A THIRD PARTY.

Men who are partizan Democrats and Republicans frequently express their surprise or indignation that there should be more than two parties in the country. They don't understand how it is, that men do not see just as they see, and act just as they act; and he is thought to be a very foolish or stubborn fellow who will not look upon everything as black or white, just as they look upon it. There is no use in wasting words upon persons holding such opinions, and we shall not attempt it; but there is another class, who doubt the expediency of third parties, to whom a word may be said with profit.

In the first place, then, there is a large plurality of intelligent voters in America, who are not satisfied with either the Democratic or Republican parties, and who, if they would act as a unit upon their principles and preferences, would soon largely outnumber either of them. This class embraces thousands and tens of thousands who vote with both the large organizations because they suppose they have no where else to go; or else they stay at home, and leave local, state and national politics to take care of themselves. There are seventy-five thousand of this last class of voters in the State of New York, and more than eighty thousand of the same class in the six New England States; and one hundred thousand in the three States of Ohio, Pennsylvania and New Jersey; and quite half a million of stay at home among the so-called most respectable and wealthy citizens of the country. Put this number into an active Presidential canvass, with the nine hundred thousand who voted for Fillmore and Donelson in 1856, and the three hundred and fifty thousand, at least, who preferred Fillmore or Buchanan, but who voted for the one or the other of the last two upon the plea that the former had no chance, and here is a vote exceeding the entire vote of Fremont, in 1856, by more than four hundred thousand! Nor is there any exaggeration in this statement.

Again, ten to one, if you meet a leading Democrat or Republican, not a professed politician, office holder or aspirant for place, he will agree with you that a third party, between the extremes of the two parties, is just what the country needs. A party not for the South alone, but for the country and the whole country.—a Constitutional Union party, founded upon the broad principles of Justice, Fraternity and Equity,—is what we need, and such a party, with good and true men as its leaders in the Councils of the Nation would give such an electrical life to the people as would thrill every particle heart between Nova Scotia and the Pacific.

And why may not such a party be successful? Why may it not appeal to the good sense and patriotism of the people to aid to its numbers? Is there no virtue and no good to be found outside of organizations which for years past have kept the country in a state of sectional excitement hardly to be exceeded between foreign States in a time of war?

It is lawful enough to join a third church, or a third sect—to believe in a tripod, nor all Unitarian, or all Episcopal, Calvinistic or Universalist—and no man is deemed a fool or a lunatic thereby. One too, when he sees two parties, or two men, disagreeing widely, can see that there are errors on both sides, and point out a road of safety between the two. The framers of the government, when they met in a national convention to frame a national constitution found [illegible] on the great questions of State and Federal power; and when the constitution was made, Strong-like New York, and man-like Patrick Henry of Virginia, held out vehemently for a time against its ratification. Had there been no medium between extreme opinions, we should have had no Declaration of Independence, no thirteen States in one Union, and from which have sprung more than three times the original number of States. This government, indeed, could not exist ten years under the extreme pressure of the extreme parties who now seek to administer it. We see the spirit of an eternal conflict between these two contestants. There is in neither of them any of the forbearance and tone of peace which characterized the founders of the Government. One side is fighting, as it thinks, for the very life of one section of the country,—and the other side are making an aggressive, constant war upon this section. "A bigoted law than the Constitution" is preached in a civil Government,—"an irrepressible conflict" among fraternal States,—a war between Capital in one part of the country and Labor in another. And then pseudo or false, as the case may be, a hue and cry about the Territories, one side insisting upon special legislation for slavery in the Territories, and the other side for special legislation against slavery in the Territories, and each side fighting for an abstraction, not for a practical principle, and putting the country by the ears with the cry "abolition" in their superfluous breath. Surely there is a straight and right way between these extremes, and as it is a safe and straight road is it too much to expect that a million or two of the American people, North or South, East and West, will delight to walk therein?—*New York Express.*

THE NEW MS. BIBLE FROM MOUNT SINAI.—The new MS. Bible discovered by Prof. Tischendorf in the library of the monastery on Mount Sinai is to be printed in St. Petersburg with great magnificence, under his care and at the cost of the Imperial Government. Prof. Tischendorf finds strong reasons for fixing its date in the first half of the fourth century; and, he says, that as a means of determining the text of the sacred writings, especially those of the Apostles, it is far more important than even the MS. of the Vatican. The age of the new MS. has already been the subject of deep controversy, a concerted attack having been made upon Prof. Tischendorf's conclusions by a number of St. Petersburg Academicians.—His replies were, however, so satisfactory that his opponents have become converts to his belief.

This MS. is the oldest MS. of the Bible which has been preserved to the Christian world. It is far older than any other except the Vatican MS., to which it is superior in age and in completeness; for the MS. of the Vatican lacks five books entirely and too in part. Its authority is also confirmed by the quotations of the early fathers, which agree with it more nearly than with any other MS.

We have before us a bill (81) of the Bank of the State of South Carolina, on which is written the following: "Here goes the last dollar of an inheritance of fifty thousand—it goes for the rest—for ever! Young man, take warning from my sad example, lest you too sink into a drunkard's grave. July 4, 1856."—*Charleston Mercury.*

North Carolina Whig.

NORTH CAROLINA

CHARLOTTE:

Tuesday, March 27, 1860.

J. H. R. Wakefield, Esq., of Lenoir, has consented to act, and is our authorized agent. He will receive orders for the Weekly Whig, or advertisements, and receipts for the same. Any persons subscribing who pay to him within three months will receive the Weekly for two dollars.

FOR GOVERNOR,

JOHN POOL, ESQ.,

OF PASQUOTANK.

CANDIDATES FOR SHERIFF.

We are authorized to announce A. H. BROWN, Esq., as a candidate for the office of Sheriff of Mecklenburg county, at the ensuing August election.

We are authorized to announce STEPHEN J. BERRYHILL, Esq., as a candidate for the office of Sheriff of Mecklenburg county, at the ensuing August election.

We are authorized to announce R. M. WHITE, Esq., as a candidate for the office of Sheriff of Mecklenburg county, at the ensuing August election.

We are authorized to announce W. W. GRIER, Esq., as a candidate for the office of Sheriff of Mecklenburg county, at the ensuing August election.

We are authorized to announce WILLIAM MAXWELL, Esq., as a candidate for the office of Sheriff of Mecklenburg county, at the ensuing August election.

We are authorized to announce SAMUEL A. HARRIS, Esq., as a candidate for the office of Sheriff of Mecklenburg county, at the ensuing August election.

We are authorized to announce J. P. SMITH, Esq., as a candidate for the office of Sheriff of Mecklenburg county, at the ensuing August election.

Ourselves.

This number commences the 9th volume of the North Carolina Whig. To those who have been kind enough to aid us in our endeavors to sustain our paper we return our thanks. We are well aware that the Whig is not what we desire to make it, but difficulties have been around us which have, to a very great degree, cramped our energies, but we are doing every exertion to remove them, and as soon as we accomplish that object we promise our readers a great improvement in the appearance of the Whig.

Although the prospects of our party have been very discouraging, yet, for one, we have never entertained for a moment, the idea of joining the dominant party for any purpose, and when the leaders of the self-styled "National Democratic party" can say that they prefer to see a Black Republican elected to a Southern man, if we keep our mind, we never will. If they are afraid to trust a man in whom we have confidence, they have no right to expect us to have confidence in them. That party has disappointed the expectations of the country, and as we believe that their object is to retain the spoils of office we will never aid them in retaining them.

More New Goods.

Attention is called to the advertisement of Messrs. Elias & Cohen. It will be seen that on the 3d of April they will open one of the largest Stocks of Goods ever brought to this place, at the old stand of Messrs. F. H. Brem & Co., to which they invite the attention of the public.

Also see several other new advertisements, especially Mr. Radcliff's. He wants all who owe him to come forward and settle.

"Saving the Union."

In 1856, the cry was vote for James Buchanan to save the Union. Many Whigs went over on that question, and the call is now being made again to the Whigs of the South to come forward and aid in electing another nominee of the Democratic Party. We were told that in electing Mr. Buchanan the Union would be saved, but it seems that the Democrats were mistaken and that the same work has to be done over, and then every four years this cry for saving the Union will be adopted, and thus the excitement will be kept up to gull only the timid. We love the Union as much as any man, but we are unwilling to join a party whose constant cry is "save the Union," and when they succeed in electing their man all excitement passes off, and things remain as they were until the eve of another Presidential election, then a hue and cry is raised, that the Union is in danger and the South must be united to save it. Would it not be much safer for the people to rise in their majesty and form a new party whose object would be the good of the country and not of a set of office holders and office seekers. Until this is done we doubt whether the excitement relative to slavery will ever cease in this country—it is only by the excitement on the slavery question that the Democratic party expects to retain office.

What the Democrats Say.

The Democrats in their opposition to our reforms urge many objections to it. One is that in taxing slaves it will have the effect to drive them out of the State. If that was a good reason why does it not drive land holders out of the State, they are heavily taxed. Another objection is that it would increase the Senatorial representation in the East. The East already has the ascendancy in the Senate, we believe, so if the *ad valorem* tax did increase the representation in the Senate, we could not complain, as it would pay the largest amount of taxes. The West would, however, have the ascendancy in the House of Commons, and one House would be a check upon the other. Although the East would have an increase in the Senatorial representation yet the people of that section are arraying themselves against it very strongly. But let the people examine the question fairly and then they will see that the democratic conclusions are all untenable.

Ad Valorem and the Democratic Party.

In the Dred Scott decision, the Supreme Court of the United States affirms that slaves is property. Well, in accordance with this decision the Opposition Party in North Carolina desires to have the constitution amended so that they can be taxed as property. But on the other hand, the Democratic Party desires negroes to be taxed no more than white persons, therefore putting them on an equality with them. This is just the position exactly of the Black Republicans, and therefore the Democratic Party are favoring Black Republican principles in North Carolina and not the Opposition Party as our opponents are trying to show. The Democrats cannot get around this dilemma no way they can fix it, if they go for putting slaves on an equality with white persons.

The State Constitution.

We have given in to-day's paper a very interesting article from the Fayetteville Observer, relative to the subject of amending the Constitution. It will be seen by reference to an extract from Gov. Graham's speech that the passage of the bill, known as the "Free Suffrage bill" was a violation of the compromises of the Constitution adopted by the convention of 1835. Thus the Democratic Party has no right to complain because the Opposition desire equal taxation. They forced upon the people and broke down the protection to the landed interests of the State, it is nothing but right to equalize different interests, that the capitation tax of the State should be altered so that the slaves in the State should bear their equal portion of the burthens of the government. Those that sow the wind must expect to reap the whirlwind.

Whats the Difference?

Many of the Democrats South say that Douglas is "no better than Seward," whilst the *Nashville Union* calls him a "political gambler." The Richmond *Whig* says the only difference is, that Douglas will give the offices to the Democrats and Seward would give them to the Black Republicans. It also says that the leaders of the Democratic party have no other motive in governing their political actions than the spoils of office. Let the yeomanry of the country see to this.

California Moss.

This is a singular article which has been brought to this State from the Land of Gold. It has the property of making a very palatable beer by the addition of a spoonful of molasses to every pint of water daily, and it has the quality of making very good yeast. This may be surprising to many but it is nevertheless true, as we have had it tried at our house. And not the least surprising quality about it is, that the moss increases every day. If any one has any doubts let them try it.

From Mexico.

The news from Mexico is of the most interesting character. Miramon, who had besieged Vera Cruz abandoned the seige, deserted his army and took refuge on board of the French fleets.

FOR THE N. C. WHIG.

"Help me, Cassius, or I Sink."

The "Democrat" howls mournfully over the result of the "New Hampshire Election. The "Angry Flood of the troubled Tyber" has swept the Democracy *down*, in the above State, but then *he does not* call out, "Help me Cassius" but he complains that the Democracy had to fight Black Republicanism alone in New Hampshire, the "Old Granite State never grew anything but" Democrats, Rocks and Hills" and they equally as firm as Gibraltar." A State according to Democratic Authority where the "Sun of Democracy never set," but was always at "meridian" with "shine bright and glorious" Such a firm Democracy to be complaining for the want of *help* to assist in putting down the foe is strange, when *they pretend* to claim to be the only National party! and in New Hampshire they have always had *all* the Power, and a "clean sweep by the Democracy" was always announced all over the country with "three cheers" for New Hampshire by the "Democratic papers" on the result of every election held in that "State." But it seems the New Hampshire National Democracy is divided between Black Republicanism and something else, an "Office Holders" probably, a regular "family quarrel" I suppose. So much for the National Democratic party in the State that brought forth a Levi Woodbury. It is just as you remarked, Mr. *Editor*, in your last issue in regard to St. Lawrence county, New York, the home of Silas Wright, another great luminary of this great pretending "National Democracy" that Gov. Ellis speaks of in his convention speech. And it shows that wherever Democracy is the strongest there Black Republicanism is Dido.

SIMON.

The Hayneville (Ala.) *Chronicle* says the frost was very heavy Thursday night last, in that section. Hundreds of acres of corn planted, and up from one to four inches high, were nipped and will generally be replanted.

The artificial breeding of fish has recently been successfully attempted in Canada.

CONGRESSIONAL.

WASHINGTON, March 20.

SENATE.—On motion of Mr. Brown, a resolution was adopted instructing the Postal Committee to inquire into the expediency of declaring Tallahatchie River, a post route from Greenwood to Sharkey, in Mississippi.

On motion of Mr. Johnson, of Arkansas, a resolution was adopted calling on the President for information, relative to the Mountain Meadows massacre in 1857, in Utah.

On motion of Mr. Mason, of Va., a resolution was adopted calling for the correspondence from the Hon. Townsend Harris, Minister to Japan, relative to the Japanese Mission to the United States; and that the Committee on Foreign Affairs inquire into the expediency of providing for the reception of said mission.

The bill authorizing publishers to print the date of expirations of subscriptions, was passed.

The Homestead bill was discussed, but postponed until to-morrow.

The Florida claims bill was up. Messrs Toombs and Mallory advocated.

HOUSE.—Mr. Sherman, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported a bill to redeem outstanding Treasury notes, and increasing the tariff. Referred to the Committee on the State of the Union.

Mr. Cox made a speech in favor of the Mexican Treaty.

March 21.

The Senate passed the Indian Affairs and Florida claims. In the Executive Session endeavors were made to revive the Nicaraguan Treaty.

The House debated and referred the Texas Defence bill to the Military Committee.

March 22.

SENATE.—The correspondence with Mr. Townsend Harris, relating to his mission to Japan, was laid before the Senate.

A bill was passed for the return of undelivered letters to the Postoffices, to the writer thereof, when their names and residences are endorsed thereon.

The Homestead bill was discussed.

In the House the Michigan election case was debated. The rest is unimportant.

March 23.

SENATE.—On motion of Mr. Brown of Mississippi, a resolution was adopted instructing the committee on public lands to inquire into the expediency of granting public land to States wherein such lands are located.

Mr. Toombs, of Georgia, reported a bill for the relief of the residents on the Houmas grant lands in Louisiana.

The bill to settle the titles to lands along the boundary line between Georgia and Florida was passed.

The private calendar was then taken up.

In the House the Postal committee almost unanimously resolved in favor of the restoration of the inland mail service, which was curtailed by the Post Office Department, after the failure of the appropriation bill at the last session of Congress.

Private bills were taken up, and both Houses adjourned until Monday next.

STIRRING NEWS FROM THE GULF OF MEXICO.

WASHINGTON, March 21.

Advices have been received from New Orleans to yesterday. Miramon laid siege to Vera Cruz on the 5th. On the 6th, two steamers appeared before the city showing no colors. The U. S. frigate Saratoga, with detachments from the Savannah and Preble, and the steamers Indianola and Wave were ordered to proceed to the anchorage of the steamers to ascertain their character. Upon nearing the anchorage off Anton Lizardo, one of the strange steamers moved off. A shot was fired to bring her to, and the Indianola was sent to overhaul her. The Indianola's hail was answered by a shot from Miramon's steamer, followed by a volley of musketry, whereupon the Saratoga fired a broadside, and the action became general. The Saratoga was towed into action by the Indianola, and took Marin by surprise. The engagement took place by moonlight. The Mexican steamers tried to escape. Three Americans were wounded, one mortally. Fifteen Mexicans are reported killed and thirty wounded. When the action commenced Marin hoisted Spanish colors. Marin and his officers are prisoners on board the Preble. His steamers passed all foreign squadrons, also the Castle of San Juan de Ulloa without hoisting his flag, although he was ordered to do so by a shot from the Castle, and other signals. The French, English, and Spanish ships of war did not notice this act. The prisoners corroborate the previous report that the steamers cleared from Havana as merchantmen, and hoisted the Mexican flag only after leaving Havana. They afterwards mounted six guns each.

SINGAPORE, January 21.

FIFTY SEVEN PERSONS MURDERED BY PIRATES.—Her Majesty's steamer Outrat, when about five days' steaming above Banjermassing, was suddenly attacked by about six hundred men in praus. The crew had not time to fire more than one shot when the assailants were in possession, and after murdering all on board, (seven officers and fifty men,) they ran the vessel aground.—In reference to this report the Globe says: "We have made inquiries at the admiralty, and we find that the prefix 'H. M. S.' to the vessel must be incorrect. In all probability the vessel took to the service of his Netherlands Majesty, if it is a vessel of war. To-day's mails have brought accounts of all the vessels in her Majesty's service which could have been anywhere in the neighborhood, and there is no report of any such occurrence. The vessel is probably named Outrat and was attacked five days after steaming from Banjermassing, up the river Banjir in Borneo, which forms part of a Dutch province."

TO CHARGE AGAINST HIM.—Judge Stump, of Baltimore, just removed by the Governor of Maryland, was charged, 1st, with rude and vulgar conduct on the bench; 2d, with having delegated power illegally to a Sheriff, 3d, and that he willfully refuse to obey the orders of the Court of Appeals; 4th that he has been intoxicated and sleep on the bench, while important trials were going on; and 5th, that he has been guilty of misbehavior in his office of Judge.

UNIPER ROOTS.—Several weeks ago we inserted an item, which affirmed that juniper roots made the best razor strops. A friend in Williamston has sent us one, and we have tried it. It is the best thing of the kind we have ever had. We suggest that our friends in the eastern counties turn the roots of the juniper tree which abound there into four square razor strops, and distribute them at large for sale. It will pay.—*Register.*

From the Fayetteville Observer.

THE STATE CONSTITUTION.

We have been a good deal surprised at the pretenses set up by the Democratic papers, of reverence for the sacred Constitution of our State, and objection to disturbing the compromises agreed upon in 1835, by the Convention which amended it. But that surprise is vastly increased when we see the Democratic Convention held last week,—a body so much more intelligent than the body of Democratic editors,—solemnly resolve,

"That we are opposed to disturbing any of the sectional compromises of our Constitution, State or National, and that we especially deprecate the introduction at this time by the Opposition party of North Carolina into our State politics of a question of constitutional amendment affecting the basis upon which our revenue is raised, believing it to be premature, impolitic, dangerous and unjust."

Now as to the editors who have harped upon this matter of the compromises of our State constitution, very few of them are familiar with the history or purpose of those compromises; but that the intelligent body of native and generally elderly gentlemen who composed the Democratic Convention should have set up such a bald pretence, indicates either an ignorance of which we did not suspect them, or a recklessness by no means creditable to their integrity.

We propose so show that the compromise now insisted on was *destroyed by the Democrats themselves*, and is of course no longer binding in one part, the other being abrogated. And we propose to show that when it was so destroyed, it was with a solemn warning of the very result no impending. We cannot do this more clear and forcible terms than are presented by a speech of Gov. Graham in the State Senate in December, 1854—a speech which was published at the time in the Observer and other State papers, and in pamphlet, and we have no doubt was listened to and read by many of the very persons who now profess to be shocked at the idea of "disturbing" a compromise which they were then warned, (only five years ago,) they were about to destroy by passing the Free Suffrage bill.

We ask particular attention to some passages which we have italicised in the following extracts from Gov. Graham's speech, and indeed to the whole of the extracts:—

"Sir, to the most casual reader of the Act of 1835, it is perfectly manifest that the retention of the freehold qualification in electors of the Senate was as well defined and secured and object in the adjustment, then made, as taxation for the basis of representation in the Senate, and federal population of representation in the House, and a much better secured object, than any other provision of the amended Constitution, save those two. And as that adjustment was a compromise of a contention for thirty years, literally a treaty of peace, *the parties to its mind all where, will be exonerated from its further observance in case any one of its fundamental articles has been abrogated and annulled.* I wish this to be *known and remembered* by those who have such dreadful apprehensions from the call of a Convention, and whatever changes the Constitution may be destined to undergo, *that we may hear no complaint of a breach of plighted faith, and a departure from the terms of compromise.* This original bill *sets the compromise of midnight*, and leaves every man to take part in regard to amendments of the Constitution, as may seem right in his own eyes, Sir, there is no escape from this conclusion. You propose, by this bill, a plain and palpable violation of the compromise of 1835, and yet you evince a very salutary fear of losing the benefits of that compromise in other particulars. If there be, as you, I think, vainly apprehend, a serious or general disposition to disturb the basis of representation, you will have lost more than half your power of resistance to it, when you have broken the faith 'which binds the moral elements of the world together.'

"But, the change in the Constitution proposed by this original bill is not only a violation of the compromise, but if it be made and nothing more be done, it will destroy the balance between conflicting interests then established, and will be an act of gross injustice to the owners of landed property, as contra distinguished from the owners of property in slaves. This may not be obvious at first sight, but I think it can be made perfectly apparent. We have already seen that a Constitution of a free government is like the human system, compounded of various parts, harmonized in one whole; and that such is the union of those parts with each other, that one cannot be disturbed without affecting others. It might be supposed by a superficial observer, that the human hand would be improved by cutting off the fingers of equal lengths, and the operation would be so simple that any child who could handle an axe could perform it. And yet we know that this curtailment of the extremity would wound nerves and blood vessels connecting with the brain and the heart, the very citadel of the system. So this apparently simple lopping off from the Constitution of the State what is represented as a mere excrescence, under the captivating idea of a political right, would, from the connections and dependencies of the provision, produce effects reaching far beyond a mere question of equality in voting, in which aspect alone it is treated by the public. I have already demonstrated that the freehold qualification required in the electors of this body was the landholder's defence against unequal taxation on his property, that for this purpose it was ordained by our fathers in the first Constitution, that for the same purpose it was revised and re-ordained by their children in 1835, and that the compromise Constitution then given to us was in other of its parts built upon this provision as upon a foundation stone. Being a member of the Legislature both in 1833 and 1834, and taking an humble part among the advocates for a Convention, I recollect something of the history of that Convention act and of the negotiations by which a sufficient number of votes was given to the bill to allow the question to be determined by the people. Not only was it required that this qualification in Senatorial voters should be retained as a protection to landed property, but it was also required and conceded that the Convention should have power to make the capitation tax on slaves and white polls equal throughout the State; and it was morally certain from the manner in which the Convention was constituted, that it would be done; and it was done to the fullest extent of the power conferred. Sir, the language of Eastern gentlemen, addressed to their Western brethren, was substantially this: Your property consists for the greater part in land. That is protected against unjust levies, by the power of the landholder to elect the Senate, that power we all agree is to be retained. But we own the larger portion of the slaves. Give us a constitutional guarantee against undue taxes upon slaves, and other matters being arranged satisfactorily, we will go into convention, and give you equal representation.' This was agreed to. The convention was called. It ordained that slaves, under twelve and over fifty years of age, should not be taxed at all; and those ages should be only subject to such poll tax as should be laid on white men. Thus, one half in number of all the slaves in the State is exempted by the constitution from taxation altogether; and the other half is exempted from all tax as property, but is liable only to the capitation tax imposed on white men. Thus, the two great subjects of property in the State, lands and slaves, were placed under the protection of the constitution, against unreasonable exactions by the Legislature—the lands retaining their old defence, by means of a political power in the hands of their owners, which enables them to have a veto on legislation, in one House of the General Assembly—the slaves having a still more effectual shield, not by means of a political power in the owners, but by a positive interdict upon the Legislature from laying its finger upon the one-half of them for any levies for the support of Government, and upon the half, only so heavily, or so lightly, as it lays it upon the white man with a vote in his hand. And now, sir, you propose by this "Free Suffrage" bill to take from the landholder the protection which he has had from the foundation of the government, and by reason of the retention of which, protection was given to the slaveholder in 1835, and to permit the protection then for the first time allowed to the slaveholder to remain. This looks to me very much like taking out the foundation, and expecting the structure to remain poised in mid air—very much like taking out a balance wheel from a complex machine, and expecting it to run on, as if never disturbed. Does any one doubt for a moment, that if the protection to land had not been continued in 1835, the guarantee in favor of slaves would never have been adopted? I was continuously a member of the General Assembly, from the ratification of the amended constitution, until 1840; and I am very sure, that after the compromise of 1835, down to that date, if a Western member had introduced a bill to amend the constitution, by annulling the guarantee in favor of slaves, or if an Eastern member had proposed a bill to amend the constitution, by abolishing the protection of lands, by doing away the qualification of voters for the Senate, either would have been charged with a breach of faith; and from which ever side the movement might have come, it would have provoked retaliation on the other.

"But, I may be told, that Eastern and Western parties have passed away. Be it so; I shall be the last to attempt to revive strifes merely sectional. But the great interests of society exist now as they existed in 1835; and although men may be individuated, and are no longer in sectional masses, the question still is of as much interest as ever—is there to be any check upon the Legislature in the imposition of taxes on property? And if there is, on what species of property? Shall land, the most important of all property, be cast away, and bear such burdens as may be imposed at pleasure or of necessity, while slaves enjoy the exemptions now allowed? Sir, I fear this subject of amending the constitution has been considered too much with reference to equality on days of election.—Let us become a people of equal rights and equal privileges, says the Governor, in his message. The problem really to be solved is not one of political equality merely, but of taxable equality also. And whilst I do not object to all free citizens casting equal votes on days of election, I must insist that along with that change in the constitution, there shall be security for as near an approach to the equality as possible on the days of tax gathering, and, when the sheriff makes his annual round, for the collection of the revenue, that each man shall contribute according to his several ability, for the support of the Government. It has been treated as a question solely between the landholder and the non landholder, in regard to equality of votes. It is an equally important question between the landholder and the slaveholder, and white poll, in regard to taxation. We must view things as they are. What are the great subjects of taxation in the State, from which revenue is to be derived? Lands, slaves, and white polls. You may derive something handsome from taxes on moneys at interest, and stocks in banks, or other corporations, and a pittance from what is laid on your daughter's piano, your wife's silver spoons, *et cetera*, but your main reliance for revenue is upon the three sources just mentioned. Those three interests were all represented in the convention of 1835, were parties to the treaty then made, and are all protected against unequal burdens under the existing constitution.—The land, by the power of its owner to select the Senator; the white poll, by his power to select the House of Commons, and the slave property, by the guaranty already mentioned. There is, and was designed to be, between them, mutual checks against inequality of imposition. By this bill you destroy this system; you strike from the landholder his power of defence, while you leave the slaveholder his impenetrable shield. You set out with the Quixotic idea of establishing equal political rights, and end by creating an unequal and unjust exposure to taxation, a greater mischief and grievance than that you designed to remedy; a natural consequence of undertaking to deal with the complicated subject of the constitution by piecemeal. Sir, suppose this Senate were sitting as a convention, with power to make and propose a whole constitution to the people of the State, (and that is the situation in which we should place ourselves, when we come to devise amendments,) and that we had progressed so far as to establish two branches of the Legislature, and to ordain that the electors for each should be the same—that we had further voted that land should be liable to taxation at the will of the Legislature, without any restraint, and then that some member should propose to restrain the General Assembly from taxing slaves, provided in the present constitution, how many votes do you suppose the proposition would receive? Would it not be at once replied, and perhaps with some impatience, 'No, we have refused any restraint in regard to land, and it would be unjust therefore, to provide one as to slaves.' And is the injustice any the less, because, both lands and slaves being protected under the present constitution, you strike out the protection of one and leave that of the other, than if you had a new constitution to make, you refused protection to lands and inserted it for slaves? Sir, this subject has sooner or later to be met on manly and intelligent ground. When you take away the present constitutional protection to land, there are two alternatives open to your adoption, one of which you will be compelled to take; and these are either to insert a new provision which shall afford the protection you have taken away, unaccompanied by political power, or to strike out all protection to property, of every kind, and leave it to be taxed at the pleasure of the Legislature. For, Sir, when it shall become known to the people of the State that you have sent them a constitution, as you propose to do by this bill, in which no property is protected from taxation except slaves, and that, of these, one-half cannot be taxed at all, and the other half only as white polls, *you will have produced a tear upon the interest of the slaveholder, quite as fierce as that you are now waging against the landholder.* Let no one accuse me of desiring to produce such a contest. The charge would be as unjust as untrue. A slaveholder myself, to a considerable amount of the estate with which I am endeavoring to provide for a somewhat numerous family, I have every reason to desire security and protection to that species of property. But when we are called on to consider propositions for change in the structure of the government, it is necessary to analyze society, and see of what elements it is composed, and how they consist together. And as a matter of policy, I do not wish to see slave property enjoy the 'bad eminence' of being the sole favorite of the constitution, and subjecting its owners to a public sentiment which cannot be otherwise than injurious; and as a public servant, charged with the duty of guarding alike all the interests of the State, and to allow to none an advantage above another—I cannot and will not consent to put the landholder without the pale of the protection of the constitution and leave the slaveholder within it. * * * * *

"I repeat, sir, it is a delicate, and by no means an agreeable task, thus to review the great interests of the State, and place them in apparent antagonism. But it is necessary that we shall realize what we are about, when an amendment to the Constitution is urged which is in the nature of an attack on one species of property, and survey the whole field before us. The landholders are not a majority of the people, but they approach much nearer to it than the slaveholders, and when you have triumphed over them, and exposed their land to unlimited taxation, especially when you accompany it with a new tax bill, *they will turn upon you and demand a repeal of the protection against taxes on slaves, and will find recruits enough to carry it as by storm.*—Thus a contest is to be begun, of which no man can tell the end.

"Sir, it is to avoid these consequences that I offer the amendment under consideration. Since you propose, as I have shown, to abandon and violate the compromise of 1835, to annihilate the checks and balances then established between conflicting interests, to allow one of those interests an advantage it could never have obtained but for that which you propose to establish in another, the earlier and more calmly you can settle the matter the better. When a compact becomes thus disregarded or misunderstood, and there is a determination to get rid of its terms, it is high time to call together the parties who formed it, and let them agree upon new stipulations."

SUPREME COURT—OPINIONS.

By PEARSON, C. J. In Hayes vs Askew, from Hertford, judgment reversed and Venire de novo. Owens vs. Kinsey, from Currituck, affirming the judgment. Rodman vs. Gaylord, from Beaufort, judgment reversed and venire de novo. N. R. Nav. Company vs Commissioners of Newbern, from Craven, judgment reversed—judgments here for defendants. Town of Louisburg vs. Harris, from Franklin, judgment reversed and venire de novo. Dula vs. Cowles, from Wilkes, judgment reversed and venire de novo. In Doe ex dem. Welborn vs. Finlay, from Wilkes, affirming the judgment. Turner vs. Ford, in equity, from Stanly, dismissing the bill. Steward vs. Stowe, in equity, from Gaston, directing a decree for plaintiff. Sugg vs. Stowe, in equity, from Gaston, decree for an account vs. Stowe.—Wiswall vs. Potts, in equity, from Beaufort, directing a decree. Emmons vs. McKesson, in equity, from Wake; the motion to dissolve allowed. Berry vs. Sloan, in equity, from Orange, report confirmed, costs to be paid by plaintiff. Leathers vs. Scott, in equity, from Orange, allowing the plaintiff to have an account. Posten vs. Gillespie, in equity, from Rowan, directing a decree for plaintiffs. Townsend, Arnold & Co. vs. Moss, in equity, from Mecklenburg, decree for the smallest note. Davidson vs. Hutchinson, in equity, from Mecklenburg, declaring that there is no error in the order.

By BATTLE, J. In Pridgen vs. Anders, from Bladen, vs. affirming the judgment.—Stricklin vs. Murphy, from Duplin, affirming the judgment. State vs. Oscar, from Rowan, declaring that there is error in the proceedings of the Superior Court. Cockerham vs. Baker, from Surry, affirming the judgment. Fite vs. Lander, from Gaston, affirming the judgment. Harrington vs. McLean, in equity, from Harnett, cause remanded with leave to amend. Capehart vs. Mhoon, in equity, from Bertie, plaintiff may have benefit on his secondary equity against administrator and his sureties.—McRae vs. Guion, in equity, from Robeson, reversed in part, and ordered to be certified. Thompson vs. Guion, in equity, from Robeson, demurrer sustained and bill dismissed. King vs. Galloway, in equity, from Brunswick, sustaining the demurrer and dismissing the bill. Williamson vs. Williamson, in equity, from Wilson, dismissing the petition to rehear. Fuller vs. Smith, in equity, from Caswell, (two cases,) decree for plaintiff in each. Webb vs. Webb in equity, from Granville. Dibble vs. Scott, in equity, from Lenoir. Myers vs. Williams, in equity from Rowan, exceptions overruled and report confirmed. Wood vs. Reeves, in equity, from Rowan, demurrer overruled.

By MANLY, J. In Felton vs. Reed, from Perquimans, affirming the judgment. Garndy vs. Humphreys, from Camden, affirming the judgment. Freshwater vs. Baker, from New Hanover, affirming the judgment.—Freshwater vs. Nichols, from New Hanover, affirming the judgement. Bire vs. Kelly, from Bladen, order to be reversed. Coward vs. Fields, affirming the judgment. Crowell vs. Simpson, from Union, judgment reversed and venire de novo. Haywood vs. Ryalls, in equity from Wake, sustaining the demurrer. Draper, Knox & Co. vs. Jordan, in equity, from Montgomery, dismissing the bill. Branch vs. Branch, directing an account. Adderton vs. Sarrat, in equity from Davidson, dismissing the bill with costs.—Cawley vs. Lawson, in equity, from Lenoir, directing an account. Caldwell vs. Wallace, in equity, from Mecklenburg, order to be reversed.—*Raleigh Press, 21st instant.*

Wisconsin has abolished the system of collecting debts by execution. The State must hereafter be considered the heaven of debtors.