

RALEIGH REGISTER

AND NORTH-CAROLINA GAZETTE.

"Ours are the plans of fair delightful peace, unwarped by party rage, to live like brothers."

THREE DOLLARS Per Annum }
ONE HALF IN ADVANCE }

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1836.

VOLUME XXXVII.
NUMBER 51.

THE REGISTER
IS PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY,
By Joseph Gales & Son.

TERMS.

THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM—ONE HALF IN ADVANCE
Those who do not, either at the time of subscribing or subsequently, give notice of their wish to have the Paper discontinued at the expiration of the year, will be presumed as desiring its continuance until countermanded.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Not exceeding sixteen lines, will be inserted three times for a Dollar; and twenty-five cents for each subsequent publication: those of greater length, in proportion. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out and charged accordingly.

Politics of the day.

A Circular Letter has just been issued to the voters of Caswell, on the subject of the approaching Presidential Election, by seven gentlemen of that County, who deserve the gratitude of their Whig brethren for the noble stand they have taken in defence of correct principles, under circumstances which would have prevented most men from fearlessly uttering the truth. Their names, which deserve to be remembered, are as follows: *Starling Gunn, John Kerr, Jun. John H. Graves, A. Gunn, Sen. William Lea, of Leasburg, James Burton and John P. Harrison.* We subjoin a portion of this Letter, which is as well adapted to any other meridian as Caswell:—

FELLOW-CITIZENS—In our free country it is the privilege of every man freely to adopt, express and act upon his own opinions. Indeed our institutions are founded upon the virtue, intelligence and independent spirit of the people. And when we cease to think and act for ourselves, and surrender our opinions into the keeping of any man or set of men, we cease to be free, and render our condition no better than that of the subjects of the most absolute monarchy in Europe. Influenced by these reflections, the undersigned, a few of the citizens of Caswell, exercising the same right that belongs to any and to every other freeman, have determined to offer to their fellow-citizens a few plain suggestions upon the subject of the approaching Presidential election, than which one of more importance has not occurred since the foundation of our national government. We design in this address to confine ourselves simply to a statement of facts, the truth of which no man of whatever political party can or will deny.

The candidates between whom the people of the South will have to make an election, are Martin Van Buren of New York, and Hugh L. White of Tennessee. For the Vice-Presidency, Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky, is placed upon the Van Buren, and John Tyler of Virginia, upon the White Ticket. Now, fellow-citizens, let us look to the men—candidates consider their pretensions, and decide which has the higher claim to our support. Martin Van Buren is a citizen of New York—a State whose institutions differ materially from those of our own—where domestic slavery is not permitted to exist, and where there are to be found more of those miserable and misguided fanatics called *Abolitionists*, than in any other State in the Union. New York has always occupied a Federal stand in relation to all the great political questions which at different times have agitated our country; and it is a fact attested by the most authentic history, that there were more *Tories* in New York at the period of the Revolutionary war, than in any other division of the confederacy. Her late illustrious Governor, De Witt Clinton, was an eminent Federalist, and was actually the Federal candidate for the Presidency in 1812 against James Madison, and he was then strongly supported by this same Martin Van Buren, as Mr. Van Buren's most zealous friends are bound to admit. Nor is this all. The late Rufus King, who, upon the death of Alexander Hamilton, became the acknowledged head and leader of the Federal party, was in 1820 a Senator in Congress from the State of New York, and was supported for that distinguished station by Mr. Van Buren; and was moreover instructed by the Legislature of New York (Martin Van Buren voting for the instructions) to oppose the admission of Missouri into the Union, unless that State would prohibit the existence of slavery within its territory. This is a fact which every man South of the Potomac ought to be informed of, that the Southern people may beware of the man whose opinions are fraught with so much danger to their best and highest interests. Suppose a man were to offer for the Legislature in the county of Caswell, who held opinions adverse to the existence of slavery in the State, would you vote for him? We think not. Will you then vote for a man, entertaining such opinions who aspires to an office the highest that your country can confer, and the attainment of which bestows a power, for good or for evil, tenfold greater than a mere seat in your State Legislature? The people of the

South think that the States ought to be permitted to exercise their own discretion upon the subject of slavery, and they will not tolerate the idea of an interference in the slightest degree with this question on the part of Congress or the General Government, either as it regards the States themselves, or the territories, or the district of Columbia. Yet Mr. Van Buren entertains contrary opinions, and has actually said in a letter which he wrote a short time since to a committee of gentlemen in North-Carolina, "that from the lights now before him, he would not feel himself safe in pronouncing that Congress does not possess the power of interfering with or abolishing slavery in the district of Columbia?" Here then is an explicit avowal that Congress has the power to abolish slavery in the district of Columbia at least; and if it has in the district of Columbia, then it is easily shown that it may likewise exercise the same power any and every where else in the United States. A single argument will prove this. The Constitution of the United States does not give to Congress any such power; if therefore it possesses it, then it has been derived from some other source than the Constitution. Certainly there is no other source from which it could be derived, so far as respects the States and Territories. But it is argued by Mr. Van Buren and others, that Congress derives the power to abolish slavery in the district of Columbia, not from the Constitution of the United States, but from the Articles of Cession, by which Virginia and Maryland ceded the District to the General Government. If these articles be examined, it will be seen that they give to Congress the same power and authority over the district of Columbia which Virginia and Maryland themselves possessed before the transfer was made. Now Virginia and Maryland had no power to abolish slavery within their respective territories, and consequently could not convey any such to Congress. The Constitutions of these States only authorize the Legislatures to take the property of the people for public uses, and require that an equivalent shall be given even in those cases. Slaves are as much the property of their owners as are horses and cows—they therefore cannot be taken against the consent of their owners, except for public uses and for valuable consideration. To set them free and make them their own masters, would not be taking them for public use—very far from it. It would only be taking them from their masters and giving them to themselves, which is the same thing (so far as the right and interest of the owners are concerned) as taking them from one man in Caswell and giving them to his neighbor. Yet Mr. Van Buren says Congress has this power. Do you say so, fellow-citizens? Or will you support a man who does say so? If you do, then will you vote for one who, if elected, will put in jeopardy that species of property which is of chief value to the Southern farmer and planter.

What say you ought to be done with that portion of the people's money which has accumulated in the National Treasury, and for which the Government has no manner of use? Do you not think it ought to be given back to the people from whom it was obtained, to be used by them for the education of the poor children of the country, and to lessen the amount of taxes which we have to pay? A large surplus of money, amounting at present to about *Forty Millions* of Dollars and still increasing, is now in the Treasury of the United States lying perfectly idle—diffusing no benefit to the people, but rather serving to corrupt those agents whom they have appointed to direct the operations of the Government. From whose pockets, we ask, was this money drawn? From the people's. To whom then ought it to be returned when it is perceived there is no use for it? Why, surely to those from whom it was taken. Mr. Van Buren says, if he is elected President, this sheer act of justice to the honest people of the country shall not take place. Here are his own words upon the subject; read them for yourselves; they are here extracted from a letter which he has lately written to a member of Congress from the State of Kentucky: "It is my firm conviction," says he, "that any system by which a distribution is made among the States, of the monies collected by the Federal Government, would introduce vices into the legislation of both governments productive of the most injurious effects as well upon the best interests of the country as upon the perpetuity of our political institutions." Speaking of the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands (according to federal population) which constitutes a very large portion of the surplus revenue of the government—indeed, which constitutes of itself a fund of immense and increasing amount, Mr. Van Buren in the same letter thus expresses himself: "I am of opinion that the avails of the public lands will be more equitably and faithfully applied to the common benefit of the United States, by their continued application to the general wants of the Treasury, than by any other mode that has yet been suggested; and that such an appropriation is in every respect prefer-

able to the distribution thereof among the States in the manner your question proposes. Entertaining these views, I cannot give you any encouragement that I will, in the event of my election to the Presidency, favor that policy." Now Mr. Van Buren says that the proceeds of the public lands will be more equitably and faithfully applied to the common benefit by their continued application to the general wants of the Treasury. How can this be the fact, when, exclusive of the proceeds of the public lands, there is in the treasury already a large surplus revenue? Or in other words, more money than there is any use for. What general wants can the Treasury have, to require the money arising from the sales of public land, when that same Treasury cannot find a use for all of the money which it derives from other sources. The truth is—if Mr. Van Buren had told us that he was opposed to the distribution of the surplus revenue because he wanted the money to remain in the Treasury, not to be applied to its general wants—but to be used for partizan electioneering purposes, then would he have spoken his real views. Gen. Jackson, whom you all so much admire, recommended the distribution of the surplus revenue among the States in his Message to Congress in 1829. But notwithstanding all these things, we are yet told that Mr. Van Buren is the *Democratic Republican* candidate, and has been nominated regularly, and therefore we must vote for him. That he has been nominated by a self-constituted Caucus or Convention, we readily admit. But that he is either a Democrat or Republican, remains yet to be determined. That he was at one time a decided Federalist, his voting for De Witt Clinton in opposition to Madison most clearly proves. What he may be now, however, God only knows. For, like the weathercock, he has been found always to turn with the changes of the wind. He was no democrat, certainly, when he sat in the Convention, which was called to revise the Constitution of New York, in 1821. For upon a motion to extend the right of suffrage, submitted by Gen. Root, Mr. Van Buren held the following language: "I cannot consent to undervalue this precious privilege (of voting) so far as to confer it with an indiscriminate hand upon every one." This, then is Mr. Van Buren's Democracy—it is on a par with his Religion; as the latter is indicated in his celebrated letter to the Pope of Rome, which was written, as we firmly believe, for the purpose of inducing the Pope to use his boundless influence over the Catholic church in this country, to make them vote for Martin Van Buren when he should become a candidate for the high office to which he now aspires.

Executive Interference.

The Whig Central Committee of Virginia have just issued a second Address to the People of that State, which is replete with sound reflections and cogent argument. The impropriety attendant on bringing "the patronage of the Government, into contact with the freedom of Elections," is thus forcibly set forth:—

"It was the duty of the President to observe the most cautious neutrality in respect to who should be his successor. That was the course of the illustrious men who preceded him. Mr. Jefferson, to whom he has been compared, but with what propriety let the contrast in this instance, among many others, answer, declared that he suffered "no one to converse with him on the subject." So far from avowing his predilections to the Public, he was careful to conceal his opinions even from the candidates, and maintained undisturbed his friendship for each. Yet Mr. Jefferson was not a man to behold a Presidential election with indifference, or to suffer it to pass away without decided opinions. No one knew better to whom the important trust could be confided with the greatest safety, for he knew thoroughly, and with accuracy, the qualifications of the candidates; and none could be more solicitous that a wise and just selection should be made. But, respecting the delicacy of his position, the deference which he owed to the Public, and sensible of the great mischiefs which would result from the opposite example, he withheld his opinions, and left his countrymen to decide the election among themselves, free from the suspicion of official interference. How different and unbecoming his high station is the course of Gen. Jackson. It was to have been expected that respect for the memory of his predecessors would have restrained a departure from their example, when there was no motive for it but the gratification of his own private, personal wishes and inclination. If there be those who questioned the force of that consideration upon one whom nature and indulgence had made wilful and impatient, there were yet grounds for believing he would avoid the mischievous error. In his Inaugural Address, it was remembered, he had solemnly pledged himself, in the hearing of the whole nation, that the patronage of the Government should not be brought in contact with the freedom of

elections. But neither the examples set in much wisdom by the founders of the Republic, his own solemn declarations to the contrary, nor the evils of the step, have prevented his mingling in the election with his characteristic freedom and boldness. It cannot be denied that the President has openly and boldly attempted to lead and control public opinion. As early as the spring of '34 he declared himself in favor of a National Convention, and, not satisfied with that, he had the indelicacy to indicate the *nominee* of the Convention. Nor was this all. In order to arrest the expression of popular feeling, which it was apprehended might forestall the proceedings of the Convention, he remonstrated against the nomination of Judge White by the People of Tennessee; and such was the intemperance of his zeal, that those who opposed his will incurred his displeasure. Trace him onwards, and it will be found, as the day of election approaches, his interference is more unequivocal and offensive. Having designated his successor, he has refrained from no efforts which were likely to secure the triumph of the favorite. The open avowal of his preference, the expression of that preference by letter, which his correspondent publishes, the circulation under his frank of newspapers teeming with vituperation against an independent and faithful public agent, whose only offence was that he consented to be placed by the People in opposition to the official candidate—the denunciation of those who resist, and the admission to favor of those who acquiesce in his choice, display the bigoted attachment of the President, and with what energy he is employed in accomplishing his end.

Our object is not to assail the President, or to invoke against him your resentment; his course is nearly finished; and too soon for his own peace is he destined to experience how sadly he has been betrayed to the injury of his own fame. But, while we would indulge in no unnecessary acrimony against him, we cannot express too strongly the impression which we have of the dread consequences which must ensue if the attempt at dictation be not met by indignant and overwhelming resistance. The day has been when an argument against the intrusion of official interference would have been regarded as an idle, if not an impertinent warning. The bare suspicion of official intermeddling would have aroused a spirit of bold and determined defiance; and signal would have been the retribution which awaited the offender found guilty of such disloyalty to the Government, and insolence to the People. Sad, indeed, and ominous of ill, is the change which has come over the People, if they fail to detect the attempt at dictation, under whatever insidious disguise it may assume, and repel the faintest approach to it.

The exact neutrality and inflexible reserve of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, was the result, not of apathy and unconcern, but of comprehensive and patriotic views of their duty to the public. It was a voluntary restraint, submitted to from conviction that the officers of Government, and especially the first functionary, could not mingle in the election without invading the elective franchise, and that the practice was vicious, and would inevitably lead to venality and corruption. Here what Mr. Jefferson said: "The elective principle becomes nothing, if it may be smothered by the enormous patronage of the General Government." If the propriety of their course rested alone on the authority of their names, we humbly trust that the People would not submit to an innovation upon it. But it is apparent, on the least consideration, that nothing short of the most exact neutrality is consistent with the freedom of elections and the purity of the Government.

It is not possible for the President to engage in the contest without implicating his high office, and bringing the authority of that to bear upon the issue. He cannot, if he would, confine his voice within the limits which circumscribe that of the citizen. He is a man of authority—by the exercise of his prerogative, he may reduce to obscurity and curtail the income of official dependents, and advance to consequence and emolument those who attract his notice and obtain his favor. The declaration of his preference is the signal for coalition among the office-holders, and of all those anxiety is to be found on the strong side, and to be admitted to the rewards of active and conspicuous retainers. The Executive patronage devoted to the cause of the Executive favorite, the cause of the favorite becomes connected with questions of State, and nothing is decided without reference to its bearings on the election. There grows up a party, formidable for numbers, and yet more formidable for discipline, eager for success, expert at all the arts by which advantage may be won, that aims at power with an exclusive view to selfish and factious ends. It will call itself by any name which may best serve to allay and divert popular suspicion, democratic, republican, Jeffersonian, or by them all at once; but by whatever name it is called, it is a

party whose plans will reach their consummation in nothing short of the absolute overthrow of popular right, and the accession of Executive supremacy.

Again, the President cannot be permitted to nominate his successor, but at the expense of the independence and virtue of public men. Add that to the already colossal power of the office, and his influence in the Halls of Congress becomes irresistible. It would be idle to think of resisting his name in the election of Representatives, when his nomination could elevate his favorite to the Chief Magistracy. The functionaries of Government are transformed into courtiers and sycophants, when the President's friendly offices are a passport to popular approbation. We have witnessed the bitter fruits of this new and formidable influence, but the system is yet in its infancy, and the evils we have seen are but a prelude to the ruin which must follow, if the People in their offended majesty, do not crush and annihilate it."

Mr. SENATOR EWING, of Ohio.

We copy with pleasure from an Ohio paper the subjoined letter from THOMAS EWING, honorable by courtesy, but twice honorable by nature, if we had no other evidence than this letter to prove it. We know no better illustration of the combined manliness, energy, and intellectual vigor of the Great West, than is embodied in the person and mind of the writer of this letter; and, after reading it, we can conscientiously say that we believe no man ever better understood himself than Mr. EWING does. He stands in the first rank of what the miserable demagogues of the day call "the aristocracy" of the country: that is to say, he is a true Whig, and a friend to the Constitution and Laws of his country.—*Nat. Intel.*

LANCASTER, Oct. 3, 1836.

Gentlemen: I received your favor of the 27th ult. inviting me, in behalf of the working men of Cincinnati, to attend and address a meeting to be held by them on the 8th inst.

I would accept the invitation with pleasure if my other engagements would permit it, but unfortunately they do not. I must, therefore, deny myself the gratification which I should feel in meeting with so many of my fellow-citizens, and joining with them in the discussion of subjects important to the character of our State, and to the pure republican institutions of our country. I should be more gratified to be with them, as I am assured they are, what they profess to be, real WORKING MEN—a portion of the hard-handed and sound-hearted yeomen and mechanics of our country; men, on whose intelligence, integrity, and patriotism, our republican Constitution must rest as the surest and strongest pillar which sustains and supports it."

You have been kind enough, in the letter which you wrote in their behalf, to speak in terms grateful to my feelings of the taunts and sneers which have been cast out against me for having once been a working man, and having labored with my own hands for my support and advancement. Many false things have been said and written of me, but this is not one of them. This is true. I admit the charge to the full extent. And if the working man be unworthy to rise to the elevated stations in our Republic, then I am unworthy. If wealthy parentage, tender nurture, and youth spent in ease, in indulgence, or luxury, be essential to qualify a man for office in a Republic, then am I not qualified, for I have had none of those advantages. My father was poor, and lived a life of hardship and privation. When young he was a subaltern officer of the Revolution, and shared the fortune of many of the ardent youth of that day, who devoted themselves to the same glorious cause. At the close of the war he was cast upon the world without property, or the habit or the means of acquiring it. He left his native State, and sought a home in the frontier settlements, in the then "Far West," where I was born, in a very humble shed, and reared, not, surely, in the lap of luxury. With my mental and physical powers as my only inheritance, I was brought up a working man, or, rather, a working boy—among the People, and truly one of them—and I have no regret that my lot was so cast. I have seen, and known, and felt, how much of manly sense, shrewdness of observation, sterling worth, and generous feeling, are concealed beneath the rough exterior of the plain working men of our country. I know them well, for I have been an inmate of their homes, a guest at their tables, and one amid the social circle around their firesides; and I look back to those scenes, not only with pleasure, but with pride.—I am proud to feel that I carry with me something of the true character and spirit of the American working man. I was early imbued with manhood, and I trust I shall retain it to the latest period of my life. And if to these characteristics, which I claim with them as our common heritage—if to their sound good sense, just good moral feeling, patriotic devotion and firmness in support of the right, I have been able to add that knowledge

which is the fruit of long and laborious study—that facility for business which springs from habit—something of literary taste, and a talent for public speaking, which enables me to bring the powers of my mind and my stores of knowledge into use, then I claim that, even without the advantage of high birth or early fortune, I am fit to stand forth in the presence of the nation as the true representative of the People of my State.

In the elevated station to which their partiality has called me, I have still been a working man. I have not wasted my time in idleness, nor my energies in the haunts of dissipation; but have devoted myself fully and entirely to my official duties—the service of my State and of the Union. I am now assailed with a virulence heretofore unknown in the annals of our political warfare: those who have fixed their eyes on the revenues of the General Post Office, the Public Treasury, and the Public Lands, and marked them as their plunder and their spoils, now rage with fury against me. I am not surprised at it. I stand in their path, and they have been so long kept back from the tempting bait, that they are now hungry and fierce for their prey. If I had been dull and inefficient—if I had slept upon my post—or, especially, if I had connived at the villainy which I saw practised, I might have been permitted to pass without reproach, and probably received as a favourite by those who now assail me.

But I did not, for my very nature forbade it—I did not calculate chances, or weigh the advantages, which one course of conduct would bring, or the dangers to which another would expose me. A sentinel on the watch-tower, I had no choice but to give warning of danger when I saw it approaching. Placed in the breach, I must defend my post, until the People could rally and come to my rescue. And whether I now be sustained by their cheering voices, or be borne down by the multitude, and the malice of my enemies, I regret nothing of my course, and shall never wish that I had changed it. One of its consequences only I look to with anxiety and pain—it is, that many good men, all deceived by the base falsehoods which have for years been invented and circulated against me; withheld from me that approbation to which I feel I am entitled at their hands, and which I know they would extend to me, if they could be undeceived as to my political course.

Be kind enough to communicate my sentiments to the meeting, and believe me, with great respect, your obedient servant,
T. EWING.

The following contains a statement of the most horrid, deliberate murder which we have heard of in modern times. It may be relied on as authentic.—*Knoxville Reg.*

TAZEWELL, (TENN.) SEPT. 24, 1836.

SIR: A murder was committed in Claiborne county, near this place, on the road leading to Kentucky, last week, in self-defence, under the following circumstances: William Hurst shot Thomas J. Berry, who expired in a short time after. The parties were brothers-in-law; bad feelings had existed between them; the deceased had occupied the house where Hurst now lives; had removed to the Crab Orchard, in Kentucky, with his family; returned a few days back to this neighborhood, as stated, with a view to have satisfaction. On the day of the fatal deed, Berry (whose father lives in this neighborhood) borrowed a gun of one of his brothers, walked past Hurst's house several times, and stopped out of sight. Hurst's eldest son discovered him, and hallooed to his father that Berry intended mischief. Berry then came in sight, and walked towards Hurst and his wife, both then standing in the road. On hearing, Berry levelled his rifle. Hurst got behind his wife, and used her as a shield. Berry still dodging to get an aim or sight to shoot Hurst. In the mean time, Hurst sent his son to borrow a rifle. This Indian struggle lasted fifteen or twenty minutes, the contending parties being some three feet apart. Berry, finding he could not get a shot at Hurst, without probably hitting his wife, which he did not want to do, took the rifle in one hand, and drew his butcher-knife with the other. In the act of doing so, Hurst's son handed his father a loaded rifle, who instantly shot Berry thro' the body mortally. Berry also fired, but missed, the ball grazing the side of Mrs. Hurst's head. The two rifles cracked within a second of each other, Hurst firing first. After being struck, Berry made an effort to reload, in a few minutes took off his shot-pouch, laid his rifle against the fence, and soon fell and expired. After falling, water was handed to him; he spoke a few words—that he had come to kill Hurst, but Hurst had killed him. Hurst asked his forgiveness, and Berry gave him his hand in token, and, in doing so, expired. Hurst gave himself up, was tried by a called court next day, and acquitted.

Berry has left a widow and small family in Kentucky.

I have thought proper to give this brief statement of the case, to prevent false rumors, &c.

Respectfully yours.