

Carolina Watchman.

PENDLETON & BRUNER,
EDITORS AND PROPRIETORS.

Published Weekly at Two Dollars, and Fifty Cts.

NO. 31—VOLUME VIII.
WHOLE NO. 395.

SALISBURY, FEBRUARY 28, 1840.

POETICAL.

From the Alexandria Gazette.

THE WORLD A BARBER SHOP.

Our notions rightly kilted up,
No one a doubt can harbor,
That all the world's a barber's shop,
And every man a barber.

The farmer, he's a barber's friend,
And ready in a trice, sir,
To lather with a recommend
And shave us with a price, sir.

Mechanics, they are barbers, all,
Nor luckeys at the play, sir;
They lather when for work they call,
And shave us for the pay, sir.

The Doctor he's a barber too,
He lathers with a pill, sir,
And many applicants or few
He shaves us with a bill, sir.

The Merchant, he's a barber too,
And who that him surpasses?
He lathers with fine calico,
And shaves the beardless lassies.

Our Congress members, lately have
Assumed the barber's station,
And without lather tried to shave
With double compensation.

But of all the suds bedaubing host,
With razors what the keenest
The lawyer lathers folks the most,
And shaves mankind the clearest.



Agricultural Matters.

From all accounts, I have no doubt by far the most abundant and cheap food we could raise, not only for hogs but for almost every other kind of stock, would be the carrot. It is said to suit best a light sandy soil, as do nearly all the esculent roots, and would therefore do well in our country. The yield has been known to be upwards of eight hundred bushels to the acre, and two hundred is as low as the most indifferent soil and cultivation are said to produce. In the 5th vol. of "The Library of Entertaining and Useful Knowledge," published at Boston, there is a strong recommendation of this vegetable from which I make the following extract:

"Besides their use as human food, carrots are in some places grown largely for the consumption of stock, especially for horses. It is affirmed that cattle which have once tasted them, usually prefer them so much to turnips as with difficulty to be made to return to the latter. The milk cows fed on carrots never acquire any unpleasant flavor, while at the same time the quantity produced is increased. Calves thrive admirably, and bullocks are speedily fattened on this food. Carrots are equally beneficial as nourishment for sheep, and are devoured with avidity by swine. In the short space of ten days, a lean hog was fattened by these roots, having consumed during that period 196 pounds. Its fat proved very fine, white and firm, and did not waste in the dressing. Horses receiving no other sustenance, perform their work as usual without any diminution of their sleekness."

As a demonstration of the vast productiveness and nutritive strength of the carrot, the following from the same article is also added:

"At Parlington in Yorkshire, the stock of a farm, consisting of 20 work horses, four bullocks, and six milk cows, were fed from the end of September to the beginning of May, on the carrots produced from three acres of land. The animals, during the whole of this period, lived on these roots with the addition of only a very small quantity of hay; and thirty hogs were fattened on the refuse left by the cattle."

How immensely are we behind the scientific farmers of the older parts of the world in thrift and economy! and how dearly are we paying for our neglect of these things? Among us, if a farmer were asked to support the above stock, if he pursued the usual course, he would perhaps plant the three acres in corn alone, or with the addition of a few cornfield peas or pumpkins; and with good cropping and his utmost thrift, the produce would scarcely subsist the horses alone one-third of the above time.

MILKING.

When you go to milk, take a vessel of cold water and a sponge. Wash the udder and teats clean, dashing on the cold water. This will prevent the teats from becoming sore, and the udder from being hot and feverish, besides rendering the process of milking much neater. Milk with clean

hands. The whole business of milking is frequently conducted in such a slovenly manner, that the milk is entirely unfit for food.

The cow should be milked while eating her fodder at morning and evening. She should always be milked and fed at the same time in the day, and uniformly by the same person. Milk without interruption. Be sure to milk the cow as dry as possible.

To be milked by different hands, at different times in the day, in a slow, interrupted, gossiping manner, and leaving part of the milk in the udder, will ruin the best cow in the world.

Cows will yield more by milking three times in the day, than if milked but twice. When this can be done, we would advise it, during the summer season, not only as a matter of economy, but as a kindness to the cow. The quantity of milk accumulated during a long summer day cannot be otherwise than painful. It has also a tendency to render the udder hot and feverish, and of course the milk unhealthy.—Temple Farmer.

Sun-Flower Seed—Cure for Founder.

"The seeds of sun-flower, says a correspondent of the Zanesville Gazette, 'are one of the best remedies known for the cure of founder in horses. Immediately on discovering that your horse is foundered, mix about a pint of the whole seed in his feed, and it will give a perfect cure.'"

NOTE TO MR STANLY'S SPEECH.

In the Globe of the 28th of January, Mr. Waterson has published his "appendix and proof" with a speech; I will therefore publish my speech with this "appendix and proof."

If what I said did not have the effect of convincing Mr. Waterson, it has made it necessary for him to bring forward other evidence to support his charge. A large portion of Mr. W.'s notes is devoted to Mr. Parmenter. I am very willing to let this rest upon Mr. Parmenter's explanation and letter. He is welcome to all the benefits of his friend's "appendix and proof."

Mr. Waterson says: "Mr. Stanly also read a letter of Mr. Williams, of Massachusetts, in which strong opposition to slavery was expressed. Whether Mr. Williams is or is not an abolitionist, I know not!" I will let Mr. Waterson's "anti-slavery" friend, Mr. Parmenter, answer this question. Hear Mr. Parmenter's definition as quoted by Mr. Waterson: "Mr. Parmenter said he would define what he considered to be the views of an abolitionist. It was a desire that Congress should abolish slavery in this District and in the Territories, without regard to the rights of others, the peace and tranquility of a large portion of the country, and the safety of the Union." Now compare this with Mr. Williams's own words: "I still believe slavery to be contrary to the laws of God and the best interests of man; that it ought not to be extended by the admission of new States into the Union with Constitutions tolerating so great an evil; and that it is the imperative duty of Congress to adopt immediate measures for its abolition in the District of Columbia!"—"Whether Mr. Williams is or is not an abolitionist, know not," says Mr. Waterson!

Anti-slavery resolutions were introduced into the Massachusetts Legislature. The question was taken by yeas and nays upon each resolution; here are two of them:

Resolved, That Congress, having exclusive legislation in the District of Columbia, possesses the right to abolish slavery and the slave-trade therein; and that the early exercise of such right is demanded by the enlightened sentiment of the civilized world, by the principles of the Revolution, and by humanity.

Resolved, That slavery, being an admitted moral and political evil, whose continuance, wherever it exists, is vindicated mainly on the ground of necessity, should be circumscribed within the limits of the States where it has been already established; and that no new State should hereafter be admitted into the Union whose Constitution of government shall sanction or permit the existence of domestic slavery."

Whether those who voted for these resolutions are abolitionists or not, I leave Southern people to decide. Upon the passage of these resolutions, Henry Williams, with every other Van Buren Senator except one, recorded his name in the affirmative! Mr. Waterson says, "gentlemen may specify a scattering abolitionist, here and there;" and I presume the Van Buren Senator who did not vote for these resolutions was among the "scattering." A little examination will convince us that Van Buren abolitionists are "scattering" thick all over Massachusetts.

Alexander H. Everett was the regular Van Buren candidate for district No. 9, in Massachusetts. In November, 1837, he said, in a letter to Orin P. Bacon, "I have, on several occasions not connected with the political affairs of the day,

distinctly stated my conviction of the essential injustice of slavery, and my belief, founded in part on historical evidence, of the natural quality of the colored race with our own."

"I am satisfied that Congress has the constitutional power to abolish slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and to prohibit the slave-trade between the States. I am aware of no good reason why this right should not be exercised without delay."

Benjamin F. Newhall, of Saugus, Massachusetts, says, in 1838:

"I am in favor of immediate emancipation in the District of Columbia and the Territory of Florida. I believe that Congress has power to abolish the slave-trade between the States, and I am in favor of the immediate exercise of that power."

He was a regular Van Buren candidate—one of the committee of the anti-slavery society.

Joshua Caldwell, another Van Buren candidate, in a letter to B. F. Newhall and others, indulges in vehement abuse of what he terms "the enormities and injustice of slavery." Hear his own words:

"Justice requires and mercy pleads that this system of horrible enormities should be no longer tolerated in this land of freedom, religion, and law."

He thinks success, at no distant day, will crown the efforts of abolitionists, and he believes that "Congress has the power to abolish the slave-trade between the States."

Mr. Nathan Webster, a Van Buren candidate for the State Senate in Massachusetts. He is in favor of immediate emancipation in the District and Territories. He thinks Congress ought to prevent the selling of slaves from one State to another, and that Congress possesses the power to do so.

The Globe, in October, 1838, publishes the proceedings of a "democratic convention," at which Josiah Caldwell was chairman. I have copied Mr. Josiah Caldwell's opinion above. This convention of Globe democrats recommends Mr. Robert Rantoul, Jr. to the democrats as a proper person for their support. The Globe says, "we are happy to learn that Robert Rantoul, Jr. has been brought out as the democratic candidate in Essex south." It indulges strong hopes of the success of Mr. Robert Rantoul, Jr. Now, let us hear the sentiments of a Globe democrat upon the power of Congress over slavery. He says: Congress has the entire power over slavery in the District of Columbia. He says, in these words, "slavery ought not to exist in the District; so long as it exists there, it will endanger the existence of the Union." (Of course, he wishes the Union preserved.) Like other anti-slavery Van Buren men, he says:

"(Slavery) would have been already circumscribed within much narrower limits than it now occupies but for the malignant influence exerted by one man, the Hon. Henry Clay, some 18 or 19 years ago."

Mr. Rantoul also says: "Under the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, Congress have already prohibited the African slave-trade, and under the power to regulate commerce among the several States, Congress may equally prohibit the slave-trade among the several States."

Here we have the opinions of A. H. Everett, of B. F. Newhall, of Josiah Caldwell, of Nathan Webster, of Robert Rantoul, Jr.—all regular Van Buren candidates; of Mr. Parmenter and Mr. Henry Williams, "scattering" anti-slavery men. The Globe says they are democrats; Mr. Williams "may be relied on."—Mr. Parmenter (says the Globe of October 9, 1838) has been re-nominated in the 4th district of that State, having received 100 votes out of 101. The Globe compliments him as "faithless among the faithless to the rights of the People and the principles of republicanism."

Mr. Waterson thinks "the democracy of the North are the natural allies of the South." Sir, says he in concluding his speech, "I am proud of that alliance; we fight in one common cause, and under one common banner; that cause is the Constitution of our country." Everett, Newhall, Williams, Rantoul, and Parmenter, are all called Democrats. Are they the allies Mr. Waterson is proud of? Are they fighting in one common cause? Is that cause the Constitution of the country? Mr. Waterson thinks the Union will be destroyed if slavery were abolished by Congress. No doubt of it. But what does his democratic ally, Mr. Robert Rantoul, Jr., think of this? Hear him: "Slavery ought not to exist in the District. So long as it exists there it will endanger the existence of the Union!" But, says Mr. Waterson, "we fight in one common cause, under one common banner." By this process of reasoning, I might make Mr. Waterson an abolitionist just as he has made the Whigs of the North. He is as much in error in this as he is in arrogating to the Van Buren party the praise of being the only Democrats. To be a good Whig, a man must be democratic in his principles and feelings. But Whig democracy is very different from the democracy of Everett, who believes in the "natural equality of the colored race with our own;" very different from the Globe democracy of Rantoul, Williams, Parmenter, Newhall, Tappan, or Governor Mostou. Whig democracy, like the "sweet South

o'er a bed of violets," waits the vessel of state steadily and safely along, without injuring a sail or straining a spar. Van Buren democracy comes like the desolating Sirocco, with the fury of the blustering porteaust wind, destroying and beating down, tearing every thing to pieces, while the pilot at the helm, instead of regarding the advice of Washington, instead of keeping in view what he pointed out as the North star, is trying experiments with new "lights" before him.

Mr. Waterson quotes at length the circular of the "young men's anti-slavery society in New York," urging the anti-slavery electors to oppose Marcy. Here again Mr. Waterson has only heard one side. After the publication of that circular, a member of the same society published a letter in which he says: "It should be distinctly understood that the issuing of this circular was the work of some twelve individuals, a small portion of whom only are prominent abolitionists, and that the young men's society, numbering some hundreds, did not and would not sanction the proceedings." The editor of the Emancipator wrote an apology for this circular, by saying, "it was the act of individuals, for which the 'anti-slavery society, even of Albany, is no way responsible.' So much for this circular.

I submit to Mr. Waterson the following extract from the Albany Evening Journal, Nov. 28, 1835:

"Mr. Weld, the Abolition lecturer, did, to our certain knowledge, travel the country, advocating Van Buren's election for President. It is a notorious fact that the officers and pupils of the Oneida Institute voted for Van Buren. We have the authority of reputable men for saying that the editors of the Friend of Man and Emancipator were supporters of Van Buren. We are also informed that W. L. Chaplin, the corresponding secretary and general agent of the New York State anti-slavery society, who appoints and directs these agents in all their movements, has been a decided supporter of Mr. Van Buren."

The Emancipator in New York is continually denouncing the Harrisburg nomination, and was bitterly opposed to the election of Mr. Tallmadge. The "Friend of Man," an abolition paper, condemns the election of Mr. Tallmadge. It speaks of him thus: "The vilifier of the abolitionists, the contemner of the right of petition, and advocate of gag-law, the supporter of the censorship of the press, is elected a Senator of the United States to represent the Empire State of New York (and particularly the party that elected him) for six years from the 4th of March next!" The same paper complains that the Whigs would not meet the Van Buren party on middle ground, and vote for Gerrit Smith. This Friend of Man says: "If only twelve Whigs could have been found in the Assembly, and seven in the Senate who would have voted for Gerrit Smith, he would have been elected to the Senate of the United States." But not a single Whig would vote for him! Whig abolitionists must be rather "scattering" in the New York Legislature!

This nomination of Gerrit Smith, by Chatfield, a leading Van Buren man, has been pronounced by Mr. John H. Prentiss of New York a mere joke! The abolitionists did not regard it as a joke. This same Mr. Prentiss, I am informed by a member from New York, was the editor of a blue-light, anti-war, Federal paper in Otsego county, and in one of his papers described 'democracy' as 'a tiger, roaming the Libyan desert, jaying to drench his tusks in blood!' He is now 'in one common cause, and under one common banner' with certain Southern gentlemen!

Mr. Waterson says: "I assert no man can be a republican and an abolitionist." There lived in New York not long since an abolitionist by the name of William Leggett. He professed to be a Democrat and a friend of Mr. Van Buren. He received from Mr. Van Buren the appointment to the Guatemala mission. Hear what Leggett said upon this subject:

"I am an abolitionist. I hate slavery in all its forms, degrees, and influences. Abolition is, in my sense, a necessary and a glorious part of democracy."

The Emancipator praises the "magnanimity of the President" for the appointment of Mr. Leggett to office.

It is said that there was one abolitionist in the Harrisburg Convention. What of it? In the Baltimore Convention which nominated Martin Van Buren, there was a certain R. M. Saunders, now candidate for the office of Governor in North Carolina. When he was in Congress he presented two abolition petitions, praying that slavery might be abolished in the United States! Is this a charge against Mr. Van Buren? If to that Baltimore Convention there was a delegate who had committed forgery, does that affect Mr. Van Buren? Suppose he had afterwards given such a man an office, and appointed another delegate to office who proved a defaulter, does this make Mr. Van Buren a dishonest man? Yet, by the same reasoning by which Harrison is proved an abolitionist, I might show Van Buren an abolitionist and a defaulter. It is a bad rule that will not work both ways.

Mr. Waterson rejoices that "whilst this dark cloud of abolitionism is hanging over the country, we have a pilot at the helm of State whose views are so sound upon this

subject, that he has been denounced upon this floor and elsewhere as a Northern man with Southern principles."

I was not aware that this was a denunciation of Mr. Van Buren. If I am correctly informed, he was called a "Northern man with Southern principles" by one of his own friends as a compliment. I deny the correctness of this. It is rather equivocal praise, if true. But I should be glad to know what proof he has ever given of Southern principles. If this pilot is "so sound upon the subject," what will be thought of some of the democratic crew: such as Morton, Rantoul, Everett, Williams, and Tappan?

But I deny his "soundness upon the question," and I challenge comparison with the opinions of Harrison.

When the Missouri question was agitated before the Legislature of New York, Mr. Van Buren was a member. The following resolution was introduced in the Senate of New York:

Preamble and Resolution.—Whereas the inhibiting the further extension of Slavery in these United States, is a subject of deep concern to the people of this State; and whereas we consider slavery as an evil much to be deplored, and that every constitutional barrier should be erected to prevent its further extension; and that the Constitution of the United States, by giving Congress the right to require of the new States not comprehended within the original boundaries of the United States, the prohibiting of slavery as a condition of their admission into the Union; therefore

Resolved, (if the honorable Senate concur therein) That our Senators be instructed, and our Representatives in Congress be requested, to oppose the admission of a State into the Union of any Territory not comprised as aforesaid, making the prohibition of slavery therein an indispensable condition of admission.

On the 29th January, 1820, the Senate took up the resolution and passed the same unanimously, the following Senators being present.

Messrs. Adams, Austin, Barnum, Bantow, Browne, Childs, Dudley, Dayton, Dumont, Evans, Fortington, Hammond, Harb, Livingston, Loudsberry, McMartin, Moore, Mallory, Moore, Noyes, Paine, Ross, Rosencranz, Skinner, Swain, Van Buren, Watson, Young—29.

Here is "soundness upon this subject," I suppose. And where was Harrison then? Defending the rights of the South, and voting against these Van Buren resolutions—He lost his seat in Congress on account of his support of the pre-existing rights of the South? Mr. Van Buren at that time said: "We cannot look back; let us not therefore, have any halting. I put my hand on its propriety."

I will give 'democratic' authority for this too. The editor of the Nashville Union is State printer of Tennessee; a Van Buren man, "to be relied on." In 1836 he was the editor of an abolition paper. He is one of the "scattering" democratic abolitionists, under the same banner, in the same common cause, with Southern supporters of Martin Van Buren.

From the New Bedford Gazette, Nov 3, 1836.

[BY JEREMIAH G. HARRIS.]

"In 1820, Mr. Van Buren voted that Congress had the constitutional power to abolish slavery in the Territories, and instructed the New York Senators in Congress to vote against the admission of Missouri."

"In 1836, he says that Congress had the constitutional power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia."

"In 1821, he voted to give free blacks the right of suffrage."

"In 1822, he voted in favor of restricting the introduction of slaves into Florida."

From the New Bedford Gazette, Nov 14, 1836.

by Jeremiah G. Harris, now the editor of the Nashville Union. He addresses the "votes of color."—"He tells them Mr. Reed, a Whig member from Massachusetts, cannot be depended upon."

Mr. Crocker was the Van Buren candidate. Mr. Harris says to the democrat "votes of color."—"We have conversed with Mr. Crocker—we are satisfied with his sentiments—he shall give him our vote, and so will every abolitionist in New Bedford that knows him."

The same Mr. Jeremiah G. Harris, printer of the Van Buren party in Tennessee under the same common banner, in the same cause with Mr. Waterson, in 1836, denouncing General Harrison as a friend of slavery," advocated the cause of Mr. Van Buren. He quotes his own words from the New Bedford Gazette of June 22d, 1836, by Jeremiah G. Harris, now editor of the Nashville Union: "Mr. Van Buren admits the constitutionality of abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, but doubts its expediency, but no where denies the right of free discussion."

"Gen. Harrison, says the mighty Hero of Tippecanoe, in his Fourth of July oration at Cheviot, Ohio, in 1833, said, 'that the question on the subject of emancipation in the non-slave-holding States is equally injurious to the slaves and their masters, and has no sanction in the principles of the Constitution.'"

Further. Mr. Harris says of General Harrison, "He stands committed to Southern interests," and has the impudence to tell a Northern audience that they have no right, "by the principles of the Constitution, to discuss the subject of emancipation." Mr. Jeremiah G. Harris was now, of course, oppose Harrison and call him an abolitionist.

In April, 1820, Mr. Jefferson wrote, "The momentous question, like a fire-bell in the night, awakened and filled me with terror. I considered it at once the knell of the Union." This speaks volumes in favor of the services of General Harrison, who sacrificed his political prospects to save that Union which he attempted to destroy. Mr. Van Buren were calculated to injure the Union to late times. In reply to inquiry addressed to him by a committee in North Carolina, Mr. Van Buren admits that Congress had the constitutional power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. Hear his own words: "This view of the matter, I would not, from the light I saw before me, feel myself safe in pronouncing that Congress does not possess the power of interfering with or abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia."

There is no constitutional objection—more expediency governs him.

Now hear Gen. Harrison. A few years ago