

THE TARBORO' PRESS.

Whole No. 931.

Tarborough, Edgecombe County, N. C. Saturday, January 27, 1844.

Vol. XX. No. 4.

The Tarborough Press,

By GEORGE HOWARD, JR.

Is published weekly at Two Dollars per year, if paid in advance—or, Two Dollars and Fifty Cents at the expiration of the subscription year. Subscribers are at liberty to discontinue at any time on giving notice thereof and paying arrears. Advertisements not exceeding a square will be inserted at One Dollar the first insertion, and 25 cents for every continuance. Larger advertisements at that rate per square. Court Orders and Judicial Advertisements 25 per cent. higher. Advertisements must be marked the number of insertions required, or they will be continued until otherwise directed, and charged accordingly. Letters addressed to the Editor must be post paid, or they may not be attended to.

POETRY.

From the Raleigh Independent.

LINES

Written on the night of the 31st December 1843.

Another year has swiftly pass'd,
On noiseless pinion by;
Not like the rushing, wintry blast,
That rolls the billows high,
But like the fleecy cloud of morn
That fades away in air—
While gazing on its folds, 'tis gone,
And leaves no impress there;

Or like the silent dews of eve,
That fall on herb and flower,
But in the morning gently leave,
The grass plat and the hower;
And leave no mark or trace behind,
To tell they had been there,
But like the swift, catervailing—
'Tis gone—we know not where;

Or like the tear on childhood's cheek,
That danced a little while;
But ere the doating one could speak,
'Twas followed by a smile;
And on the loved one's downy face,
So sweetly bright and fair;
No mark was left by which to trace,
The tear drop had been there;

Or like the visions of the night,
That seep at opening day,
Like spectres flying from the light,
On lightning wing away;
And leave no picture on the mind,
Distinct in its outline;
But mixed with dreams of kindred kind,
Nought but the fragments shine;

Or like the gently ebbing wave,
That breaks upon the strand,—
Whose limpid waters softly lave,
The billow-beaten stand,—
Then mingle with the tide again,
And never rises more,
To rush across the stormy main,
And break upon the shore;

Or like the vapoury, gauze-like wreath,
That twines the mountain's brow,
On which the morning zephyrs breathe—
'Twas there—but is not now,
No vestige lingers round the rocks,
That crown the sunlit height;
The hoary, floating, airy locks,
Have vanished into light;

Thus like the cloud, the dew, the tear,
The vapoury wreath, the dream, the wave,
Has pass'd away another year,
And borne us downward to the grave!
How soon life's guided, fleeting dream,
Will be with us forever pass'd!
How like the little winding stream,
It finds the mighty sea at last!

Raleigh. NAMELESS.

POLITICAL.

THE DOCTRINE OF COUNTER RESTRICTIONS.

Amongst the advocates of the restrictive system, there are many who hold the opinion, that the principles of free trade are those upon which the policy of a state should be founded, provided, that all nations were to adopt them; but who think them to be erroneous, in the actual condition of the world; whilst so many countries have departed from them. This view of the subject, which has been widely propagated, has done more to strengthen the prohibitory party, than all their other arguments put together. Although we have examined this doctrine upon a former occasion, in our remarks upon Mr. Madison's letters, it is a subject of sufficient importance, to merit a repeated investigation, and we shall present therefore the reader with the following additional views.

Legislative protection, by high duties, imposed for the purpose of excluding foreign commodities in whole or in part, is never resorted to, except where a foreign article can be imported cheaper than a similar, or a kindred one, can be made at home. A protective law, therefore, is a law declaring, that the productive power of the nation shall be so applied, as to produce less of certain commodities, than it is capable of producing, if left to the exercise of its faculties in a state of perfect freedom. It is a law, in other words which declares, that it is better for a nation to have few commodities, than to have many—that it is better to buy dear than to buy cheap—or, what is the same thing, that it is better for individuals to procure the necessities of life by a more laborious, than by a less laborious process. For, if a bale of cotton be put into the hold of a ship, and be there converted, by the process called commerce, into 300 yards of cotton cloth, whilst a similar bale of cotton, put into a factory, can by the process called manufacture, be converted only into 200 yards, it is very clear, that those who advo-

cate the latter mode of production, consider that the commodity is much better off with two hundred yards of cloth, than with three hundred.

Now, in this view of the subject, there is something so absurd, that we doubt if a single individual in the land could be found to yield his assent to it, so revolting is it to the dictates of common sense; and yet, strange as it may appear, this is the doctrine upon which the famous "American system" is founded. All that is requisite to gain proselytes to the most silly and injurious schemes, seems to be to dress them up with patriotic and high sounding phrases, and then to connect them with the fortunes of some favorite. This is the course that has been pursued, in regard to the "American system," which has hence become, not so much a question of reason, as of party passion, and is therefore not so easily overthrown, as other erroneous projects, which can be combated by addressing the understandings of their advocates. If a farmer were to be asked, whether it was most for his interest to buy a coat for ten dollars of a manufacturer, or for five dollars of a merchant, he would have no hesitation in designating the latter; but when the same question is put to him upon a large scale, and when he is asked, whether it is most for the interest of the whole people to buy their coats dear, or to buy them cheap, he appears to be lost in the magnitude of the question. The terms "domestic industry," "the great American system," "patriotism," "paying foreign tribute," "dance before his eyes like so many phantoms; and he soberly answers, that the nation would gain, by enacting a law to compel people to give ten dollars for their coats, instead of five. Such, reader, is the true state of this case, and not only are such false views entertained by the great body of the farmers in the middle States, but even, and we are sorry to say it, by a great portion of our lawyers, physicians, scholars, and other influential citizens, who, for the want of a disposition to investigate a subject, which would require the study of a volume or two, suffer themselves to be deluded into a course, which is adverse to their individual interests, as it is to those of the nation.

The corn laws of Great Britain stand as one of the most prominent examples of legislative folly. By these laws, the importation of grain into Great Britain, for consumption, is burdened with duties so extravagant as to amount to a prohibition, except in times of great scarcity. The consequence is, that the population of Great Britain are compelled to pay dearer for their bread, than they would have to pay were the duty a moderate one, imposed merely for the purposes of revenue. That this is an evil to the population of Great Britain, is too palpable not to be seen by the uneducated mind. It is universally condemned by the people of the United States, not only as an inhuman measure, but also as an impolitic one; inasmuch as Great Britain, by refusing to purchase grain from foreign countries, deprives them to an equal extent of the means of purchasing her manufactures; and besides, if food were cheaper in Great Britain than it now is, her manufactures would be cheaper, and her command over the markets of the world, in the same proportion extended. But, however great the folly of other nations may be, we have no right to intermeddle with them. All that we have to do, is to profit by their experience, and their want of wisdom; and if we can perceive, that a restrictive law, which raises the price of bread, is injurious to the nation which enacts it, let us keep in mind, that one which raises the price of clothing, is also injurious. What is folly in Great Britain, would be folly if adopted by any other nation, and no less so if adopted by ourselves. The restrictive system in all its forms is an effort to diminish production, and consequently the comforts of the people; and that branch of it which has a tendency to multiply naked backs, is no better than the one which has a tendency to multiply empty stomachs.

But, say our restrictionists, if Great Britain will not buy our flour, it is for our interest not to buy her manufactures. If that be the case, then it is very certain that we will not buy them. We understand what is for our interest as well as other people. But, where laws are called in at the urgency of interested parties, to force people to leave off purchasing British manufactures, it excites at least a suspicion, that it is not for our interest to leave off. The interest of the American nation, as one family, is to buy manufactures of Great Britain, so long as she can supply them cheaper than we can make them, and is willing to take payment in any of our productions; and for precisely the same reason that it would be for the interest of Great Britain, to buy grain of foreign nations, if they would sell it cheaper than she could raise it, so long as they would take payment in any of her manufactures. Of late years, Great Britain has done no act, signifying that she will not take payment of us in products of some kind or other, for as many of her manufactures as we are willing to buy. It is true she exercises the right of choosing

the articles which suit her best. But this is precisely the same right which we ourselves exercise in our purchases from her. We should think it strange, if the owners of the coal mines in England, should represent it to parliament as a grievance, that the New Yorkers would buy no more of their coal, since they get supplies from the Schuylkill and Lehigh coal mines—or if the farmers of Ireland should wish to prohibit our flaxseed, because we will only take potatoes from them in times of great scarcity, as at this moment—or if the manufacturers of Scotland, should advocate the exclusion of American productions, because it suited our convenience to purchase chiefly of the manufacturers of Manchester and Birmingham. There is no doubt that the restrictive laws of each nation, limit the interchange of commodities which would take place did they not exist, and it is very clear, that it is not the policy of either to push them any further. As to the question of which was the first offender, it is not material to inquire. The legislative acts of neither, in the first instance, were intentionally hostile. Corn laws prohibiting the importation of foreign grain, under certain circumstances, have existed in Great Britain, for a great number of years. They were not levelled at us, but designed to extort money from the consumers of bread, in order to promote the interests of the landholders, and the tenants who had entered into long leases when grain was at a high price. We therefore, have no right to complain of the existence of those laws, any more than we have of the laws of Peru and Mexico, which shut out our flour and cotton fabrics from their markets. And we should certainly not act wisely, were we, in retaliation for their measures, to prohibit the importation of their specie, copper, cocoa, and other commodities, which they are willing to give us in exchange for others of our products.

From this view of the subject, it will be seen, that every step which is taken in a war of restriction, does equal injury to both parties, for every refusal to buy of foreign nations is an annihilation of the power to sell, precisely to the same amount. To suppose, then, that a nation can gain by a counter restriction, is altogether fallacious. The restrictive system is nothing but imitating the folly.—If nine nations out of ten, are silly enough to believe, that the fewer commodities they produce, the better, and in consequence of that belief, restrict the industry of their people, it would be for the interest of the remaining one to keep herself unshackled, and to buy of them all, as much as they would be willing to exchange for her productions. This truth is constantly displayed in the transactions of private life. If a farmer had nine neighbors, employed in various trades, who should take it into their heads to raise a considerable part of their own butter, eggs, poultry, vegetables, and fruit, but were still willing to buy of him grain to the full extent of what he was willing to buy of them, such as hats, shoes, and clothes, would it be for the interest of the farmer to become his own hatter, shoemaker, and tailor, and thereby cut off the only market which he had for his grain? Would it not be better for him, to continue to buy, so long as he could get more hats, shoes, and clothes, for his grain than he could make at home? If the time, indeed, should ever arrive, when the hatter, shoemaker, and tailor, would take nothing for their fabrics, which he could offer in payment, then his trade with them would cease of itself, without the necessity of any compulsory law. This case is precisely parallel to that of our relations with Great Britain.—She says to the United States, "I will take products from you to the extent of your purchases of my manufactures. I will, however, exercise the right of choosing amongst your assortment of articles, that which suits me best, in the same manner, that you exercise the right of buying from me the manufactures which suit you best." Now, in all this, there is nothing unfair. We certainly have no right to designate the articles which we shall take; and we would be very silly, if, because she will not buy from us products which she does not want, we should refuse to sell her those which she does want. And yet, this is what we have done. Our tariff laws are nothing more nor less, than declarations to England, that we will not sell her our cotton; for a nation which says "I will not buy," says at the same time, "I will not sell."—(RAGUET)

Mr. Clay's Popularity.

The Federalists appear to build their hopes of the election of Mr. Clay more upon their wishes than their real strength. They might perhaps learn a useful lesson, and probably avoid much mortification in future if they would cast off their prodigious magnifiers and look at things as they really are? What chance has Mr. Clay of being elected President in 1844? None, in our opinion. But we will examine how he has stood before the American people

heretofore; and see how they have estimated his character. That is the most practical way of arriving at just conclusions.

Mr. Clay has been a candidate for the Presidency for more than 20 years, either regular or irregular, and what has been the result. We will look back and see.

In 1824, Mr. Clay was a candidate for the Presidency, and had many ardent friends, particularly in the west. There were four candidates voted for by the people, and Mr. Clay was the lowest on the list, and was excluded from the House of Representatives, on which body the election devolved, there being no choice by the people.

In 1828, he was so identified with John Q. Adams, having bargained himself into the office of Secretary of State, that a condemnation of one was necessarily the condemnation of the other, and Adams and Clay were sent into retirement by the Democracy of the nation.

In 1832, Mr. Clay was again brought before the people by a national convention, as the anti-Jackson candidate, and received only 39 electoral votes out of 201! The popular vote against him was near a half million! Even the enemies of the Jackson administration, in New York, Pennsylvania and Vermont refusing to vote for him.

In 1836, notwithstanding great exertions were used, his friends could not get him fairly on the track owing to his known unpopularity; and he was passed by as unavailable by his party.

In 1840 he was not suffered to come on the track. The Harrisburg Convention which met in December, '39, did not consider him as available as old Tip, and they were certainly right.

In the spring of 1841, Mr. Clay was again brought forward as the Federal candidate for the Presidency in '44, by large and enthusiastic meetings throughout the country, and we need barely mention that the Federal party has scarcely gained a victory since?—Fifteen States that voted for Harrison in '40 have since given large Democratic majorities. Even in Kentucky, the "Banner State" of whiggery in the days of Harrison, there has been a drawn battle, the Democrats having elected half the Congressmen from that State.

Now, with these truths before him, will any one say that the friends of Mr. Clay do not predicate their hopes of success more upon their wishes than the actual strength of their candidate. We think such are the facts. We know that the federalists calculate largely on division in the Democratic ranks, but in this they are bound to be disappointed.—The number of the Democratic National Convention will receive the cordial support of the Democracy, and we conscientiously believe, he elected by an overwhelming majority. Mr. Clay has seen his best days, and his doctrines, are if possible, more unpopular now than they have ever been.—The days of humbuggery are passing by fast, and Mr. Clay and his odious doctrines will soon be forgotten by the American people, at least we hope so, and conclude that we have said enough on this subject at this time.

Hamilton (O.) Telegraph.

Celebration of the 8th Jan. at Apollo Hall, Washington City

We give below the letter received by the Committee of Invitation, from Gen. Andrew Jackson:

Hermitage, Dec 28, 1843.

Gentlemen: Your favor of the 19th, in behalf of the Democratic Senators and members of Congress, held in the hall of the House of Representatives on the evening of the 18th inst., inviting me to participate with them in the celebration of the victory of New Orleans, has been received.

I sincerely regret that the feeble state of my health will not allow me to be present with you on this occasion; but, though absent, I shall participate with you in the just remembrance of the patriotic exertions of my brave compatriots in arms, who repulsed the British force on the plains of New Orleans—a force amounting to three times their own number, and disciplined in the service of hard-fought battles on the continent of Europe. Methinks I now hear the glorious response to my order along the line, when this force, displaying ten thousand bayonets, commenced their attack upon us. I directed my aid-de-camp Major Reed, to pass along our lines, and say, that New Orleans must here be defended, and our wives and daughters shielded from pollution, or we must cheerfully fall in the ditch before us. This order was conveyed throughout the lines, and it was received with three cheers, which had not ceased to ring upon the ear when the battle began.

History records the result. It is due to the brave men who so nobly performed their duty, that they should be remembered at each anniversary of the day which they rendered so memorable. Such remembrance may keep bright for other times an example that will teach our posterity what to do in a similar case. May it forever keep alive that spirit of holy pa-

triotism which prefers death to the dismemberment of our Union, and regards every sacrifice as desirable which is made to repel foreign invasion!!

For the kind terms in which you have been pleased to recur to my services on that trying occasion, I beg you, gentlemen, to receive my thanks, and my best wishes for your welfare.

I am, very truly, your friend,

ANDREW JACKSON.

The reading of the letter from the old Chief of the Hermitage was received with three times three, given in a spirit of warmest enthusiasm.

The Rail Road War.—Mr. Francis E. Rives, of Petersburg, Va., ex-member of Congress, purchased a claim of \$26,000 against the Portsmouth Rail Road.—Unable to effect a satisfactory arrangement with the Rail Road company for the payment of the claim, Mr. Rives, with about a dozen white men and fifty negroes, proceeded to tear up that part of the Road which lies in North Carolina, and to destroy the bridge over the Roanoke. He had succeeded in tearing up about two miles of the Road, when a strong force, chiefly of volunteer mechanics, headed by Major Gwynn, President of the Road, arrived on the spot from Portsmouth, arrested Rives and his assistants, destroyed the cars belonging to the rival Petersburg Road with which Rives was carrying off the iron rails, and in an hour and three quarters had the road repaired, except the bridge.

Mr. Rives, in custody of the Sheriff of Northampton, went to Raleigh and applied to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court for a writ of *habeas corpus*. The case was argued before the Judges, who bound Mr. Rives, in the sum of \$3,000, to appear at Northampton Court.

It is said that the Petersburg company agreed to pay Mr. Rives his claim, if he would destroy the Portsmouth Road. This, however, Mr. R. denies. Strong feeling has been excited against the Petersburg, and in favor of the Portsmouth Road.

Washington Whig.

Flour.—The New York Express says: "By a statement made up with care and accuracy, it appears that the stock of flour in this market is three hundred and ninety one thousand barrels, and if all the scattering lots were collected, the sum total would reach four hundred thousand. At the closing of the fliver last year, the supply was one hundred and fifty thousand. Thus, it appears, that the excess this year is two hundred and fifty thousand barrels."

Cotton Speculations. The sales of cotton in the New York market during the past week were about 32,500 bales. The Express says:

"During the last two weeks the sales have been as large as the number of bales in market. Some lots have been sold eight times and have not been moved, and every seller has made a profit. Nearly the whole business has been on speculation."

The New Orleans Courier of 2d inst. says:

"We have heard it stated that the nephew or agent of the house of the Rothschild, now in this city, has orders to purchase all the cotton in our market. If this be true, as we have every reason to believe it is, so gigantic a speculation cannot fail of proving highly beneficial to the holders of that article."

The New-bornian speaks of New-born as the largest town in the State. This is a slight mistake. According to the Census of 1840, the population of Wilmington was 4,744, that of Newborn 3,690. The population of Wilmington at the present time is doubtless some hundreds over 5,000. By the same Census the population of Fayetteville was 4,285, of Raleigh 2,244.—Wilmington Chronicle.

Free Negroes.—A correspondent in Abbeville District furnishes us with the following striking proof of the happy and contented situation of our Slave population, when compared with that of the Free Negroes. The writer is a gentleman of high standing in society, and we have no hesitation in vouching for the correctness of his statements.

"Not long since I was informed by a respectable citizen of Georgia—who is one of the Executors of the Will of a deceased gentleman recently of that State—that the gentleman provided in his Will, that immediately after his death, the large number of Negroes he owned should be comfortably situated in the State of Ohio, which requisition my informant said, was fully complied with; and now that the Negroes have remained in Ohio about two years, all the while dissatisfied, they have applied to the Executors to send for them, stating their willingness to serve them the remainder of their life, averring that they had rather be Georgia Slaves, than Ohio Free Negroes. This statement may be relied upon as correct."—Greenville (S. C.) Mount.