Mr. Van Buren presents a formidable front, to his opponents, when flanked by the celebrated Baltimore Convention and the "accursed Tariff"—ominous harbingers of continued oppression to the farming interest of this country, and the Southern country in general—and for the better understanding of the subject of the Tariff and Mr. Van Buren's connection therewith, I would remind the friends of Southern rights, and Southern principles, that sometime in July, 1827, a Tariff meeting was gotten up in Albany, the seat of government of the State of New York, at which meeting, the Hon. Martin Van Buren delivered his sentiments in full, and advocated with "thundering eloquence" the protective system, in the following pathetic strain:

"Every American, whether his domicile was in the east or the west, in the north or the south, wished them (i. e. domestic manufactures) success, they were closely connected with the welfare and prosperity of the country." * * * "In regard to it (the question of protection) there is in this State, with the exception of the portion of the inhabitants of our chief city, and others of more limited extent, no diversity of opinion."

Mr. Van Buren then went on in a strain of eloquence, the impetuosity of which rivalled the cataract of Niagara, and contrasted "the flourishing cities and villages which crowded

the banks of the Hudson, from its source to its connection with the ocean," with the squalid appearance of the tax-ridden South, thereby boasting with loud and clamorous eloquence, of the glorious prosperity of his "empire State." Mr. Van Buren said: "If there be a citizen who doubted it, let him travel, let him pass through the Southern States." But it seems, that however squalid and unprosperous are the landscapes of Southern scenery, yet they have attractions, irresistible attractions, when the Great Magician wishes to ascend the steeple of his ambition. Let us hear what he had to say relative to the "wool growing interest," an interest in which he participated largely:—

"He had at present invested more than \$20,000 in sheep and farms, devoted and which he meant to devote, to that business."

To save the duty on his woolly investment, he gave his vote in the affirmative, on the proposition to advance the duties upon woollen goods. It is generally admitted that the most obnoxious and oppressive parts of the present abominable Tariff, "are the minimums established by it." In order to bring matters correctly to view, I will place some of his votes in their proper light, for the purpose of establishing the fact, that he is one of the principal authors of the Tariff, and consequently an enemy to the South. "On the question to agree to the fourth amendment in the following words," "Section 2, line 19, after 'yard' strike out the words 'there shall be levied, collected and paid twenty cents on every square yard' and insert, 'shall be deemed to have cost fifty cents the square yard, and be charged thereon a duty of forty per centum ad valorem until the thirtieth of June, 1829, and from that time, a duty of forty-five per centum ad valorem.'" This question being put to the Senate, was determined affirmatively—yeas 24, nays 22—Mr. Van Buren voting, according to custom, for the increase of duty. Several other questions of a similar character were proposed, on which Mr. Van Buren voted in the affirmative, thereby aiding to destroy the South by unexampled burthens, and causing the Tariff States to flourish, in all the pomp and pride of Asiatic magnificence. If Mr. Van Buren has ever contributed, by any act or vote, to the preservation and protection of the rights and interests of the people of the Southern States, I have been unable to ferret them out. We find him in opposition to the election of James Madison, a statesman distinguished for sound democratic principles, and voting for De Witt Clinton, with the undeniable view of making himself popular in the "empire State"—and when he became the ascendant, he had Mr. Clinton removed, by his satellites in the Legislature, as one of the Canal Commissioners; this act of intrigue and consummate imbecility, caused a re-action in Mr. Clinton's favor, and he was consequently restored to their confidence. So much for the Baltimore Convention candidate for the re-