

North Carolina Argus.

VOL. I—NO. 29.

WADESBOROUGH, N. C., THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1859.

NEW SERIES.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY
FENTON & DARLEY.
 TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.
 Single copies, Two Dollars per year, invariably in advance.
 To Clubs of Ten and upwards, it will be furnished at One Dollar and a Half per copy.
 No subscription received for less than six months.
 RATES OF ADVERTISING.
 One square, ten lines or less, brevier, One insertion..... 70c.
 Three insertions..... \$1.50
 Three months, or nine insertions..... 4.00
 Six months..... 9.00
 One year..... 18.00
 Advertisers must state the number of times they wish their advertisements inserted; otherwise they will be continued till forbidden, and charged according to the above.
 Agreements will be made with yearly advertisers on liberal and advantageous terms.
 Professional and Business Cards, not exceeding five lines in length, will be inserted for \$5 a year; if exceeding five lines will be charged the same as other advertisements.
 Ordinary notices free when not exceeding twenty lines; all above twenty lines at advertisement rates.

ASHE & HARGRAVE,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW.
 Practice in partnership in the county of Anson, except on the Criminal Docket in the County Court, (J. R. Hargrave being County Solicitor.)
 They will attend to the collection of all claims entrusted to them in Anson and the surrounding counties.
 T. S. Ashe attends the Courts of Richmond, Montgomery, Horry, Cabarrus, Union and Anson.
 J. R. Hargrave those of Montgomery, Stanly and Anson.
 Office at Wadesboro'.
THOMAS S. ASHE. | J. R. HARGRAVE.
 12-17

LITTLE & BATTLE,
Attorneys and Counselors at Law,
 WADESBORO', N. C.
 ALEXANDER LITTLE and B. H. BATTLE, Jr., Esq., having associated themselves in the practice of their profession, will promptly attend to all business entrusted to them in the Counties of Anson, Richmond and Union.
 Office opposite the Bank 17-20

ELVANS & THOMPSON,
WASHINGTON CITY, D. C.
 Dealers in Coach, Cabinet and Upholstery Hardware, Bar Iron and Steel.
 1007 A Complete Assortment of RUBS, SPOOKS, FELLOWS, SHAFES, &c. 12-17

DENTISTRY.
B. N. HORTON, DENTIST, WADESBORO',
 N. C., will operate on TEETH at the following LOW rates, for persons who call at my office to have the work done.
 On any cash. Gold Rings, \$1.50. Teeth on Silver, \$4. Teeth on Gold Plate, \$5 each up to six—all above that \$5 each. Full Upper Set on Sulfur, \$70; Lower Teeth, the same. All other operations equally low. When I have to credit my charges will be made. I can refer to those who wish to see of the most respectable dentists for whom I have plugged teeth eighteen years ago; the same plugs are still in and doing well. For others I have put in teeth on silver and gold plate, same full sets on suction, which they have worn for several years, and are still wearing, all doing well, and many other operations, which have been done for about eight years, all doing well. But I warrant all my operations, and have the advantage of upwards of eighteen years' practice, I have no doubt, but I can give satisfaction to all who are disposed to patronize and give me a fair trial, which is all I ask.
 N. B.—Having engaged in the Photographic Art, some have been induced to believe I had quit the practice of Dentistry. Now this is a false impression. I have not made enough to justify my retiring from the business. On the contrary, I am better prepared than ever to operate on teeth, and am still in the field, ready at all times to attend to all calls from this or any of the adjoining counties, and respectfully ask a continuance of that patronage heretofore so liberally bestowed. So come along and have your mouth put in laughing order, and then get one of my superb Ambrotypes.
 So you who have beauty to HORTON should take it, and you who have none should let him make it.
 10-15

S. S. ARNOLD,
 DEALER IN
 Dry Goods, Clothing, Hats, Caps, Boots, Shoes, Hardware, Groceries, Crockery, Saddles, Trunks, Bills, &c.
 AT THE OLD STAND.
 I HAVE NOW RECEIVED THE MOST OF MY late purchases of Fall and Winter Goods, comprising a much larger assortment than usual, consisting in part of the following articles, viz:
 Black and Fancy Silks, Brown and Red Sugars, Cashmeres, Kid, Java and Lag, Coffee, Merinos, Ains and Spem Candles, Poplins, Kerosene and Sperm Oils, DeLaines and Laces, Castor and Cod Liver Oil, Jaconet Muslins, White Lead and Zinc, Swiss Muslins, Paris Green in Oil, Barred Muslins, Chlorine Green in Oil, Brillantes, Window Glass, all sizes, Starch Shawls, Putty in Cans, Wool Shawls, Concentrated Lye, Kid Gaiters, Kerosene Lamps, Cashmere Gambles, Guns and Pistols, Carpenters' Tools, Groceries, Canned Goods, Nails, 30 to 404, Wall Wheels, Hoops and Hoop Skirts, Wall Buckets, &c.
 All of which will be disposed of on the most accommodating terms. Please call and examine before making your purchases.
 S. S. ARNOLD,
 4-17

A. E. BENNETT'S
DRY GOODS, HARDWARE AND GROCERY STORE,
 WADESBORO', N. C.
 I HAVE JUST RECEIVED MY FALL AND WINTER Stock of
DRY GOODS,
 Embracing CLOTHS, CASSIMERES, DELAINES, CALICOES, SILKS, &c., &c.
 Also, a fresh supply of
GROCERIES AND PROVISIONS,
 And a large and well-selected stock of
SCHOOL BOOKS.
 All of which I will dispose of for CASH, or on time to punctual customers.
 18-17

Horse-Shoing, Blacksmithing and Iron Work in General.
SMITH & LINDSEY RESPECTFULLY inform the people of Anson in general, and the citizens of Wadesboro' in particular, that they are carrying on the BLACKSMITHING BUSINESS, IN ALL ITS BRANCHES, at the well known STAND now partly occupied by Mr. E. F. FREEMAN, and that they are prepared to do and perform all work in this line of business with promptness. They guarantee that all work done at their establishment shall be finished in a workmanlike manner, and that there shall be no unnecessary delays and disappointments—that when a job is promised a certain time, when the article, the work shall be done, and well done, too.
 18-17

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
 ANSON COUNTY.
 COURT OF PEAS AND QUARTER SESSIONS, January Term, 1859.
 Walter B. Leak and James A. Leak, Executors, of Ann P. Leak, vs. John W. Leak, William C. Leak, and Others.
Petition for Settlement.
 IT APPEARING TO THE SATISFACTION OF the Court that the Defendant, Henry Steele, Eugene Steele and William Steele, reside beyond the limits of this State: It is therefore ordered by the Court that publication be made in the North Carolina Argus, a newspaper published in the town of Wadesboro', for six weeks, notifying the said Mary Steele, Eugene Steele and William Steele, to appear at the next Term of our said Court of Peas and Quarter Sessions, to be held for the County of Anson, at the Court-House in Wadesboro', on the second Monday in April next, and then to plead, answer or demur; or judgment final will be rendered against them and the said estate will be sold to satisfy the Plaintiff's claim.
 Witness, Patrick J. Coppedge, Clerk of our said Court, at office in Wadesboro', the second Monday in January, A. D. 1859.
 25-30 P. J. COPPEDGE, Clerk.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
 ANSON COUNTY.
 COURT OF PEAS AND QUARTER SESSIONS, January Term, 1859.
 Thomas C. Capel vs. Allen C. Ingram.
Additional Petition for Settlement.
 IT APPEARING TO THE SATISFACTION OF the Court that Allen C. Ingram resides beyond the limits of this State, or so conceals himself that the ordinary process of law cannot be served on him: It is therefore ordered, that publication be made in the North Carolina Argus, for six weeks, notifying Allen C. Ingram to appear at the next Term of this Court, to be held for the County of Anson, at the Court-House in Wadesboro', on the second Monday in April next, and then to plead, answer or demur; or judgment final will be rendered against him and the said estate will be sold to satisfy the Plaintiff's claim.
 Witness, Patrick J. Coppedge, Clerk of our said Court, at office in Wadesboro', the second Monday in January, A. D. 1859.
 25-30 P. J. COPPEDGE, Clerk.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
 ANSON COUNTY.
 COURT OF PEAS AND QUARTER SESSIONS, January Term, 1859.
 Joel Held vs. Calvin M. Falkner.
Justice's Execution Levied on Land.
 IN THIS CASE, IT APPEARING TO THE SATISFACTION OF the Court that the Defendant, Calvin M. Falkner, is not a resident of this State: It is therefore ordered by the Court that publication be made in the North Carolina Argus, for six weeks, notifying Calvin M. Falkner that a Justice's Execution against him, in the above stated case, was returned to the present Term of this Court, with the following levy endorsed thereon, to wit:
 "November 27, 1858. I, this day, for want of goods and chattels, levied this execution on one House of Lot, in the town of Wadesboro', adjoining A. Little and Dr. Howe, and also one other House of Lot, adjoining E. Bennett and others, as the property of C. M. Falkner."
 Witness, Patrick J. Coppedge, Clerk of our said Court, at office in Wadesboro', the second Monday in January, A. D. 1859.
 25-30 P. J. COPPEDGE, Clerk.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
 ANSON COUNTY.
 COURT OF PEAS AND QUARTER SESSIONS, January Term, 1859.
 Seth S. Arnold vs. Calvin M. Falkner.
Justice's Levy on Land.
 IN THIS CASE, IT APPEARING TO THE SATISFACTION OF the Court that the Defendant, Calvin M. Falkner, is not a resident of this State: It is therefore ordered by the Court that publication be made in the North Carolina Argus, for six weeks, notifying Calvin M. Falkner that a Justice's Execution against him, in the above stated case, was returned to the present Term of this Court, with the following levy endorsed thereon, to wit:
 "27th November, 1858, I, this day, levied this execution on two hundred acres of land, the property of the Defendant, C. M. Falkner, on the west side of Jones's Creek, joining J. B. Moore and others, being the lands be bought of Stephen Huddle, adjacent to W. Little and P. J. Coppedge a trust. J. E. HORN, C. C. WITNES, Patrick J. Coppedge, Clerk of our said Court at office in Wadesboro', the second Monday in January, A. D. 1859.
 25-30 P. J. COPPEDGE, Clerk.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
 ANSON COUNTY.
 COURT OF PEAS AND QUARTER SESSIONS, January Term, 1859.
 Madam Shaw vs. Calvin M. Falkner.
Justice's Execution Levied on Land.
 IN THIS CASE, IT APPEARING TO THE SATISFACTION OF the Court that the Defendant, Calvin M. Falkner, is not a resident of this State: It is therefore ordered by the Court that publication be made in the North Carolina Argus, for six weeks, notifying Calvin M. Falkner that a Justice's Execution against him, in the above stated case, was returned to the present Term of this Court, with the following levy endorsed thereon, to wit:
 "November 27, 1858. For want of goods and chattels I levied this execution on one House and Lot, in the town of Wadesboro', adjoining A. Little and Dr. Howe, and others, at one o'clock, as the property of C. M. Falkner."
 Witness, Patrick J. Coppedge, Clerk of our said Court, at office in Wadesboro', the second Monday in January, A. D. 1859.
 25-30 P. J. COPPEDGE, Clerk.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
 ANSON COUNTY.
 COURT OF PEAS AND QUARTER SESSIONS, January Term, 1859.
 W. P. & F. E. Kendall vs. Calvin M. Falkner.
 Edmund M. Robinson vs. Same.
 John W. McLehden vs. Same.
 Elizabeth Huntley vs. Same.
 Caroline Huntley vs. Same.
 Elijah B. Worley vs. Same.
 Mary Green vs. Same.
 Thomas Gallegher vs. Same.
 Patrick J. Coppedge vs. Same.
 Addison C. Moore vs. Same.
 Same vs. Same.
 Malcolm Shaw vs. Same.
 John Stacy vs. Same.
 Same vs. Same.
 Attachments Levied on Land.
 IT APPEARING TO THE SATISFACTION OF the Court that Calvin M. Falkner resides beyond the limits of this State, or so conceals himself that the ordinary process of law cannot be served on him: It is therefore ordered, that publication be made in the North Carolina Argus, for six weeks, for the said Calvin M. Falkner to appear at the next term of this Court, to be held for the County of Anson, at the Court-House in Wadesboro', on the second Monday in April next, and then to plead, answer or demur; or judgment final will be rendered against him in the above named cases, and the lands levied on condemned to satisfy the Plaintiff's claims.
 Witness, Patrick J. Coppedge, Clerk of our said Court, at office in Wadesboro', the second Monday in January, A. D. 1859.
 25-30 P. J. COPPEDGE, Clerk.

FRANCS, LEMONS, CANDIES,
 DRAGON, WATER and LEMON CRACKERS,
 COCOA NUTS, BIRCH NUTS,
 ENGLISH WALNUTS, FILBERTS,
 RAISINS, &c., &c. Just received by
 S. S. ARNOLD.
 18-17

BLANK WARRANTS FOR SALE AT
 this Office.
 18-17

NORTH CAROLINA ARGUS.

STICK TOGETHER.
 When amidst the wreck of fire and smoke,
 When cannons round the skies assuage,
 And fierce dragons with quivering stroke
 Upon the rolling regiment thunder,
 The ranks close up to sharp commands,
 Till helmet's feather touches feather,
 Compact the furious shock they stand,
 And conquer for they stick together!
 When now 'mid clouds of war and want,
 Our comrades' walls rise fast and faster,
 And charging madly on our front
 Come the black legions of disaster,
 Shall we present a wailing band,
 And fly like leaves before wild weather?
 No! side by side and hand in hand,
 We'll stand our ground and stick together!
 God go with hands—one of, one right,
 The first to help ourselves, the other
 To stretch abroad in kindly might
 And help along our brother;
 Then if you see a brother fall
 And how his head before the weather,
 If you be not a coward,
 You'll help him up and stick together.

ABSTRACT OF SPEECH OF HON. JOHN M. BOTIN,
 Delivered before the Order of United Americans, in New York, February 22, 1858.
 [CONTINUED.]
 Let Gen. Cass, who is an honest man and a patriot, with nothing more to expect at the hands of his party, be asked this day if he did not think "the man who would defeat the passage of that bill would be entitled to rank as the greatest benefactor of the age."
 Look, again, at Mr. Hammond, who is personally unknown to me, but who has publicly confessed that he voted against his own convictions of duty for the Lecompton Constitution, which he thought, as I think, "ought to have been kicked out of the Senate."
 I select these gentlemen as the most honorable, the most distinguished, and among the most favored of their party, holding seats in that body, which, from childhood we have been taught to look up to as the great conservative branch of the government; removed by the period for which they are elected from those influences that would naturally operate elsewhere; and when we see such men as these in such positions as they occupied, thus tied down by party discipline, I ask what have we to expect from inferior men in inferior places, many of whom have no other wish and no hope than to live on popular favor at home, and on the public crib abroad?

What other than the Democratic party, bloated with arrogance, and glutted with confidence in their own strength, would have dared to disturb that healing measure of compromise which had given peace to distracted country for thirty-four years, only for the purpose of making a new issue by which they might, as they thought, more certainly retain their ill-gotten power?
 What mighty ills have not grown out of that disturbance?
 The legislation of our wisest and best men, of our most experienced statesmen, a long unbroken current of judicial decisions for sixty-four years, as expounded by Marshall and Story and Billings and Washington, all swept by the board; an old wrong, and the ship of state turned loose upon the waves of faction—tossed and strained and worn, drifting no one knows where, and encountering no one knows what; striking upon the rock of popular sovereignty here, the shield of squatter sovereignty there, upon which she is thrown, first upon her beam ends and then upon her bows, straggling and straining for relief—and with no pilot at hand, and no helmsman, nor compass, nor sail, nor mast, nor spar, to run or guide her into port. Yet, notwithstanding all this, she will neither strand, nor founder, nor wreck, but, in defiance of the mismanagement of all on board, she will ride triumphantly upon the waters—find her way into port—be brought into dock, overhauled and repaired, and again launched with officers and crew that will put her on her old track and weather every storm; but no thanks for this to her present officers and crew, but to her own stout frame and superior sailing qualities.
 But what shall be done with those who have perpetrated this grave offense? Shall they go unwhipped of justice; or shall they pay the penalty of their guilt?
 How stands the question now of the power of legislation for the Territories? Does it remain where the Constitution placed it, where it had been exercised for sixty-four years, and where the judicial tribunals of the country had decided it to exist, in the Congress of the United States? or does it abide in the Territories themselves?
 We have some new theory broached on this subject nearly every day, because from the moment they departed from the old landmark, they have been bawling and blundering and stumbling from bad to worse, like a blind horse in ploughed ground, simply for the reason that there was no path to follow, and no road to travel, and no sign-post to guide; and you must get back to the Constitution and the power must remain where it was lodged by the Constitution—in the Congress of the United States—before matters will get straight again.
 This power Congress has no authority to transfer; they have no choice but to exercise it themselves. If the power is given to Congress to legislate for the Territories, they have no more right to divest themselves of that power and transfer it to the Territorial Legislatures, than they would have to divest themselves of the war-making power, and transfer it to the State Legislatures. And if the power is not vested in Congress, where do they derive the power by legislation to transfer the authority to the Territory? This proposition is too plain and simple to embarrass the mind of any statesman. Away, then, with all new fangled theories and experiments of popular and squatter sovereignty, unknown to the Constitution. It is sheer nonsense and folly; there can be no harmony of action, no peace, no agreement as to the power, until this holy law is abandoned and the Constitution is restored to its original action and to its true interpretation. If, then, I am asked, as I often am, what about Senator Douglas's new theory of squatter sovereignty—I answer, according to the terms of the Kansas-Nebraska bill he is all right; but, according to the Constitution, he is all wrong, essentially and radically wrong; extra judicial political opinions that have been made to hinge upon the Nebraska bill, and not upon the Constitution, to the contrary notwithstanding.
 This is a position that no argument can refute and no sophistry evade. Its constitutional law, settled and carried out in practice by better and wiser men than those of the present day, and judicially decided and expounded by a pure, upright, and independent judiciary, who had no political objects to accomplish, and no party to serve or obey.

To the masses of Democracy I cannot and do not impute any other motives than such as control us in the Opposition. I believe they are as honest in purpose, and patriotic in design, as the masses of the Opposition; but in Southern States, where alone Democracy remains triumphant, they are misled by demagogues and shallow leaders, who have wormed themselves into their confidence. They are kept, too, in a state of profound ignorance and darkness, by the fact that nearly the entire South is represented by the Democracy—who keep the county flooded with nothing but Democratic demagogues which never expose Democratic misdeeds. From my own State, we have fifteen Democratic representatives, in the two houses of Congress, not one of whom, I presume, ever sent an Opposition speech or document into the State; or if they did, it was swept from all such profane documents as withheld. I say this as an apology for the condition of things that exists in Virginia. But, if they could have the same opportunity that has been held out to the North, to see for themselves to what condition Democracy has brought the country, they would be as willing to throw off the galling yoke as have been the Democracy of Maine, New Hampshire, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, all of which they were once proud to number in their ranks.
 I am not prepared to admit that the Democracy of Virginia are more benighted and ignorant than the Democracy of the other States; nor are they less patriotic, nor are they less interested in good, wholesome, salutary legislation, if they were only afforded the same facilities for forming a sound and correct judgment.
 Have I said too much of the sacrifices this Democratic party is at all times prepared to make of principle, or consistency, in obedience to party spirit, and party fealty? Let us see; and if I have, let me be visited with public condemnation, as one who has calumniated their good name and fame.
 I will not go back into those old, hackneyed questions, such as Internal Improvements by the General Government—not of what they have possessed in their platforms, and practiced in Congress—for all that, I disapproved in the campaign of 1850—in what is commonly known as my African Church speech. I will confine myself to issues of a later date.
 In 1848, there was not a Democrat in the Southern States who did not especially repudiate and eschew the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty—as set forth in Gen. Cass's famous Nicholas letter, and who did not strictly deny its liability to such an interpretation. In 1854 there was not one Southern Democrat in either House of Congress that did not vote for this identical Squatter Sovereignty doctrine, which constituted the basis of the infamous Kansas-Nebraska bill; and now, in 1858, again they are as much opposed to that doctrine as they were in 1848.
 Does this, or not, establish their claim to principle or consistency?
 Again, it was but a few short years since, that the entire South supported the Missouri Compromise, in Congress and out of it, as a thing to be sacred and too holy to be touched. In the Legislature of Virginia it was declared, by a vote of 117 to 19, that any attempt to repeal that compromise would be a just cause for a dissolution of the Union; and that it would be resisted at all hazards, and to the last extremity. In 1854 every Southern Democrat in both Houses of Congress, voted, as a party measure, to repeal that Compromise, and every Southern Democratic paper, public speaker, and voter, without an exception, as far as my knowledge extends, supported them to the very echo—and I, myself, was loudly denounced, as a traitor to the South for resisting its repeal; and there were some whose rash and intemperate zeal so far outstripped their Democracy and discretion as to counsel my expulsion from the State for my unreasonable opposition to the disturbance of our peace.
 Does this, or not, establish their claim to consistency or principle, or does it show their readiness to yield both to party dictation and party success?

In 1854, now intervention was the universal cry of Democracy—South; now they begin to find non intervention too pay, and already they raise the cry of *Intervention*, as indispensable to the protection of their property, and the preservation of the Union. Perhaps they may rest their claim to principle and consistency on this sudden transformation.
 They claim to be a State rights party, and utterly deny that any man can be a friend to the rights of the States, who does not attach himself to their Democratic organization.
 Well—in the course of my reading and my experience, I have known of but few instances in which there has been any attempt on the part of the general Government to interfere with, or encroach upon, the rights of the States; and these few are very striking and very remarkable instances, as well as of transcendent importance, and of very recent date, and have all been originated and been sustained by the Democratic party.
 The first case was that of the Lecompton Constitution—in which the doctrine was asserted by a State-rights Republican-Democratic President—that it is the title they have assumed to themselves—and strenuously attempted to be carried out in Congress, that it was in the power of the Federal authorities, to legislate one of the Territories of this government, as a State, into the Union, with a constitution which had never been submitted to the people for ratification, or the assented ground, that if submitted it would be rejected, and against which seven-tenths of the people of that Territory were then reonstrating and protesting a doctrine that struck a death blow at the basis and foundation of our revolution; a doctrine that denied both the right and the capacity of the people for self-government; a doctrine, the advocacy of which, in the absence of party machinery and party demands, there was not one of its advocates within the broad limits of this nation, whose standing and popularity could have withstood the storm of popular indignation and wrath with which he would have been overwhelmed; a doctrine that was the most anti-Democratic, anti-Republican, anti-State rights, anti-constitutional, anti-common sense, and anti-common honesty doctrine that was ever propounded to the American people; and yet there was not one Southern Democrat, in either House of Congress, that had the consistency, the principle, or the independence to vote against it. And it is an historical fact, never to be forgotten or overlooked, that the only party in this country that could be found to give it their support was the Democratic Republican State rights party, and that that fraction of the party, claiming "par excellence," to be the true and genuine simple pure, State rights

party, gave it the most earnest and active support.
 For my own part, having just returned from abroad when this question was raging with its greatest violence in Congress, I stood by, an inactive, but not an unconcerned spectator, feeling that if the final result should show that the power and influence of the President had become so impotent and overwhelming, or that the people had become so debased and indifferent to their own rights and the enjoyment of free government, as to have submitted patiently to such outrageous and intolerable oppressions and wrongs, that then there was no despotism in the Old World under which I would not as soon have lived as under the tyrannical and iron despotism of Democracy.
 Thanks to God! the doctrine did not prevail; and thanks to God! the people are resolved to be left free, to choose their own form of government, in defiance of bribes offered on the one hand, and the threats of the other of the Democratic Republican State rights party, that now holds the reins of government in its hands, I trust for a limited period only; for if after this they shall be retained in power, the moral effect and virtue of the action of the people will have been thrown away.
 Does this action of the party indeed constitute Democracy? If a case parallel to this could occur in England, it would drive any ministry into everlasting disgrace, if no more. In France it would produce a revolution, that no power of government could resist. In Russia, it would be regarded as an act of detestable tyranny, against which the serfs themselves would rebel. Yet, here, it is claimed as evidence of Democratic consistency, and adherence to the principles of true Democracy.

Look, again, at the question of the admission of Kansas under a new constitution. Every Southern Democrat has already voted for its admission, under a constitution that the people of Kansas have disapproved, rejected and spurned. They were offered admission with their 55,000 population, if they would ignore all that had passed, stifle themselves and yield obedience to the dictation of the Federal Executive and Congress; and now, since they have indignantly rejected the bribe, and spurned the threats which accompanied it—it is recommended by the representative of the Democratic State rights party, that one rule shall be adopted for the admission of Kansas, and another for Oregon, and all the other Territories of the United States.
 May we not ask, in the name of Heaven, what has this Government come to? In what direction are we drifting? What have we come to reach? Is this Democracy? Is this justice? Is this honesty? Is this constitutional liberty? Is this what our fathers fought for? Is this State rights? Is one Territory to be left free to form a government to suit itself, and another to be required to frame one to suit the President or the Democratic party? Is this the way the President hopes to put down agitation, and restore harmony to our already distracted country? Yet where is that party which looks up in relief, for the equality and sovereignty of all the States? Where is that Democracy that is always leeching in prebunching the equality and sovereignty of the people?

But perhaps the most glaring outrage ever yet perpetrated, or proposed against the rights of a State, may be found in the action of the Democratic party in the Senate of the United States, in relation to the two Democratic Senators who were confirmed in their seats, when there were no authorized legal contestants to dispute them, and at a time when their votes were supposed to be necessary for the passage of the Lecompton Constitution, or the English Montgomery bill, as it was called—and who were alleged to have been elected in violation of the Constitution and laws of Indiana; and now, when the Legislature of that State has elected two other Senators, according to the provisions and requirements of their constitution, and sent them, as the representatives of her sovereignty, to Washington, they find the doors of the Senate chamber rudely closed against them, on the ground that the Senate had made the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members, the case is adjudged, by their own *ex parte* decision, and they have no power to go behind their own act, to ascertain whether or not fraud or wrong has been committed. The case partakes of the nature of the Lecompton case, and raises the question as to whether the Senators of Indiana shall be elected by the legislative body of that State or by the Democratic party in the Senate of the United States.
 I have no time to enter into an argument of this case, but call attention to it as one of grave and great consideration, which would not have been raised with any Southern State in this Union; and if it had been, would have led to consequences ever to be deplored—and as it is, I presume, we have not yet heard the last of it—for a greater outrage I cannot well conceive—yet I have heard none voice raised against it by the State rights party of the South.

One other attempt at encroachment on the rights of the States must not be overlooked, and to which I beg to call the attention of the country, and I can conceive of a few cases calling more loudly for the anathemas and denunciations of the State rights party, and for their interposition in defence of the rights of the States.
 I allude to the recommendation of Mr. Buchanan in his message to Congress in 1857, and again, after twelve months deliberation, repeated in 1858, that Congress shall pass a bankruptcy law, to be applied to the State corporations, or banking institutions created by the States. That is to say—the power being conceded to the State governments to create incorporations, they now claim for the General Government the power to destroy.
 Each government is supposed to be distinct in their several organizations; each State government sovereign, and independent of all the rest, so far as their State governments are concerned, and each, likewise, separate, distinct and independent of the Federal Government in the exercise of all those rights not granted to the General Government.
 Yet, here is a State rights Democratic President claiming the power, and twice recommending under his guardianship the institutions of the States, as created by State authority. Take my own State for example, and I only take that because I know more of the interest held by that State in her banking institutions than I do of any other.
 In Virginia, there is not an incorporated bank in which the State itself is not a large stockholder, nor is there a railroad corporation in which it has not an interest of three-fifths or more. A crisis such as we had in 1837 comes on, the banks through out the country suspend specie pay-

ments; they apply to the State Legislatures to legalize the suspension, which is done; and then comes in the Congressional law to force them into bankruptcy. Here is a conflict between the State and Federal Governments—which is to prevail? As a State rights man, always prepared to stand up manfully for every legitimate right of the States, I maintain that it is a paradox to suppose that the power is anywhere given to one government to create, and to another to destroy.
 If the State of New York has the constitutional and legal power to incorporate her banks, she has the power to authorize or legalize a suspension of specie payments, whenever she thinks the interests of her people require it; and there is no power on earth that can legally interfere with it. The Government of the United States has no more authority to counteract the legislation of New York, than the Russian or British Government would have. Yet, there is the proposition, a second time made, after an interval of a year, by a State rights party; and if the State rights party do not adopt it, it is because they have lost all confidence in the President of their choice, or because they regard him as a setting star, whilst some star of greater magnitude is rising in a different quarter; but certainly, they have raised no outcry against it, as an attack on the rights of the States; and coming from the head of the party, they must be held responsible for it as a Democratic proposition until they have unequivocally repudiated and condemned it.
 Where, then, rests the claim of that party to the credit of being either the State rights or Democratic party of this country?

Within the last eighteen months, we have passed through a commercial revolution that has destroyed confidence, blasted credit, locked up capital, crippled the revenue of the country, left the public treasury bankrupt, brought us all into a condition that requires a prompt and speedy remedy, and the Democratic party, that is responsible for the whole of it, continues to present to the country, through the public press, in their political speeches and public documents, every variety of cause but the true one.
 Certainly there was some leading cause for such a catastrophe, which is worthy of investigation, and which if not removed, or if permitted to continue, must lead to similar results, at some future, perhaps no very distant day. The men of means and capital—the men of business and energy—who are most interested in looking into and correcting this great evil—are so engrossed in their daily pursuit after the almighty dollar, each one struggling with his neighbor, to see who can be the first to grasp it, and who seem to care either for the cause or for the remedy—and upon whom, at last, the necessity will develop of demanding, in a voice not to be disregarded, such a change in the political economy of the State as will secure them against similar disasters in future—those who interest themselves the least about it, and, without stopping to examine for themselves, suffer the most idle and absurd theories to pass current, as authority no more to be disputed than divine revelations.
 We can engage in no more important task, on this day of jubilee, than to institute inquiries and set the public mind to work upon this all-absorbing question.

Some (and among them the President) ascribe it to the expansion of bank credit, and he declares—that those "periodical revolutions, which have existed in our past history, must continue to return at intervals as long as our present unlimited system of bank credits shall prevail;" and the only remedy he suggests is the passage of a law, by the general government, to force the banking institutions of the States into liquidation and bankruptcy, whenever another revolution shall occur that will drive them into a state of suspension; although suspension may be legalized by the authorities from which they derive their existence, and occur again it must, if the present system is not speedily changed.
 Let us grant for a moment that the President is right, in ascribing this wide spread ruin to its true cause. In what manner does his proposition to lock the stable door after the horse has been stolen, remedy the evil? It must be perceived that if the banks could foresee or apprehend the trouble they might have to encounter, they would contract their issues in time to avoid the danger. But they cannot, and did not, and therefore, a bankrupt law, which would have a final and not a remedial effect, would have answered no beneficial purpose.

Now, I put it to the intelligent business men of New York to say if such a bankrupt law had been in existence in 1857, and instead of the suspension of your banks being legalized by the State Legislature had been forced into bankruptcy—whether it would have proved a remedy for, or an aggravation of, the evil?
 Would the country, at this day, have been better or worse off than it is now, if all the banks in the United States that suspended specie payments had been forced into liquidation and closed?
 I venture to say that such a state of desolation and universal ruin never fell to the lot of any nation of people, as would have fallen upon us. It was bad enough as it was; but we have reason to be thankful that this Democratic expedient had not been resorted to in time to have made it a hundredfold worse.

But, it is true that there was such an expansion; or, if there was, that it was the cause not only of the unexampled national distress in this country, but that our banking system had degraded the monetary affairs of the whole commercial globe; or is this a mere expedient of Democracy to divert attention from the real cause? In the first place—if it were true, it would only prove the necessity for putting down all such ill-regulated institutions, or of establishing a National Bank that would, as in all other countries, be a safe, furnish a currency that would constitute a circulation medium for its own citizens, with which you could travel and trade in any part of the Union, without a discount, at every turn, and that would, as the old bank did, keep the State banks in check, and correct the tendency of their part to over issue.
 I do not propose the Bank of the United States. I only mean to express, as my individual opinion, that no financial agent of the government has yet been adopted or proposed, that, in all respects, was more free from constitutional objections, or answered so good a purpose, as would a properly chartered and well conducted national bank. But go on, and let the Government continue the operations of their experimental sub-treasury, which withdraws \$50,000,000 a year from the purposes of commerce, trade, and manufactures, and we shall all see what will be the end of it.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]
 P. Morris, editor of the New York Home Journal, has been appointed Consul to Havre.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

[TO BE CONTINUED.]