



NORTH CAROLINIAN.

FAYETTEVILLE, N. C.

SATURDAY, April 16, 1859.

A Friendly Advice.

We are about to make improvements in our establishment, and of necessity will be compelled to go to some additional expense. We would therefore call upon our friends to render that which is our due and in so doing perform their duty.

To those who owe us for five years subscription we would say, that we would be greatly obliged to them were they to let us hear from them, either by sending the amount they owe, or inform us whether they intend to pay at all.

Of those who owe us for four years subscription we would ask, if they expect a paper to succeed without any money, or that they expect us to supply them with news gratuitously?

As to the two year old debtors we would give them this hint, that we would like to see them send us five dollars, and also that it is but our due and their duty to have this sent.

One year men will be charged \$3 per annum after the first three months of the year have expired, so that they will save one dollar by sending on the money immediately. From this course we will in no case deviate. Money mailed to the Editors of the North Carolinian, Fayetteville, will be at our risk so that you have no excuse.

We will also give our friends an excellent opportunity to procure new subscribers for us. We will give to each old subscriber, who will send us six new ones, a receipt for one year's subscription. And after next month a better paper than they have had for many years, because our weekly will contain more reading matter than heretofore. Excellent opportunities will be given to clubs. Send on your names and money, and we will endeavor to give you its value.

One of our exchanges in enumerating the number of persons under sentence of death at this time, mentions two in Pittsburg, Pa. There are three at that place, two for wife killing and one for stabbing his fellow-man.

There is a little history connected with one of these men which we think worth giving, this is Jacobi, a German, who shot his wife on the 4th of July last, (independence day—a great way of celebrating it) Jacobi was arrested in the far West, taken to Pittsburg, tried, found guilty and sentenced to be hanged. One of his counselors after sentence being pronounced advised him to make application for a new trial. Jacobi, who had paid some \$500 to the attorney for defending him could not be fooled into such a game. "Ah nix!" said he, "it costs too much in this country to pay lawyers."

Jacobi is to be hanged in May next. He will not rest in his cell without a lighted candle, such is the condition of his mind, through the commission of this atrocious crime.

Why Strike a Vanquished foe?

The Winston Sentinel should now be satisfied with the result of the controversy about Mr. Gilmer. The Opposition papers that opposed and ridiculed the statement made by the Sentinel have come out of the affair completely vanquished, broken-winded, lame and spavined, with a bad temper for making comparisons by way of excuse.

Mr. Gilmer is a gentleman for whom we entertain the highest opinion—one whose honor and integrity can in no way be questioned, and we should have been very sorry to have said a word which would militate against him. We were governed in this matter upon a question of principle, because some papers would seem to call our veracity in question, and also the motives of our party. We are now willing that the whole matter should rest, seeing the crippled condition to which some of our exchanges have been reduced. We incline always to the side of mercy.

Coming out as we Said.

Of late we have heard much about Mr. Letcher, the Democratic candidate for Gov. of Virginia. The opposition say he is an abolitionist, and indeed have gone so far as to hint that should he be elected they (the opposition) will feel justified in voting for Seward, Hale or Greely. The opposition have long been indulging in comparisons,—comparing their acts with those of some Democrat, as if they desire to attain to be the national position we now hold. If we charge them with siding with the Black Republicans, they will reply and say, "The Charleston Mercury published an abolition speech"—but do they add, took the liberty to comment upon its doctrine? If we charge any of these men with an impropriety, or misdemeanor committed by way of alliance with the abolitionists, they point to some act of a Democrat committed in his infancy as a set off. But what can they say to these extracts. Here is the record of the Virginia opposition. Look at it every Southern man. This is what has become of the great hobby of distribution. We most earnestly recommend it to the consideration of every one. This is nearly as good as free negro voting:

A FRESHOUL CANDIDATE FOR CONGRESS IN VIRGINIA.—At Henrico C. H., Virginia, Mr. Abrams announced himself a candidate for Congress, and proclaimed himself in favor of the extinction of slavery in Virginia! He was in favor of applying the "proceeds of the public lands" to the purchase of young slaves. Abrams voted for Scott and Fillmore, and declared his intention to vote for Goggin.

What do our people think of this? A Goggin candidate for Congress in favor of appropriating the proceeds of the sales of the public lands to the extinction of slavery in Virginia! Would this candidate have dared to publicly announce such incendiary sentiments if the "Imposition" Convention which nominated Goggin had not endorsed Botts' treason to the South?—*Norfolk Argus.*

We refer our readers to the communication of "Mac."—It is a subject in which all are interested. He shows a thorough knowledge of his subject, and treats it with a master hand.

Hon. Edward Everett delivered his oration at Wilmington, on the evening of the 12th inst, and at Newberne on the 13th inst. It is spoken of by our exchanges in the usual terms of commendation.

The Respect for Law in the North.

When the law, by reason of fanaticism, becomes a nullity, it is a fearful sign in any community. The case of Daniel Dangerfield *alias* Webster, in the city of Philadelphia, which we gave in our last issue, is a potent warning to the South. She is weak and single-handed against a powerful enemy. Respect for the laws and submission to its transcendent authority is what might have been expected from the citizens of Pennsylvania, but the late termination of this case is proof conclusive that fanaticism reigns supreme defying alike the power and authority of all law, and treating the Constitution as a dead letter. The whole affair was a complete farce: under the semblance of a legal trial it amounted to nothing but a judicial robbery. Facts, conclusive to any unprejudiced mind, were treated as mere probabilities, while testimony which in all its bearings was of the most doubtful nature, was looked upon as unimpeachable.

The reports of the case show that five honest, respectable men from Virginia swore positively as to Daniel's identity. The testimony of these men it appears is to be considered as nothing compared to that given by two negroes and one white man—although the last three were contradicted by the prisoner's own statements.

At the result of this trial we must own that we were not surprised. Had the issue been submitted to a jury we would have considered it a moral impossibility for the claimants to have recovered their property; but as it was to be decided by a United States Commissioner, we thought that sectionalism would not have so much weight in the decision of the cause.

There is a trial of the same nature at Pittsburg, Pa., the facts of which are as follows: G. W. Faris, a slave, owned in Alabama, ran away from his master. He was nearly white, a good tradesman, and was never suspected of being a fugitive. He went to Pittsburg some six years since, worked at his trade, and in time married a white woman. Afterwards, one Shaw, who had been to Alabama, went to Pittsburg, knew Faris by a description of him contained in Mrs. Stow's Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin, and made some attempts to get Faris to Virginia, but failed. Some time afterwards, Faris went down to St. Louis, Missouri; Shaw followed, arrested him, and carried him to Alabama. On Shaw's return to Pittsburg, he was in turn arrested and committed to stand his trial for the abducting of a free negro. In the first trial which took place last fall, the prosecution failed to prove that he was a free negro, but such was the array of abolitionism, that the jury brought in a verdict of guilty, and had his attorney not moved for a new trial because the verdict was only rendered by eleven jurors (the twelfth having taken sick) he must inevitably have undergone an imprisonment of seven years in the Penitentiary and paid a fine of \$5,000. One of the most outrageous features in this case was that the Judge, who is a rank abolitionist, opened the charge to the Jury in the following words, from a celebrated Poet:

"I would not have a slave to till my soil,
To fan me while I sleep, or tremble when I wake."

Thus exciting the prejudices of the jury against the prisoner mingling in a legal charge, the poetical effusions coined in the brain of a fanatic. A new trial was granted the prisoner on the ground already stated, and is now progressing, but the result will be the same. We can look for nothing better from any Northern tribunal.

Broke Jail.

Bill, a slave, the property of Mr. Baker, (one of the Big Swamp Negroes) who was convicted of burglary and sentenced to be hanged on the 29th inst., at Lumberton, Robeson County, broke jail on the night of the 12th. He was accompanied by another negro, a runaway. It appears that they were in some way provided by an evil disposed person with files, or had them in their possession—with them they managed to cut the bars of their cage in the cell, and after having done this, picked through a brick wall over 18 inches thick. Quite an excitement prevailed in Lumberton. It is expected they will make good their escape.

The Wilmington Journal seems unwilling to give up the Conventional question, and we will, for the last time refer to it in this issue.

"We must confess that we cannot agree with those who would regard the holding of a convention as an exhibition of hostility to any particular person. . . . We have been frequently asked about a convention, and have received some communications on the subject, but it has not appeared to us that either these inquiries or communications were prompted by any feeling of hostility to Mr. Winslow.—*Journal of the 30th ult.*

"We never said these communications were in favor of a convention."—*Journal, 10th inst.*

"Cum talis sis utinam noster cases." Could we but call so great a genius ours, we would be sorry to bury it by applying our time to the editing of a newspaper. We have not got so admirable a talent for writing that which can never be used as proof positive, but merely as circumstantial evidence. There is a decided advantage in this way of doing, because we can mean just what we please without being compelled to say yes or no.

"The Journal is excited about our using the word 'many' with reference to the communication which it received, (if they have ever received any, and we are inclined to believe them when they speak positively.) If the Journal will go into a numerical definition, and tell what quantum will be required by it to make 'many,' and the amount it considers 'some,' we may learn whether we were wrong respecting their meaning. If they were more than one they were many as compared to what the *Carolinian* received.

If our cotemporary considers us to have used the word 'many,' as copied from its columns, it does us a great injustice. Such a word would be positive, and consequently inconsistent with the *modus loquendi* of the *Journal*.

We were not guilty of using the words 'in favor' of a convention as taken from its columns. No one would expect the *Journal* to say that these communications were for or against a convention. From the facts, as stated above, and their bearing upon the case, we took the communication as being in favor of a convention. Our readers will judge whether the construction was a reasonable one.

The *Journal* is right when it presumes that the private intelligence we received from these counties was communicated by individuals, and not rapped up by some spiritual medium. We have the good luck to have little to do with spirits or their mediums.

As to that part of our cotemporary's article which refers to the ability of the *Carolinian*, we prefer not to answer. We never deal in matters of a personal nature.

We commend the resolution of our cotemporary respecting the saddling of its ignorance upon us. We are not accustomed to saddles—we prefer leaving them to Baalam's beavers.

"WE KNEW IT.—Some time since, we stated that the opposition were evidently going over to the Black Republicans, and warned Southern men of the fact; but we had no idea that our statement would be corroborated so soon.—We learn from one of our opposition exchanges, that should the Democrats succeed in electing their Governor in Virginia, the opposition will feel perfectly justified in voting for Seward, Hale or Greely. Here is the cloven foot at last!"—*Fay, Carolinian.*

"Will the 'Carolinian' please inform us what was the name of the 'opposition exchange' from which it got the precious bit of information conveyed in the short paragraph above? And furthermore, are we to understand it to say that all who oppose Democracy are willing to vote for Seward, Hale or Greely in case John Letcher, Esq., should be elected Governor of Virginia? We would like our cotemporary to answer us these questions."—*Wilmington Herald, 12th inst.*

We are sorry that it is impossible to give the name of this Opposition paper; but we will communicate to our friends the *Herald*, a slight hint with reference to the *locus in quo* of the said opposition exchange, and by way of helping the memory of our cotemporary, who had equal opportunities with ourselves to learn the fact, take a few extracts from the columns of two exchanges.

One of the opposition exchanges from which we learned this precious information, is printed scarcely two miles from our own sanctum—its date 7th April, '59. The following is an extract from the communication which we found in its columns:

"But should the Democrats succeed and elect Letcher, I think I may, with equal consistency, vote for Seward, Hale or Greely."

Another opposition exchange, from which we learn the same in substance, is a paper printed in Wilmington, N. C., entitled the *Herald*, date 12th April, '59:

"But really, we don't know that the opposition could injure the country much should they elect either of the men mentioned above."

"This is the cloven foot! We do not say that all who oppose the Democracy would vote for Seward, Hale or Greely. The body of the Southern opposition are honorable men, for whom we entertain the highest regard. We would have no fears of them, if left to themselves; but their journals and leaders may carry them astray."

Is our cotemporary satisfied with our answer?

Our cotemporary of the *Democrat* need not be alarmed about quarrelling with us, we never quarrel with our friends—we consider it a contemptible trait in any journalist who is unable to discuss a question without emiting.

We would not force our friends of the *Democrat* into a discussion. Such was not our design. We are however, glad to see it acknowledge the fact that squatter sovereignty differs from non-intervention. This is what we have contended for.

The *Democrat* may rest easy as to ourselves and the opposition. We have a word for each in their season. We never trim our sails to suit the popular breeze—we have them set to principles which never change.

The *Democrat*, or some of the supporters of the Douglas expediency, will please tell us how it is that Douglas was the author of the following resolution which was reported to the Mississippi Delegation at the Cincinnati Convention, and also explain how it compares with the Douglasism of the present day?

"Resolved, That the National Democratic party believe in the perfect equality of the States, and that the citizens of every State have an equal right to elect peaceably to the Territories, and to take with them whatever is recognized as property in the States from which they go, and that receive for it adequate legal protection; that there is no power in Congress or in the Territorial Legislatures to exclude from the Territories anything which is regarded as property in a State; but when a Territory has sufficient Federal population, lawfully ascertained, to entitle it to one Representative in Congress, (i. e. according to the present ratio, 93,420,) it is the duty of Congress to authorize the Territory to form a State Constitution, republican in its form, preparatory to admission into the Union as a State, and that it is no constitutional ground of objection to the admission of such State that the Constitution thus formed either admits or excludes slavery."

To the Editors of North Carolinian:
I am sorry to see in your last issue that you have decided not to expose any further the scheme which has gained a footing in our party. This should not be permitted to rest. This theory called Douglasism, is at war with every principle of justice and equality. It should be nipped in the bud. Let us hear from you again upon this subject.

RICHMOND.
In reply to "Richmond" we would say that we are not alarmed about the matter assuming any thing of a dangerous aspect, because whichever party adopts this theory will surely be defeated. It has not yet attained a proportion sufficiently large to be called a Democratic measure, not even of the present-day Democracy, i. e. the expediency democracy who have borne the last remains of principle to their resting place, and hoisted the standard of expediency to allure a few Northern abolition supporters. "Richmond" may feel assured that we will never forsake the time-honored principles of Democracy. We will never leave the party,—if it chooses to leave us we are not to blame.

TREASURE FROM A WRECK.—At the offices of Messrs. Abell and Langley, bullion brokers, London, there are now to be seen gold bars of the value of £11,000, and silver bars valued at £4000, fished up from the wreck of H. M. S. *Lutine*, which was lost off the coast of Holland, on the 21st of October, 1799. After sixty years' immersion the gold looks as fresh as if it had just been taken out of the bank. The silver bars, on the other hand, have become externally almost black, under the action of the salt water; and some of the dollars, which have been also saved, are so much corroded that they are worth only one or two shillings each.—*Petersburg Express.*

THE SLAVE, DANIEL WEBSTER.—The Philadelphia *American* says:—
We understand that this much talked of colored man is now on his way to Canada. Fearing that if he remained in Philadelphia he would, at some future time, be again arrested, his friends have transported him beyond the reach of claims in the future. A fact has transpired in relation to Daniel which, if before made public, would have somewhat lessened the sympathy felt for him. It is that, when he absconded or escaped from Virginia, he left behind him a wife to whom he was married by a minister of the Gospel. As he was married to another female in Harrisburg, it follows that Daniel was guilty of bigamy. Had he been remanded by the Commissioner, Mr. Brewer's intention was to have given, towards purchasing his freedom, the fee received from the claimants, and a hundred dollars in addition. We understand that one of the colored witnesses has since acknowledged that he knew, at the time he swore to the contrary, that Daniel was an escaped slave, and that the District Attorney is now considering whether or not to cause his arrest on a charge of perjury.

Giddings—No repose for the South.

This arch-enemy of the Constitution and the Union "still lives." He turned up at New York a few days since, and addressed a squad of young traitors with his oft repeated fanatical ravings. The Cincinnati papers also contain a communication from this hoary-headed traitor, in which he triumphantly says that the victory of the Abolitionists over the slavery sentiment of the country has been won. He says:

"The lovers of liberty at this moment wield the moral power of our nation; and a wide-spread influence must soon fall into their hands."

The Abolitionists throughout the North are promulgating the same sentiments. They no longer mince matters, but boldly and openly avow their determination to pursue their aggressions until they have finally consummated all their designs.

In view of these portentous demonstrations, we would again call upon the South to look to her interests and prepare for the storm that will soon sweep over the land. We know there are those who ridicule and deride any allusion to the state and hackneyed subject of slavery. They call the friends of the South agitators, stigmatize them as disunionists; but, reader, we ask you to look the facts in the face, and then say, if you can, there is no cause for alarm. As we have before told you in these columns, the Abolition cloud which at first was no larger than a man's hand now over-shadows the nation. Thirty years ago the Black Republican party in Congress did not exceed a dozen, and these few miserable creatures were insulted, laughed and despised in every section of the Union. But now they have the numerical strength and will push their aggressions until they accomplish, to the full extent, all their hellish schemes.

The question of Abolitionism, like Aaron's rod, has well nigh swallowed up all other. They are gathering their forces and will soon present a mighty phalanx, and march upon the South for the purpose of spoliation. It is less for the South to beg, implore, beseech and entreat with the hungry plunderers. This task of degradation and humiliation has already been performed. Compromise and concession have availed nothing. The bright fruits, which it was expected would fill the land by concession, like those on the shore of the Dead Sea, have turned to ashes on the lips of the Southern people, who have so long fought for repose—freedom from constant outrage. The poet tells us that we approach crime by degrees, that what at first seems a hateful monster is soon pitted, endeared and embraced. The same may be said of the Southern people, for the craven spirit of submission is daily increasing.

The most revolting sentiments are now tolerated, and it will not be long before our people will show a willingness to pity, embrace and endure any man who may dare to desert the South, or ever espouse the cause of blamable abolitionism. In the language of Hayne, of South Carolina:

"If we could go to yon tomb at Mount Vernon, awaken the illustrious dead, and tell him how much we have endured on account of the inheritance which our fathers left us, he would cry out in the language of the murdered father of Hamlet, urging his son on to avenge the honor of his household."

"If thou hast nature in you bear it not."
Beset by traitors at home, and a flushed and defiant enemy abroad, it becomes the true friends of the South to renew their exertions to arouse the people as to the dangers that beset them, and to prepare to meet an issue which may be postponed, but cannot be evaded.

The Democracy of Kansas.

We learn from the *Pennsylvanian*, that the Democratic Territorial Executive Committee has called a State Convention to be held at Tecumseh, on the 10th of next month, for the purpose of a thorough organization of the party in the Territory. Many of the leading Free State men are prominent in the movement, and several counties have already elected delegates. As an indication of the views entertained by our Kansas brethren we give the proceedings unanimously adopted by the Democracy of Jefferson county, on the 21st ult:

WHEREAS, The question of slavery which has heretofore been the chief and ruling subject of difference among us in political sentiments, is now, in our opinion, virtually settled, so far as its introduction or prohibition in this Territory is concerned, by the voice of the people, and by the acquiescence of all parties in this unmistakable verdict in favor of Kansas being a Free State; AND WHEREAS, The intolerant spirit of fanatical sectionism, evinced by a certain portion of the citizens of this Territory, does not accord with the principles which we entertain, in regard to the best interests of our Territory, and the policy to be pursued to secure to us permanent peace for the present, and prosperity and advancement in the future; thus rendering it necessary to effect an organization of ourselves into a political party in order to more effectually oppose the policy we deem wrong in its tendency, and support the one we consider right; therefore,

Resolved, That we organize ourselves and be known as the Democratic party of Jefferson county.

Resolved, That we adhere with strict and abiding confidence to the great cardinal principle of Democracy enunciated by Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Folk, and others of like faith, and re-affirmed by the Democratic party of the Cincinnati Convention of 1856.

Resolved, That we sustain and support the provisions of the Kansas Nebraska bill, as containing the only true and Democratic principles, for the settlement of all vexed questions among the people of a Territory, in forming themselves into a State Government.

Resolved, That we are opposed to all and every attempt made by agitators, to disturb the peace and quiet of our own Territory and the peaceful relations between us and the citizens of our neighboring States.

Resolved, That we are opposed to free negroes being permitted habitations in this Territory, either as our equals in increasing political rights, or in any way whatsoever.

Resolved, That the fair and manly course of Governor Medary, in his general actions in this Territory, meets our approbation and respect.

WAKE SUPERIOR COURT.—At the present term of this Court, Hogue was convicted of the murder of Parrish at Winton's Hotel in this City last January. Robins was convicted of bigamy, and Nathaniel Ship, charged with committing manslaughter on E. A. Merritt, was acquitted, it appearing that he acted legitimately in self-defence.

At 11 o'clock on yesterday, Hogue was taken into Court for the purpose of receiving the sentence of death. The counsel for the prisoner asked for a new trial on the grounds that the Judge had improperly charged the Jury on some points and urged some other reasons, but the Judge overruled the petition, and then passed sentence of death upon the prisoner, appointing the 20th day of May next as the time for the execution.—The counsel for the prisoner then appealed to the Supreme Court.—*Ral. Standard of the 9th inst.*

The Various Phases of Squatter Sovereignty.

When General Cass first brought forward the doctrine of squatter sovereignty, Mr. Calhoun denounced it as worse than the Wilmot proviso. It was, in the first place, the exclusion of slavery, by act of Congress, from our territories. Congress did not, as the Wilmot proviso required, directly prohibit slavery in our territories, but it did the same thing by squatter sovereignty, indirectly, by empowering the Territorial Legislature—organs of its creation—to do it; and, in the second place, it was a more ignominious expedient of our exclusion than the Wilmot proviso. For the southern people to be prohibited from entering our territories, by all the States as a body, through their duly authorized agents in Congress, was a wrong, yet a wrong inflicted by equals; but to be excluded by the emigrant population which first enters our territories—the refuse of the old State—many of them fugitives from justice, bankrupts in fortune and character—citizens of foreign nations—many of them owning not a foot of land but by occupancy—few in numbers—organized into a government by Congress, a power without them, who appoints their Governor and their Judges and their Marshals, and can nullify all their laws—is an instrumentality of exclusion as degrading to the great State constituting the South, as it was absurd and contemptible in itself. But audacity may be equal to any political empiricism when it meets willing or submissive dupes.

By belittling popular rights and popular sovereignty, a party actually arose who tried to lift up this miserable humbuggery to the dignity of a principle. It was a mere expedient of abolitionism to do quietly in our territories what could not be done in Congress. Hence the boast of Senator Douglas, when the Kansas-Nebraska bill passed Congress, that it was the best abolition measure which had ever been adopted by Congress. When the decision in the Dred Scott case pricked this empty bubble and dispersed it into thin air, it was supposed that all portions of the democratic party at least would give a cheerful acquiescence to its authoritative exposition of the rights of the South. But not a man actually arose who tried to get up to maintain the constitution or the rights of the South. It was gotten up to set aside both—to extend the sectional ascendancy of the North. Hence, when the Lecompton constitution of Kansas was adopted by all the forms of popular rule—first in convention, where the people were called together in the elemental capacity; and second, by a direct vote of the people on the constitution—a new expedient—a new phase of squatter sovereignty, was invented to defeat the South in a constitution tolerating slavery. All the people, it was alleged, did not vote. There was a majority silent and inert, who were opposed to the Lecompton Constitution; and this dumb and speculative majority were the true squatter sovereigns, before whom Congress should bow, and the rights of the South in the admission of a slave State, under all the forms of popular rule and law, should be defeated. Senator Douglas was the grand political harlequin to play off this new jugglery on the South. The administration of Mr. Buchanan opposed it. It recommended the admission of Kansas into the Union under the Lecompton constitution. With an almost united South to support it, it was defeated by an almost united North. Every press in South Carolina, we believe, without exception, supported the administration. But the sectional interests of the North, as it always does, rose superior to all considerations of party or reverence for the constitution, and, predominating in Congress, passed into the last fall elections.

Although the South was defeated and Kansas was won by the North, the fever of sectional interests, ambition and fanaticism so kindled the people of the North that the democratic party was divided, and the administration, throughout the free States, was overthrown and condemned. Now comes a new phase of squatter sovereignty. It comes from the South. It is an expedient not of abolition but of submission. It is an expedient to keep the democratic party together, and thus reach, by the next presidential election, the spoils of office. It is called non-intervention. The Supreme Court of the United States has solemnly determined that the southern people have an equal right to enter our territories with their slaves, and to be protected therein. As all territories are organized by Congress—as Congress determines their boundaries, establishes their government, and makes void or make them as territories—southern statesmen in Congress have contended that a Territorial Legislature has no right to exclude slavery from our territories; and if, from any cause, slave property in our territories require protection, it is the duty of Congress to afford it. This is the simple, plain right of slaveholders in the territories under the authoritative exposition of the Constitution of the United States by the Supreme Court of the United States. If the constitution is carried out and protection is afforded to slave property, as the Territorial Legislature of New Mexico has lately done, well and good. Or, if, through the judges and marshals of a territory, not appointed or controlled by abolitionists, the same protection is afforded, still better. All the South wants, and has a right to demand, is that her people shall be practically as completely protected in their property in our common territories as the people of the North.

If, by any hostile proceedings in a territory, the protection is not afforded the southern citizen, Congress, the agent and administrator of the territories "belonging to the State," is bound to afford it. That will never do, says the advocate of the new phase of squatter sovereignty. Non-intervention is the policy of the South. If the people of a territory will let the southern slaveholder keep his slaves in a territory, be it so; but should they take away his negroes, let them take them. They should be sovereign. We can't help ourselves. They will not enforce any laws of Congress by their juries, passed to protect the slaveholder; and, therefore, let him go down. Law and constitution, and the solemn decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, all guarantee his rights; but the abolitionists in a territory will not allow them to exist. Therefore they ought to be abandoned. Squatter sovereignty, carried out by congressional non-intervention, is the policy of the South. The southern statesmen who lately, in the Senate of the United States, exposed and defended the rights of the South in our territories, against the unconstitutional pretensions of the North—Mason and Davis, Hunter and Brown, Clay and Iveson—committed a "folly." They paled the part of hot-headed extremists. They actually, for the sake of mere principles—abstractions, ventured to put in peril the honor of the Union, but the pros and cons of the thousand southern aspirants and officials. Is it not more wise, more statesmanlike, more calmly, safely patriotic, to abandon these distant rights—especially as the rights of southern citizens in the common territory have already, to so great an extent, been given up with such fine effects upon the sectional equilibrium and the preservation of southern power? Should we hesitate to yield them up in view of the aforesaid results? Is it not the true con-

servative and rational course? Is not "discretion the better part of valor?" Is it not a correct principle of common sense, that

"He who fights and runs away,
Will live to fight another day?"

Is it not right to encourage our northern friends, who are really hostages in the hands of our enemies, by giving up, time and on every issue which arises, all that our worst enemies desire? Is it not the part of prudence, under all these trying circumstances, to continue to be "cheated" of our territorial rights,—to shut our eyes hard and to be half-killed-well met with our allies—albeit we know them to be "juggling hinds," in the bad bargain made in '54.

"That palter girth us in a double sense;
That keep the word of promise to the ear
And break it to our hope?"

Or is it true there was no "cheating" at all in the matter? Was the non-intervention compromise intended, from the outset, to be nothing more nor less than a surrender of discretion, which good faith now requires should be perpetuated as an abject and total abandonment of the rights of southern men to people the common territories? This interpretation was never given it at the South; yet this is the interpretation now attempted to be put upon it by some to meet the requirements of party and its anti-Lecompton squatter sovereignty enemies in the North.

In this connection, we cannot but express our profound regret at the silence of the Senators from South Carolina during the great debate at the close of the late session. South Carolina might have added to the effect it has produced upon the southern mind, and silenced the apologists of Douglas.

From the Washington Union.

Democracy and the Tariff.

The New York Herald has compiled the following comparative statement of the duties levied on prime articles of consumption by the new tariff, as contrasted with those of previous years. It affords a happy illustration of what the anti-tariff party do when they come to legislate on the subject, as contrasted with the principles they avow when seeking the votes of the people. It will be seen that in every instance there is an increase, while in some the duties are nearly or quite doubled:

	1855.	1856.	1857.	1858.	1859.
	Pr. Pr. Ct.	Pr. Pr. Ct.	Pr. Pr. Ct.	Pr. Pr. Ct.	Pr. Pr. Ct.
Coffee	8 1/2	10	10	20	20
Molasses	6	11	11	18	30
Sugar refined	32	28	25	26 1/2	40
"other"	27 1/2	20	17 1/2	21	30
Tea	11 1/2	11 1/2	11 1/2	12 1/2	20
Boots and shoes	12 1/2	14 1/2	20	21	20
Harness	12 1/2	17	20	21	20
Cotton goods	12 1/2	13 1/2	15	15	20
Iron goods	12 1/2	13 1/2	15	16	20
Silk goods	12 1/2	13 1/2	15	17	20
Woolen goods	12 1/2	14	15	18	20

We clip the above from the Savannah Republican of the 1st inst, and were to consult our private feelings, we would spare the editor of that paper the exposition which duty to the democratic party compels us to make. Taking into consideration all the circumstances which surround the discussion of the present condition of our national finances, and especially the tariff question, at the last session of Congress, the above article exhibits as utter destitution of correct information as we now remember ever to have noticed in any journal. Whether viewed as a misrepresentation, or the result of ignorance, it is unpardonable, and is only another evidence of the means to which the opposition will resort to overthrow the only political organization in this country, whose policy is based upon well-defined constitutional principles. What are the charges embraced in the above article? That while the democracy profess to advocate a low tariff, they have actually increased the duties upon many articles to an alarming extent, and have changed the rates for five years, beginning with 1855 and ending with 1859. Now, what are the facts? The only alteration of the tariff which has taken place since 1846 was made in 1857, at which time a new tariff bill was passed, which went into effect on the 1st day of July, 1857. We give below the same articles, as taken from the table of the Savannah Republican, with the rate of duty under the tariff of 1846 and the tariff of 1857:

	1846.	1857.
Coffee	Free	Free
Molasses	30	24
Sugar	30	24
Tea	Free	Free
Boots and Shoes	30	24
Harness	30	24
Cotton goods	25	19
Iron	25	24
Silk goods		