

The Oxford Mercury

AND DISTRICT TELEGRAPH.

BY JOHN CAMERON.

OXFORD, N. C., FRIDAY MORNING, APRIL 19, 1844.

VOL. II—NO. XXIII.

THE MERCURY

Will be issued every Friday at THREE DOLLARS per Annum, payable in advance.
Persons forwarding five subscribers, with the amount for said subscriptions, shall receive a copy of our paper gratis.
Advertisements.—One dollar for every 14 lines, and 25 cents for each succeeding insertion.
Court orders and judicial advertisements will be charged 25 per cent higher.
A liberal deduction will be made in favour of advertisers by the year.
All letters to the Editor must come free of Postage to insure attention.

District Whig Meetings.

WHIG MEETING IN HENDERSON.

HENDERSON, April 6, 1844.
A meeting of the whigs of Henderson District, agreeably to notice was called this day. On motion, Capt. D. E. Young was called to the Chair and V. Winfree appointed Secretary.
The object of the meeting having been briefly stated by Willis Harris, Esq., on motion, it was

Resolved, That this meeting now proceed to appoint ten delegates to attend the Convention of delegates from all the districts composing the county to be held in the town of Oxford on the 20th of this month.

Whereupon the following gentlemen were appointed, viz: John L. Henderson, S. S. Rorster, V. Winfree, H. H. Rowland, James Cox, P. E. A. Jones, John B. Debnam, S. B. Woods, J. P. Trewallis and George J. Rowland.
On motion the meeting then adjourned.
D. E. YOUNG, Chair'n.
V. WINFREE, Sec'y.

NUTBUSH DISTRICT.

At a meeting of the Whigs of Nutbush in Williamsborough on the 5th of April 1844: On motion, John Hargrove was appointed Chairman and O. F. Manson Secretary.

The Chairman explained the object of the meeting to be, for the purpose of nominating persons to represent this District in a Convention to be held in Oxford, the object of which will be to nominate candidates for the next Legislature, when on motion the following gentlemen were appointed by the Chairman for that purpose:

James H. Taylor, Jas. W. Eaton, William F. Hargrove, John Read, Dr. H. J. Robards, Charles R. Eaton, J. W. Hargrove, S. W. Smith, Henry Fowler, O. F. Manson.

On motion, the Chairman was added to the list of Delegates.

On motion the proceedings of the meeting were ordered to be published in the Mercury. On motion the meeting adjourned.

JOHN HARGROVE, Chair'n.
O. F. MANSON, Sec'y.

CAK HILL, N. C. April 8, 1844.

Mr. Editor: In pursuance of a resolution passed at Oxford on the 5th ultimo, the whigs of Golden District met on Saturday last at the Store of Messrs. Wm. H. Webb & Co. and on motion of Wm. Webb, Capt. James M. Overb. was called to the Chair and Wm. A. Philpott appointed Secretary.

Mr. Webb explained the object of the meeting, and on his motion, the Chair appointed eight delegates to meet in Convention with delegates from the different districts in the county in Oxford on the 20th inst.

The Chair then appointed W. A. Philpott, Peterson Thorp, Esq., P. Thorp, Jr., James H. Young, Howell L. Wilkins, Wm. H. Webb, J. Y. Sandford and Hugh Woodruff, and on motion the Chairman was added to the number.

JAS. M. OVERY, Chair'n.
Wm. A. PHILPOTT, Sec'y.

BEAVER DAM DISTRICT.

On Saturday the 6th instant agreeably to previous notice, a meeting of the Democratic Whigs of Beaver Dam was held at James Hicks'—when on motion, Wm. Bailey was called to the Chair and A. B. Grissom appointed Secretary.

The object of the meeting being explained by Col. Turner Laurence, the following delegates were unanimously appointed to attend the Whig County Convention to be held in Oxford on the 20th instant:

William Bailey, A. Laurence, A. B. Grissom, J. E. Whitfield, James Hicks, F. J. Carter, A. Bridges, John W. Whitfield, James Hoday, John Fleming, Turner Laurence, and Burnace Walker.

WM. BAILEY, Chair'n.
A. B. GRISSOM, Sec'y.

The amount of outstanding Treasury Notes on the 1st of April, is \$3,131,363.36.

From the Richmond Whig.

THE FAIR PROPOSITION.—No. 6. THE BANK QUESTION. CONTINUED.

As most of our readers are Virginians, we take it for granted that they will pardon, if they do not thank us, for extending the analysis of the vote on the Bank of 1816, which we commenced in our last number, so as to embrace a full view of the position of the 'Old Dominion' on that interesting occasion. This task we now propose to perform.

In 1816, the number of the Representatives of Virginia in congress was twenty-two—of these, we believe, nineteen were Republicans, and three were Federalists, viz: Gen'l James Breckinridge of Botetourt, Joseph Lewis of Loudoun, and Daniel Sheffey of Wythe. If there was any other Federalist, we are unapprised of the fact, but will promptly make the correction, if satisfied we are in error.

Let us now recur to the Journal of 1816, p. 489 and see how the vote of Virginia stood on the passage of the Bank bill. The following is the result:

Ayes 8.	Noes 10.
Th. Ghoulson,	P. P. Barbour,
A. Hawes,	B. Bassett,
J. P. Hungerford,	J. Breckinridge,
John G. Jackson,	J. Clopton,
J. Kerr,	P. Goodwyn,
Wm. McKoy,	J. Johnson,
Ballard Smith,	J. Lewis,
H. St. Geo. Tucker,	T. Newton,
	J. Randolph,
	D. Sheffey.

Four members were absent, viz: Hugh Nelson, James Pleasants, Magnus Tate, and William H. Roane.

But we are not without official evidence of the opinions of the absent members. After the bill had been passed by the House of Representatives, it was sent to the Senate, where it was amended, and returned to the House. This placed the bill again in the exclusive possession of the House, and gave it entire control over its fate.

On the 5th of April, 1816, John Randolph moved the indefinite postponement of the bill and the amendments of the Senate. [See Journal, p. 593.] This motion gave rise to much debate, and the vote being taken, passed in the negative, ayes 67, noes 91. Before this was taken, the four absent members from Virginia had returned to their seats, and three of the four, viz: James Pleasants, Magnus Tate, and Hugh Nelson voted against the indefinite postponement; or, in other words, in favor of the Bank, and only one, Wm. H. Roane, for the motion. To classify them correctly, we must make the following additions to the ayes and noes as given above:

Ayes 3.	Noes 1.
James Pleasants,	Wm. A. Roane.
Magnus Tate,	
Hugh Nelson,	

With these corrections, the Virginia delegation would be found to have been equally divided, or eleven FOR, and eleven AGAINST the Bank.

But there is one most striking fact connected with this vote, which we cannot pass over in silence.—It is that every Federalist in the Virginia delegation voted against the Bank whilst every Virginian who voted for it was a republican!

Does not this single fact speak volumes? Was it not known to our neighbor of the Enquirer during the whole time he was denouncing the Bank as an ultra federal measure? Why has it then been withheld from the patrons of the Enquirer? Will he now give it to them? Will he now let his readers have an opportunity of seeing these historical facts? Will he now accede to our 'Fair proposition?' If he does not, we insist that he shall reverse the motto which now flies at his mast head so as to make it read 'FEAR WITHOUT TRUTH,' instead of 'TRUTH WITHOUT FEAR.'

But if we turn to the Journals of the senate, what do we see? We there find the names of ARMISTEAD T. MASON and JAMES BARBOUR, the two distinguished senators of Virginia recorded in favor of the Bank! (See Doct. Hist. b. 5, p. 700.) This was the vote which led us the other day into the immaterial error of saying that Mr. Madison voted for the Bank of 1816. It should have been the Bank of 1816.

This then was the attitude of Virginia in regard to the Bank of 1816. Can any one doubt after examining these facts, that the Old Dominion favored that institution? Where were her instructions to her senators, if she was against it? Where were her indignant remonstrances against the flagrant violation of the constitution? Where her earnest and stirring appeals to her sister states to join in resisting the gross outrage on the rights of the states? And, we may add, where was the shrill clarion of the

Enquirer sounding 'To Arms, 'To Arms?'

—All was as silent as the grave! Is this the way Virginia met the encroachments of federal power? Let it not be said this proposition was suddenly sprung on the country, and there was no time to demonstrate! It had occupied the deliberations of congress during the sessions of 1814 and '15, and it was again introduced by President Madison, to the attention of the national legislature in his message at the commencement of the session of 1816. The country was fully apprised of all these movements. The Virginia Legislature commenced its session on the day that congress assembled. It was in session when the subject was first noticed and referred—when Mr. Calhoun introduced the bill on the 8th January 1816 during the greater part, if not all the time it was under discussion—and yet not a whisper of disapprobation was heard, nor a hand raised by way of opposition! The opponents of the Bank are reduced to this dilemma—they must admit that Virginia, following the lead of her illustrious Madison, had 'waived' her constitutional scruples about the Bank—or that the legislature was grossly derelict in regard to its highest duties! They may take which horn they please!

We would advert to one or two other facts connected with the course of Virginia which go strongly to fortify the opinion that she was at least not opposed to the Bank of 1816. In December 1819 a vacancy occurred in the senate of the United States by the resignation of John W. Eppey; and with a full knowledge of James Pleasants' votes in favor of the Bank, but three years before, Virginia elected him to fill the vacancy! If the legislature of Virginia had deemed Mr. Pleasants guilty of a violation of the constitution, or believed that he held political principles incompatible with those of Virginia, would they have rewarded him for his delinquency, by choosing him to fill the most dignified and responsible office in their power to bestow?

But again—for whom did Virginia cast her Electoral vote for the Presidency in 1824? Who was the favorite of the Enquirer in that election? WM. H. CRAWFORD—Crawford! the Ajax Telamon of the Bank cause! The man who never wavered for a moment in his support of that institution! Who was FOR THE BANK from the commencement to the close of his political career! The man who made the ablest speech ever made, in its behalf, and whose name rested upon his support of that measure, as upon a solid rock! This was the man Virginia voted for, and the Enquirer supported! It was marvellously proper to support a Bank man then! but it is a damning sin to do so now! Then it was perfectly consistent with the most straight-laced Republicanism, to go for a Bank man dyed in the wool! But let a candidate for the Presidency now be even suspected of a leaning towards a bank, and straightway the editor of the Enquirer turns up his nose, as if the whole political atmosphere were tainted in an incontinent stench of Federalism!

'Oh! but the Bank, was then chartered! Why make a fuss about a thing that was done, and could not be undone?' say the apologists of the Enquirer and its clique. Very true. The Bank was incorporated. But suppose Crawford had been elected, and had served out his eight years from 4th March, 1825, his official term would have extended to 1833, or one year later than the date of Jackson's veto of the Bank! Thus it follows, that if Virginia and the Richmond Enquirer had been gratified, by electing Mr. Crawford, we should have had a Bank man in office in 1832, instead of General Jackson! And as a necessary consequence of that state of things, the Bank would not have been vetoed, but would, at this moment, have been in operation! Yes, the defeat of the Enquirer's candidate lost us the Bank! If he had been elected, he would have signed the bill, and saved the country from all the evils which followed its overthrow!

Are we right in saying that Mr. Crawford was a Bank man in 1824, when he was, in the eyes of Mr. Ritchie, the very impersonation of Republicanism?—his letter to Mr. Ingersoll in 1831, he says:

"The opinion which I formed of the Bank of the U. States when I was a member of the Senate, was the result of a careful examination of the Constitution of the United States, made without any pre-conceived opinions. That opinion is recorded in two speeches which I made in the Senate in 1811. Since that time I have had no occasion of reviewing the question. My opinion remains unaltered."

"I was Secretary of the Treasury more than eight years, and during that time I had ample evidence of the great utility of a Bank of the U. S., in managing the fiscal

concerns of the Union. I am persuaded that no man, whatever his pre-conceived opinion may be, can preside over the treasury a year, without being deeply impressed with the expediency of the United States Bank in conducting the finances of the Union.

"The provision of the constitution, which gives congress the power to pass all laws, which may be necessary and proper to carry into effect the enumerated powers, gives congress the right to pass the Bank bill, unless a law most proper to carry into effect the power to collect and distribute the revenues should be excluded by that provision." Let us not omit, in this place, one other fact. This same William H. Crawford, was the special favorite of Martin Van Buren, who supported him for the Presidency, might and main! And it is not strange that a man who is so uncompromisingly hostile to a Bank, should be so zealous in his support of the great champion of the Bank? And that too, at the very moment when, if his efforts had been crowned with success, the consequence would have been the infusion of new life into the dying monster! If Mr. Crawford had been elected, and the Bank had been chartered (as it would have been) in 1832, would not Mr. Van Buren and Mr. Ritchie have been necessary before the fact to the horrible outrage on the constitution.

But enough of this—we have shown that Washington, Adams, Jefferson and Madison were all committed in favor of the Bank, by their official acts. Let us now see how Monroe stood on that question: he has defined his own position, in his letter to Silas E. Burrows, dated 20th Jan 1831. Mr. Monroe had in 1791, as one of the Senators of Va. voted against the Bank bill.—In his letter to Mr. Burrows, after recapitulating the aspect of affairs in 1816, he says:—"These considerations led to a change in my opinion, and induced me to concur with the President in the propriety of instituting such a Bank after the conclusion of the war in 1815. As to the constitutional objection, it formed no serious obstacle. In voting against it in the first instance, I was governed essentially by policy. The constitution I gave to the constitution, I considered a strict one. In the latter instance, it was more liberal, but according to my judgment justified by its powers."

There is one other circumstance connected with the history of the Bank question, which we would especially commend to those gentlemen who pride themselves on their consistency—and oppose the bank now, because they have done so in by gone days. The constitutionality of the Bank depends upon the fact, whether it is a "necessary and proper means" to the administration of the fiscal affairs of the government. All admit that if it necessarily is shown, it is constitutional. This is a practical question—theory has nothing to do with it—it is to be tried and settled by experience—one experiment is worth all the reasoning in the world. EVERY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, WE BELIEVE, FROM HAMILTON TO THE PRESENT TIME tells us it is necessary and proper for that purpose! Is it not rather arrogant and presumptuous in us, who have never had an opportunity of making an experiment of the kind, to set up our opinions in opposition to those who have made a fair trial of it?

Madison at first thought it not necessary and proper, but experience satisfied him he was wrong—Clay at first thought it not necessary but he too was convinced of his error during the war.—Giles was originally the stern opponent of the Bank, but his eyes were opened during the war to its necessity, and he changed his opinion, and voted for the Bank in 1815.

With the testimony of such men as these as to the necessity of the Bank, as a fiscal agent, and their patriotic examples before us, in renouncing erroneous opinions, who should be afraid or ashamed to say, I yield to the force of evidence and abandon my opposition to a Bank? We had hoped to finish what we had to say on the Bank question, in this number, but finding we cannot do so without extending it to an unreasonable length, we must reserve some additional facts which we wish to bring before the country, for a concluding number.

The Hon. William R. King, Senator of the United States from Alabama, was yesterday nominated by the President to the Senate to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to France, and was forthwith confirmed.

The nomination of Governor Shannon, of Ohio to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Mexico, to succeed Gen. Thompson, made some days ago was yesterday confirmed by the Senate, & Nat. Int.

From the Raleigh Star.

LETTER FROM HON. JOHN SERGEANT.
The following beautiful and patriotic letter from the Hon. John Sergeant, of Pennsylvania, to H. W. Miller, Esq., President of the Wake Clay Club, will be read with interest and pleasure by every Whig, and we dare say, by every liberal minded and unprejudiced "Democrat."

WASHINGTON, March 3, 1844.

Dear Sir—Your favor of the 23d February last has been received. Be pleased to make my acknowledgments to the "Wake Clay Club" for the honor they have done me in electing me to be an honorary member, and thank them for the invitation to be present on the 12th April next, when they expect a visit of the Hon'ble Henry Clay, to meet his fellow-citizens of North Carolina in Raleigh.

I very much fear it will not be in my power to be with you on this interesting occasion, as arrangements already made, will probably require me at that time to be in Philadelphia. Should anything occur to leave me at liberty, it will give me sincere pleasure to accept the invitation, and to meet the Whigs of that patriotic State, so much distinguished for their steadfastness and unwavering energy, as well as for the talents and worth of those who have represented them in the councils and affairs of the nation.

Allow me to express to you my hearty congratulations upon the cordial concurrence of views and sentiments which prevails among all the Whigs of the Union. They are, every where, of one heart and mind. From whatever quarter a Whig voice is heard—from formal or from casual meetings—from State conventions, from local assemblies, nay, from every individual—it is one and the same, and uttered in tones of depth and sincerity, as well as of joyous confidence and determined perseverance. In Maryland it has lately spoken through the ballot-boxes, to give the gladdening assurance, even beyond our most sanguine expectations, that our brethren there have fully obeyed the same noble impulse which led the Whigs of Tennessee to victory.

No mere party combination, no little tactics, no sinister motives, no basis of patronage offered for personal devotion, have power to bring such a spirit into action. It has a deeper and a better source. It springs spontaneously, quickened with living energy, from the love of country, pure and unconquerable, not only to achieve, but also to deserve success. The cheerful gaiety of our friends, which some of our opponents seem disposed to rebuke, rightly considered, is itself an evidence that they feel they are in the way of their duty, and are happy in the conviction that their patriotic purpose will not fail to be accomplished.

Very fortunate it is, that under these circumstances we have one among us, so worthy to be the depository of the hopes and confidence of every Whig, as the distinguished citizen you expect at Raleigh. You have invited Mr. Clay to visit you. No one doubts that you have expressed your heart's free wish in giving the invitation. The Whigs of the United States, each for himself, from the impulse of his own feelings and convictions, have invited him to be their candidate for the presidency—they have, indeed, commended him to be so, not permitting him to think of declining. Who does not know that this is the free wish of their hearts, as truly as your invitation is of yours? You desire to embrace with your hospitality the man whom you deem worthy to be honored and trusted. They desire, in common with you, to commit to his care the principles and interests they cherish for the sake of their country, because he has ever been the faithful, able and brave champion of those principles and interests. And tho' honor to him be not the chief object, yet what higher honor can be done to any man, than for the free citizens of a great Nation to seek him in his retirement, and fall upon him to come forth and take charge of their dearest concerns? What finer and more grateful reward be offered, for a life of public service, with its full share of toil, and more than the usual portion of persecution and malignant calumny!

The satisfaction to be experienced from the election of Mr. Clay, will not in my opinion be confined to those who support him. In the complicated workings of party, there may be springs of action urging men to favor another candidate. But I doubt whether there is an individual in the Country, capable of forming a judgment, who—the election once over—will not feel persuaded, and be contented under the persuasion, that the public honor and interests are safe in his hands.

Very truly yours,
JOHN SERGEANT.
H. W. MILLER, Esq.
Pres't. Whig Clay Club.