NORTH CAROLINA ARGUS.

This Argus o'er the people's rights doth an eternal vigil keep—
No soothing strain of Main's son can lull his hundred eyes to sleep.

C. W. FENTON, Editor.

WADESBORO', N. C.

THURSDAY::::::::::::::::::::::JULY 26, 1860

FOR PRESIDENT,

JOHN BELL,

OF TENNESSEE.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,

EDWARD EVERETT,

OF MASSACHUSETTS.

ELECTORS AT LARGE.

Dr. R. K. SPEED, of Pasquotank.
Hon. GEO. E. BADGER, of Wake.

FOR GOVERNOR,

JOHN POOL,

OF PASQUOTANK.

FOR STATE SENATOR,

Gen. S. H. WALKUP,

OF UNION.

FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

E. R. LILES.
S. V. SIMONS.
L. L. POLK.

PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTION

Adopted by acclamation, by the National Convention of the Constitutional Union Party, at Baltimore, May 9, 1860.

WHEREAS, experience has demonstrated that platforms adopted by the partisan conventions of the country have had the effect to mislead and deceive the people, and at the same time to widen the political divisions of the country, by the creation and encouragement of geographical and sectional parties; therefore,

Resolved, That it is both the part of patriotism and of duty to recognise no political principle other than

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COUNTRY,
THE UNION OF THE STATES,
AND THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAWS.

And that, as representatives of the Constitutional-Union men of the country, in National Convention assembled, we here by pledge ourselves to maintain, protect and defend, separately and unitedly, these great principles of public liberty and national safety, against all enemies, at home and abroad, believing thereby peace may once more be restored to the country, the just rights of the people and of the States re-established, and the Government again placed in that condition of justice, fraternity and equality, which, under the example and Constitution of our fathers, has solemnly bound every citizen of the United States to maintain a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

CHOOSE YE WHICH IT SHALL BE—

Whig Ad Valorem,	*Or Democratic Ad Valorem.*
WHEREAS, Great inequality exists in the present mode of taxation, and it is just and right that all PROPERTY should contribute its proportion towards the burdens of State: *Resolved*, That we recommend a convention of the people of the State to be called on the Federal basis, as early as practicable, for the purpose of so modifying the Constitution that every species of PROPERTY may be taxed according to its value, with power *to discriminate only in favor of the native products of our State, and the industrial pursuits of her citizens.*—*Thirteenth Resolution of the Opposition Platform.*	*Resolved*, 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; at the same time we deem it the duty of the Legislature when passing acts for the raising of revenue, so to adjust taxation as *to bear as equally as practicable within the limits of the Constitution, upon the various interests and classes of* PROPERTY *in all sections of the State.*—*Eleventh Resolution of the Democratic Platform.*

TICKETS!! TICKETS!!

We have ready for distribution Pool Tickets, either to give away or sell to those who are disposed to pay for them. Do not delay—you who cannot come for them yourselves, send.

MR. POOL'S APPOINTMENTS.

We see in the last Charlotte Whig a list of appointments from Mr. Pool. By this list he was to speak at Asheboro' on the 23d, Charlotte on the 24th, and at Concord yesterday the 25th. To-day (the 26th) he speaks at Gold Hill, and to-morrow (the 27th) at Tyson's, in Stanly. On Saturday we shall have him here in Wadesboro'.

JOHN POOL.

On Saturday, people of Anson, you will be addressed at this place by John Pool, the candidate of the Opposition party for Governor of the State. Doubtless you will give him a fitting reception—a reception worthy the high position which he will shortly be elected to fill by a large majority of the unbought suffrages of the people of the State. He will address you upon the subject of ad valorem taxation, and he will scatter to the winds all doubts and prejudices which may have been instilled into the minds of any of you by Democratic presses and orators. Come and hear him, all ye people. Come, and be convinced of the justness of the cause he advocates. Come and learn from his own lips, the operation of the system of taxation which he proposes to inaugurate—a system which will enable you to pay your tax bills for all time to come, without touching a tin cup, or a chicken, hatched or unhatched, and without causing you to pay more than ten cents on the $100 worth of land. Hear ye him. The beautiful grove adjoining the residence of R. T. Hill, Esq., has been selected. Preparation will be made for the comfort of ladies, seats &c. provided. Come ladies—and hear your champion—the champion of equal rights and equal privileges.

ESCORT.

We understand the Anson Guard will turn out and escort Mr. Pool to our town. That is right—exactly right. Success to the Anson Guard.

CONCORD CAMP GROUND.

Inasmuch as Mr. Pool, on Friday, will address the people of Stanly at Tysons', and on Saturday the people of Anson at Wadesboro, it is thought best to postpone the meeting at the Camp Ground until further notice.

BEATEN.

From accounts from all parts of the State, and admissions on the part of Democrats, we have no hesitation in saying that Gov. Ellis will be the worst beat man that was ever in the State. Well might he say to Mr. Clingman, in despair, "If you cannot do something for me, I am gone!" Going, going, "gone"! "Alas, poor Yorick!"

ROADS.

On Monday during the discussion at Gum Spring, it was contended by a Democrat that if niggers were taxed as property they could not be compelled to work the roads. The absurdity of this proposition was exemplified by General Walkups' exclaiming, "to be sure if you tax a cow, it will prevent her having a calf!"

☞ Our readers, we hope, will overlook the absence of our usual news miscellany this week. This is the last issue before the election in which we can give matter bearing on the great cause we advocate, with the hope of aiding and advancing it.

☞ The weather, since our last, continues very unsettled. Many parts of the county have been visited by very delightful showers, tending, to a great extent, to dispel the fears of many that the corn crop would be totally destroyed. The prospect now is for a tolerably partial crop. Cotton is doing very well, and planters say would do still better for a little more rain, especially in the immediate locality of this village, which seems not to have been so much favored as other parts of the county.

☞ The Constitutional Union Convention of Connecticut will meet in New Haven on the 1st of August.

THE ELECTION.

To-day, one week, is the day of election. An important day to you, people of North Carolina, and important, in its results, to every man, woman and child in the United States. To you it will be important, on account of the great principle involved in the issue of the struggle which will that day take place—an issue which will decide whether or not you are to continue to pay the present exhorbitant tax bills, or whether an amount of property heretofore untaxed and a still larger amount which has only been half taxed, shall be taxed according to its value. Thus—you are now required to pay twenty cents tax upon every one hundred dollars worth of land that you own, whether that land be poor or rich—whether it be cultivated or not—whether it be washed into gullies—whether it be old fields, or whether it be composed of rich, productive bottoms. Would it not be fairer, if your lands were taxed according to their value? You would not object to pay twenty cents on your good lands—your productive lands—though *they* are subject to drouths and many other drawbacks. You can afford to do that—but upon your *waste* lands—your *good for nothing lands*, which are a burden and expense to you, are you willing to pay twenty cents for them? You are now *compelled* to pay it—compelled to pay twenty cents for that which is worthless, while millions of the most productive property in the State is not taxed at all? Is this fair—is it equitable? This is the issue. John Pool, if elected, will equalize your taxes. He will make all the young niggers pay tax *according to value*, and all niggers, young and old, pay a tax *according to value*, and all your lands will pay a tax *according to value*, and the result will be that your taxes will be reduced from twenty cents on the $100 to ten cents on the $100 worth. This is the question for you to decide. Gov. Ellis is *opposed* to taxing niggers according to their value, and as they are the only property that can be taxed, except what is already taxed, if Ellis is elected, you must pay twenty cents on all your lands, productive and unproductive, subject as they must be to a still higher rate of taxation. Now, which will you do? The question to be decided is, shall niggers and lands be taxed according to value? Will you pay twenty cents when you need to pay only ten? Consider these things! They concern you, immediately. There are other considerations, which, as *they concern you equally* with the people of other States, we will treat of in another article.

BE CAREFUL.

Voters, be careful! Be cool! Remember to vote no ticket that has not upon it the names of *two* of our candidates. No *single* shooting. Every single shot is an injury to your cause, and does not promote the success of your candidate any more than it would if you had another name upon it. Don't you see that the ticket having upon it two names, if one of them be the name of your favorite, counts the same for him as though it had his name alone upon it? Why, then, should you vote single shots? Every single shot is one vote in favor of Democracy. Be wide awake! Look to the main chance! Victory is within your grasp—a glorious victory over the party, which has for twelve years dragooned the State, and made all things, civil and political, to conduce to the success of the Democratic *party*—regardless of State or country.

It is now time for *you* to look a little after the interests of your State—after your own interests—for they are identical. There is but one way open to you at present to accomplish this. But that way is all sufficient, if you will embrace and improve it. Providence—aye, doubt it not (for he who doubts is damned)—God himself has opened up this way of escape for you. Look, the Egyptians are upon your track! For many years you have been hewers of wood and drawers of water for them—you have made bricks to build them fine houses to live in—but now you are on the line of march to victory and freedom. The way is open before you. March on, then. Your enemies are following you in vast numbers. They think they will find you hemmed in between the sea and the mountains. They see not the way of escape which Providence has prepared for you and lighted up to guide your steps to safety. Pass over, friends, pass over—the Pool is wide and deep—pass over, dry-shod. Yes, the Pool is wide and deep. Turn and look! Behold the destruction of your enemies! Lost in the whelming waters of the Pool, they sink to that oblivion which knows no waking, save that which summons them to judgment. Is not the way plain? Follow your gallant leader—vote for him! and remember, voters of Anson—no single shots! Charge both barrels! We have three candidates for the House of Commons, vote for two of them each shot—we don't care which two—they are all good—no better—no best—but vote for two—thus shall you discomfit your enemies—thus shall your noble leader, when the conflict is over, find himself surrounded by honest men, who will aid him to discharge his duty, as Governor of the State, in such a way that *your* interests and *her* interests shall be greatly promoted, and the cause of God and man prospered. Vote all double shots.

☞ "Gov. Ellis will never give you equality, only that equality which makes no distinction between you and the nigger. John Pool rates you as white men—John Ellis as niggers."—*Wadesboro' Argus.*

"Now look at that, and see how Gov. Ellis is misrepresented. When did Gov. Ellis ever rate a white man as a nigger? The people can see by the above to what extent the Opposition are carrying their enmity to Gov. Ellis. Will they tolerate such unfair charges for electioneering purposes?—*Western Democrat.*

"Take another view of it. It is not Gov. Ellis, but it is John Bell, who, in the United States Senate, sought to make no distinction between the free white man and the free 'nigger.'"—*Fayetteville Courier.*

When did Gov. Ellis ever rate a white man as a nigger? By refusing to tax the nigger other than as a white man! What better evidence do you want? But, says the sapient editor of the Fayetteville *Courier*, it is not Gov. *Ellis*, but *John Bell*, who, in the United States Senate, sought to make "no distinction between the free white man and the free nigger." The question has nothing to do with the "free" white man and the *free* nigger. We thought all *white* men were free. With the *free* nigger we have nothing to do. It is with *slaves* we have to do, which comprise so much of the property of the State, (and by far the most valuable.) John Pool is in favor of taxing them as *property*, according to value, Gov. Ellis is in favor of taxing them as *white* people. John Bell, neither in the Senate nor out of the Senate, ever "sought to make *no distinction* between the free white man and the free nigger." The *Democrat*, the *Courier*, and the *Standard* seem to be beating about for a "file leader."

DESPERATE—FIVE DOLLARS FOR A VOTE.

We were shown on Monday last, a letter from Fayetteville to a gentleman of this place, from which we learn that a desperate game is being played by the Democracy to elect their candidate for Sheriff. Democrats are offering *five dollars for a vote, and swearing men to vote for their candidate.* Nevertheless, says the writer, we shall defeat them. I feel confident of a good gain in this county for John Pool! Five dollars for a vote! Look out for breakers, friends of law and order! Don't you think that cause desperate, which employs such desperate and dishonorable means to secure success! God save the country from the tender mercies of a party whose reckless, extravagance and unblushing corruptions have reduced it to the necessity of employing bribery and oaths to secure votes! Voters, can you conscientiously give your support to a party which tempts men to violate their consciences—which bribes and corrupts and defiles and ruins, not only the bodies but the souls of your fellow beings?

☞ Let it be remembered that every mechanic and clerk who votes for John W. Ellis will be in effect voting to continue the present onerous and unjust tax on his hard earned wages.

SHORT SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST AD VALOREM.

Come, voters, Democrats and Whigs, and let us reason together for a brief space, and then (as the lawyers say) "the jury may take the case and make up their verdict."

To begin, then, at the beginning. Whence originated, and to what cause are we to attribute the interest felt in, and the importance attached to, this question—and why *just at this time?* Now, pause, and think a little. Some there are, who, to ward off the apprehended *political* effect of it, affect to sneer at it as mere political clap-trap, gotten up by politicians to accomplish *party* ends—but that is all affectation. Every one must see and acknowledge that the cause lies far deeper than the superficial schemes and tricks of mere politicians. It has taken too strong a hold on the public mind. It is none of your empty *free suffrage* business—no mere ghost of an abstract theory; but there is *reality* and *substance* in the thing. Then, what is the cause? how came it to be thought of? and why is it so earnestly taken hold of by the people? The answer is to be found in the fact that North Carolina owes a large debt, due and falling due in instalments, which demands that its resources be proportionately enlarged and increased. No complaint is now made, or sought to be made, of how this debt originated; it is enough for every true North Carolinian to know it is justly owing, and every citizen, be he Whig or Democrat, feels that it *must* and *shall* be faithfully and promptly met. To do this, new objects of taxation have, from time to time, been introduced into our revenue bills, and the taxes generally increased, until the call of the tax-collector is getting to attract the serious attention of the tax-payer. Disagreeable sensations manifest themselves about the purse strings; reflecting men have got to thinking, and as true statesmanship would suggest, they have commenced by an enquiry into the system under which the State revenues are raised—they are enquiring, "Is it founded upon just and equitable principles?" "Is it so arranged in its details as to bear equally and fairly on all?" We assure them that the subject of our *revenue system* is one of sufficient importance to demand serious enquiry; indeed, it cannot be denied. The burden of taxation is too seriously felt to allow any difference of opinion on that point. So far, then, we all agree. Well, we will assume, as not to be denied, that for any system of revenue to be just and fair, its burdens should be borne *equally* by *all*, in proportion to each tax payer's *ability* to pay, otherwise it is *unjust* and *unfair*.

By reference to our last revenue bill, it will be seen that an ad valorem tax is laid on sundry objects of taxation, such as *land*, merchandize or goods bought, ready made clothing, vehicles, liquors, &c.; and on sundry others a *specific* tax is imposed, as on white and black polls, circus-licenses, gates, billiard tables, cards, &c.; and again on profits, such as interest, mechanics, officers, lawyers and doctors' wages and fees, &c. Now, by comparing the taxes laid under each of these heads, there will be found many gross and glaring inequalities; for instance, $1000 in value of *goods bought* by a merchant is taxed $5, while $1000 value of *ready made clothing bought* is taxed $15. Why this difference? (And by the-by, who do you think pays this tax at last, the *merchant* or his *customer?* and that customer, too—one whose purchases at any one time are so small that he cannot afford to go to Charleston, Baltimore or New York, as many of their more wealthy neighbors do, and thereby avoid paying this tax.) Salaries, fees and mechanics' wages are taxed $10 on the $1000, and polls, white and black, eighty cents per head, &c., &c. However, in charity, perhaps, there should be *some* allowance made for these and such like inequalities, for the last Legislature were doubtless much pressed by the urgent necessity of raising money in some way, and they fixed up the thing the best way they could at the time, so as to *secure supporters enough to pass it;* and, beside, their blunders can be corrected by another Legislature, so far, at least, as the Constitution will permit. But the most striking inequality is discovered in reference to certain property, as to taxing which the power of the Legislature is limited and restrained by the Constitution—the organic law—that is slaves. The Legislature is only allowed to tax them as polls, or *persons*, not as *property*, and only such as are over twelve and under fifty years of age; *all others are exempt.* Therefore whatever tax is laid on the *slave* is imposed also on the *head* of the *white* man, (an inconvenience appreciated, no doubt, by members of the Legislature.)

Now A. owns a negro of taxable age, but for a variety of supposeable causes, is not of much value. Is it just and equal that he should pay as much tax on this negro as B. ought on a valuable slave mechanic worth $1,500 or $2,000, perhaps more? While A. may not realise enough on his negro's services to pay board and clothing, B. is probably receiving annually $500 or more from the services of his mechanic. Yet the Legislature is powerless to remedy this injustice.

Again: A. owns a tract of land valued at $1000—his tax is $2; B. owns a negro worth $1000, and pays but *eighty cents.* Where is the equality or justice of this? But the hands of the Legislature are tied by the *Constitution.* The result, then, of this inquiry is, that there are *various and oppressive inequalities* in our revenue system. But it appears, however, that this *one prominent* grievance the Legislature *cannot remedy*—that is, the tax on *slaves.* They must be taxed as *persons, per head*, or not at all. Now, the question naturally presents itself here to every candid enquirer—ought not this *constitutional* barrier to be removed?—does not justice and fairness say that a valuable slave mechanic should pay more tax than the slave not worth, perhaps, $200—that if the land is taxed according to value, so should *slaves* be? The inequality between these two species of property derives its importance from the fact that they constitute the *chief sources* of the State revenue, and the further startling fact, disclosed by the Comptroller's last report, that $208,000,000 in value of *slaves* only paid $118,330, while only $98,000,000 in value of *land* paid $191,980, making up an aggregate of $310,280 paid by land and slaves alone; more than half the entire revenue raised. Surely, then, surely all will admit that this *real grievance* ought to be redressed. *How is it to be done? Only by an amendment of the Constitution*, so as to enable the *Legislature* to tax slaves according to value, of whatever age. The *distinct, isolated proposition*, then, desired by the Opposition party to be submitted to the people is, "Shall the Constitution be so amended as to remove the restriction as to *taxing slaves.*" That is all. And in connection with this, they also announce that they are in favor of, (as a *principle*, which should be adopted in the adjustment of the details of a revenue bill by the *Legislature*,) ad valorem or taxation according to value as the most *certain, simple* and *practical* method whereby *equality* can be attained.

Now, what objection can there be to this? Is it fair that the owner of $1000 worth of *land* should pay $2 tax, and the owner of a negro worth the same should only pay eighty cents? Or why should $100 invested in land pay *twenty cents*, and the same sum invested in slaves pay only five and three-fourths cents? Again: is it just and equal that a *white mechanic* should pay a tax of $10 on the $1000 of his earnings, while the owner of a *slave mechanic*, earning the same amount, only pays *eighty* cents? Put these questions to yourself, and answer, is it fair and right? But strange as it may appear, objections are made to this proposition of simple justice. As to slaves, it is insisted that negroes under twelve are rather an expense than a profit, and therefore ought not to be taxed. Now, it is to be observed that this objection virtually admits the justness of ad valorem applied to slaves between twelve and fifty. But is the objection a valid one as to those under twelve? To answer this, we will simply ask the question, "What better investment can a man make of his money than in young negroes from one to twelve at current prices? Take your own or your neighbor's experience for the past ten or twelve years—look at that negro woman of yours or your neighbors, who ten or twelve years ago bore her first child. She now has six, eight, or ten children, very probably. When she bore her first child she was worth $1000. What is the family worth now, making a reasonable allowance for expenses of raising, &c., and what rate of interest has been realized? What investment of the same amount has yielded as much, nay, half as much profit? Then why should they not be taxed? Besides, what other species of property can be so readily converted into money at full prices? Again: they say under the ad valorem system everything, even to the smallest articles of household wares, &c., such as tin cups and the like, will have to be taxed according to value, which will yield but a trifling amount of revenue, and be very annoying, &c. Now, with all due respect, we must say this is quibbling about words, and shows to what petty shifts men will resort in support of a bad cause. When men undertake to lay down general principles as the basis for future action, or as the guide by which they prepare to be directed, *general* terms have necessarily to be employed, leaving details and minutiæ to be regulated as occasion may give rise to call them forth. So we say we are in favor of the *principle* of ad valorem being adopted in raising revenue, (this at one time was regarded as good *Democratic* doctrine,) that is, ad valorem shall be the *main, prominent* and *distinctive feature* running through the general frame-work of a *revenue bill;* of course in settling the *details* of such a bill, there will very probably occur instances where it would be impractical to apply the principle, such as taxes on privileges—*i. e.*, licenses to retailers, pedlars, &c., billiard tables, and the like. So, also, it would be a question how far the principle should be extended, practically, as to things of trifling value, such as tin cups, &c., all of which must necessarily be left to the same discretion of the Legislature. All men of common sense understand this, and we must say such arguments are unworthy the dignity of the subject. Furthermore, however, by referring to the platform of the Opposition party on this subject, it will be seen that, as indicating their meaning as explicitly as possible, they declare they are in favor of "so modifying the Constitution that every species of property *may* be taxed according to its value, with power to discriminate only in favor of the *native products* of our State, and the *industrial pursuits* of her citizens." Furthermore, it is argued, and in a quarter where more manly arguments, or silence, was to be expected, that according to the ad valorem principle the table of the poor man worth $10, and the rich man or gambler's billiard table, of the same value, (a cheap billiard table, by-the-bye,) would consequently pay the same tax. Now, by such an argument as this, men not only betray the desperate strait to which they are reduced, but also that they are willing to mislead, if thereby their ends can be accomplished. Why, what is a billiard table taxed at all for? Is it on account of the value of the table as an article of furniture, or *species of property?* Does not every ten year old boy know that it is on account of the use to which it is applied? Can it be possible that the distinguished functionary, who is said to have made this argument, really believed what he said? If, as we must suppose, *he did not*, then his *head* is saved at the expense of his *heart*, or *vice versa.*

All this kind or class of objections, however, are totally *irrelevent* and *inapplicable* in discussing a *principle*, and are more appropriately to be considered by the Legislature when they come to arrange the *details* of a *revenue bill.*

Ah, but say they, this is all a political manœuvre to effect a *party* triumph. Indeed, is this true, and if true is it likely to enure to the permanent advantage of either party? What party first mooted this question? What is its past history in that respect? As far back as 1852, Governor Reid, a *Democrat*, foreshadowed this much needed reform; but his party, then largely in the majority in the Legislature, permitted it to sleep. Again: In 1857-8, Mr. Bledsoe, a *Democratic* Senator, with the *approbation* of the *North Carolina Standard*, moved the subject, before a *Democratic* Legislature, and again it was allowed to slumber. The late Opposition State Convention took the matter up—it is incorporated into their platform; but still, however, it had not and could not assume a party cast until the Democratic State Convention, which *subsequently* met, had, as it was then compelled to do, assigned to the Democratic party the position they intended or desired on the question—they took ground *against* the movement. Then, and not until then, did it become identified with the Opposition party as a party question. Then, in all candor, we ask, who made it a party issue? How easy would it have been for the Democrats, had they so desired, (and 'tis said some of them did very much desire it,) to have fallen in with the movement—frankly approved of it as they should have done, and there would have ended all the controversy, and this important reform would have been achieved quietly, easily, and speedily, and both parties stood entirely unaffected by it in any way. So that it is quite apparent that if it has assumed a party phase the Democrats have themselves to blame for it.

But yet again: There are others of our Democratic friends who say, "We are with you on the merits of this reform; but it is badly timed. We are just out of the Harper's Ferry raid, and just entering an excited Presidential canvass; and there is already too much excitement on the subject of slavery, and the discussion of the *merits* of this reform has a tendency to array one class of our citizens against another, and tends also to encourage the abolitionists; just wait awhile and we will go with you." Now, is this so? Truly, it strikes us as a very strange view of this subject. As our revenue system now stands, with such manifest discrimination in favor of the slave-owner, it is well calculated to array the non-slaveholder against the slaveholder; and the obvious policy to prevent this result is to remove the cause as speedily as possible, and let the non-slaveholder see that he has an interest in protecting this kind of property, though not an owner, to the extent of the assistance it affords in raising revenue, and instead of arraying classes against each other, they become more firmly united; at the same time we will be placing ourselves right upon this question as a Southern State, by distinctly declaring that slaves in North Carolina are *property.* Already have leading Republican presses been jubilating over the opposition made to this thing by the Democrats, and augur favorable results to their cause from it. So, we think that objection tells the wrong way.

Lastly: There is another class of our Democratic friends who say they are in favor of ad valorem, but argue very industriously among their weaker brethren somewhat in this wise: "Ad valorem is all right, and at the proper time I intend to go for it; but it is no party question; and besides, if you elect Pool he can't make the amendment, and we will be no nearer it than we are now. So don't let us desert our party on this side issue; vote for Ellis, and when the question comes rightly before you then vote for ad valorem." Now, does not every man see and know that although neither Pool or Ellis, as Governor, can amend or change the Constitution in any way? Yet in the election of Governor is a convenient time and method of getting at the sentiments of the people on questions of constitutional changes—was resorted to on the Free Suffrage question, and is adopted now for that purpose; that it is universally so regarded, and that *every vote cast in the Governor's election will be viewed and understood as a vote for or against ad valorem; and according as the result of that election may be, so will the Legislature feel itself instructed to move or not to move in this matter; and without the movement of the Legislature nothing can be done.*

But how comes it that this question is so earnestly pressed at this time? Simply because the State is in debt, and the debt growing larger. A few years ago the State was out of debt, and the ordinary expenses only about $80,000. Taxes, consequently, were light. Now we have to raise annually about $600,000, with a probability of its going up to $800,000; and our taxes have, in consequence, become a serious matter, and each man feels disposed to inquire if his neighbor is bearing his equal share of this burden with himself.

Now, friend, lay aside your party-colored spectacles, put on the clear crystal glasses of unprejudiced inquiry after *truth*, and view this whole matter in all its phases, and say if you do not think with us, that ad valorem is a *just, fair and much needed reform.*

KNOW NOTHINGISM.

For months past Democratic papers have been filled with tirades against Know Nothingism—and what they were pleased to term the secret working of the order. The writers of these articles penned them in defiance of their own certain knowledge that that organization had long ceased to exist, and that there was not, in all the land, a single lodge left standing. They appeared to delight in designating John Pool as a *third* degree Know Nothing, and only ceased their clamor against him, as such, when that degree was published to the world, and it became evident that there was nothing contained in it to which the purest patriot and most devout and consistent Christian could with decency object. Let us see how the practice of the party tallies with the preaching of its leaders. After several failures to nominate a candidate for the Senate to oppose Gen. Samuel H. Walkup, the nominee of the only national party in the county, they apparently gave it up in disgust, and the General stood, confessed, the only candidate in the field. That party had at least two conventions to nominate a candidate for the Senate—but could only agree to disagree. The quondam great, invincible, incorruptible, indivisible, harmonious, "differ-but-never divide" party, could not find a man who would openly and above board, accept their nomination. How are the mighty fallen! Who would have believed, (tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askalon) who *could* have supposed that the immaculate Democracy, would attempt, *secretly*, to accomplish that which two conventions had found impracticable! Yet so it is. On the Delaware river there is a place called Point-no-Point—but in all our reading we have never come across such a thing as a candidate-no-candidate. Yet there *is* such a thing! Democracy has discovered a man, who, if *elected*, will SERVE, but who will not acknowledge himself to be a candidate for the office of Senator! And this man is to be voted for *in secret.*

Whigs of the District—Democrats—*all*, who are opposed to an organization which works in secret—which practices but to deceive—leading you to believe that there was but one candidate in the field, with the design of taking advantage of any supineness, on your part on that account, you believing that their could be no doubt of the success of the openly and legitimately announced candidate—while they were secretly working for a concealed candidate for the same office—Whigs, Democrats, we ask you if you approve such underhand work as this. Can you be parties to such deception as this? We do not believe it. We believe you will show your detestation of such secret plottings, by voting openly for Gen. S. H. Walkup, who declared himself, publicly, like a man and a gentleman, as he is—who stands up before the people and proclaims his principles boldly and fearlessly—who is not *ashamed* of the cause he advocates! Is not this the man for you? The fact is, Democracy is in her flurry. She dies hard. No wonder, after such a life! She can't die quietly. She could not live honestly. There is no hope for her in the future—nothing but a fearful looking for of judgment to come. Keep out of her way. She is desperate.

Voters, let your watchword be "Walk up!" At the polls, let the word be "gentlemen Walk up!" And in the end you will proudly say to the General "Walk up, higher!"

Mr. Editor: Having learned from undoubted authority, that a certain Democrat of Anson county, wrote to Dr. Williams, of Union, (the gentleman who declined the nomination tendered him by the Democratic convention, held at Grassy Creek, to represent Union and Anson in the next State Senate,) asking whether he would accept their votes as a compliment, and serve if elected, Dr. W. replied that he would thank them for their votes, and would certainly serve if he should be so fortunate as to be elelected.

Gen. Walkup was informed of these startling facts, and, at one of the Union precincts, called Dr. W. out, to know whether or not he was a candidate. The Dr. stated to the crowd that he was not, but told the General if he was elected he would serve the people so far as he was able.

What has the great National Democratic party come to? Are they not verging on to Know Nothingism, the organization they have so vilely persecuted and slandered? I heard one of the leading Democrats of Anson say, only a few days since, that his party would not stoop so low, as to vote for any man *secretly*, but, sir, I have come to the conclusion, that they will do any thing, be it mean, low, or false, to accomplish their designs. P.

☞ "The Democrat, after the Charleston Convention, indicated its preference for Douglas, yet it finds it perfectly consistent now to support Breckinridge and Lane, the nominee of the Seceders."—*Wadesboro' Argus.*

As usual, the Argus is again mistaken. The "Democrat" never indicated its preference for Douglas, and we defy the Argus to show it. Before the Argus asserts anything so positively it should be certain about it.—*Western Democrat.*

We *were* certain—we *are* certain, and here is the proof:

"Such men therefore, who belong to the Yancey school, need no one to read them out of the Party. *The tree is known by its fruit.* But Mr. Douglas stands upon different ground, and so far from reading him out of the party, we have never read him anywhere only where we have found him by his own acts, right upon the question of slavery and in favor of a Constitutional Union.—*Western Democrat, June 5.*

The italics are ours. Again the *Democrat* says:

There is Wm. L. Yancey—a man who wants to precipitate the States into a Revolution, and thus dissolve the Union. We condemn his course, and disapprove of his schemes now as we did last summer when he made a fiery speech in Charlotte.—*Western Democrat, June 5.*

If this is not indicating a preference for Douglas, why *then* we are mistaken. Observe, now, reader, the language. "Such men, therefore, who belong to the Yancey school need no one to read *them* out of the party." [Indicating that they were already out.] "The tree is known by its fruit. *But* Mr. *Douglas* stands on *different* ground," &c. Is not this indicating a preference for Douglas? And yet, in the face of all this, the *Democrat* says "it never indicated a preference for Douglas, and defies the *Argus*, to show it." Well, we have shown it. The *Democrat* is in a most pitiable plight. The poisoned chalice has been presented to its own lips. Having "indicated a preference for Douglas" and read the Yancey-Breckinridge faction out of the party, it now deserts the faction it approved and supports the faction which it condemned.

☞ Let mechanics and clerks remember that as before long a larger amount of revenue will be needed, and that as the anti-ad valorem party opposed the alteration of the Constitution so that all the slaves in the State may be taxed, according to value, they will, in the event of their success, increase the tax on wages and salaries. Nor will they stop here: They will not only tax all who get $500 and upwards more than they are now taxed, but they will be compelled to tax those who only get $500, $300 and $200, per annum.

☞ Col. Watson, in the Senatorial district of Richmond and Robeson, who was nominated by the Democracy in place of Col. W. L. Steele, refuses to run, not having received any official notice from Col. S. that he had declined running for said office. So the probability is that Gen. Dockery will have no opposition.

NORTH CAROLINIANS!

You are highly favored. The God of your fathers has given you an opportunity, which, if faithfully improved, will place you and the good Old North State in the proudest position occupied by the people of any State or country in the world. You will have the distinguished honor of taking the first pull at the Bell of the Union—to cause it to ring out its first peals of joy and gladness, because of a victory obtained over Abolition, Disunion, and Sectionalism.

The eye of God is upon you. The eyes of all the people of all the States which compose the Union are upon you. Your position is a fearfully responsible one, and remember, every man of you, that this golden opportunity is placed before you by One who will hold you to a strict account for the manner in which you improve or misimprove it, and the millions of your brethren throughout the Union, whose looks are fixed upon you with an intensity of interest which makes the beatings of their hearts almost audible, are impatiently waiting to give vent to their pent up feelings in a shout which shall pierce the very heavens and cause a nation's heart to melt with gratitude, because you, North Carolinians, are, as ever, faithful and true to the cause of "the Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the laws!"

Do you love the Union, your native State, your hearths and firesides, your wives and little ones? Is her prosperity dear to you, and their happiness necessary to your own happiness? The one and the other can only be attained and maintained in the Union! Out of the Union there is no hope for either. The election of John Pool will have a powerful influence upon the Presidential election—upon the success of the only national party in the country—the only party—the party of the country—which can save us from utter ruin—from complete extinction, it may be, as a nation of freeman. God help you, people, in this crisis of your country's fate. God help you and forbid that all the years of *your* life should be embittered by the gnawings of remorse, for that you misimproved the opportunity—threw away your last hope, and entailed upon your children curses instead of blessings. Think of these things—lay them to heart—for as sure as God lives, one or the other of these positions you will occupy. The choice is with *you*. God has given you the *opportunity*. Improve it, and all will be well. Elect John Pool, that's the first step! Hurrah for John Pool and ad valorem—for Bell and Everett—the Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the laws!

FOR BELL AND EVERETT.

That venerable and highly distinguished friend of Henry Clay, Judge Robertson, of Lexington, Ky., has written a letter, giving in his adhesion to Messrs. Bell and Everett. He thinks that with one electoral ticket, the Democrats would probably be beaten; divided, as they are, they will, he thinks, give the votes of Kentucky, Tennessee, Louisiana, Missouri, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina and Georgia, and possibly those of Alabama, Florida, Mississippi and Delaware, to Bell and Everett. Douglas, with the aid of Bell's Northern vote, will prevent the election of Lincoln by the colleges, and then, Judge Robertson thinks, the "Constitutional Union Ticket" will stand a fair chance of success in the House. He says in addition: "Personally, I have kind feelings towards all the other candidates for the Presidency. With Mr. Lincoln I have had both personally and epistolary intercourse. I have no doubt of his integrity and patriotism, and have faith that, if elected, his Administration would not be controlled by any kitchen Cabinet, and would be honest and national. Moreover, his wife is a native Kentuckian, and a daughter of one of the best friends I ever had—the late Robert S. Todd of Fayette. For Mr. Douglas I have strong sympathies, because against unsurpassed proscription, he has stood up manfully for his principles and consistency, and has triumphed over a manifold combination. Mr. Breckinridge is an honorable and chivalrous gentleman—we are personal friends—he was my pupil, and is my neighbor. Nevertheless, as I feel it to be my civic duty, as it has always been my practice, to vote for my country and not for the mere man, I could not vote for either of those three candidates even if he were my brother or my son!"

THE "NATIONAL" DEMOCRATIC CONVENTIONS.

The Democratic organs differ a good deal as to the "nationality" of their two Conventions, it being the custom at the South to swear by the Seceders' Convention, notwithstanding the loud talk about disorganizers who refuse to be bound by the action of the party. Let us see which was *the* Convention.

The Convention that nominated Mr. Douglas for President, comprised a representation of *four hundred and twenty-five delegates*, after the Bolters had gone out. Every State in the Union, but Delaware, South Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, Texas, California and Oregon, was represented in that Convention, and the States not represented in that Convention have a total of only *twenty-six electoral votes.*

The Seceders' Convention that nominated Breckinridge and Lane comprised 202 Delegates, representing only eighteen States. There were only sixteen delegates from all the New England States, but two from New York, eight from Pennsylvania, none from New Jersey, and not one from all the seven Northwestern States. Of the sixteen New England delegates, thirteen were office-holders or Government contractors, and Cushing, one of the other three, is a candidate for the Supreme Court Bench. He delivered the first out-and-out Abolition speech ever made in Congress. Loring, another, who put Breckinridge in nomination, is an ex-abolition editor of the Garrison school, and a very late convert to the Davis and Cushing Democracy. B. F. Butler, the third, is the brother-in-law of the post-master at Springfield, and made such free-soil speeches last fall, when Democratic candidate for Governor, as to induce the Executive Committee to threaten him with withdrawal, unless he mended his tone.

A handsome record for the Breckinridge party!

BRECKINRIDGE ENDORSES EVERETT?

Let no supporter of Breckinridge in all the South dare ever again to whisper a word against the soundness, reliability and patriotism of EDWARD EVERETT—for Breckinridge himself has most fully, thoroughly and triumphantly endorsed him!

We have before us the speech of John C. Breckinridge, delivered in the Hall of the Kentucky House of Representatives, at Frankfort, December 21st, 1859—six months ago—by invitation of the Democratic Legislature of his State. After boasting of the soundness of the Northern Democracy on the slavery question, Mr. Breckinridge adds:

"There is another element at the North, not large, but NOBLE AND TRUE. It consists of the scattered cohorts of the *old Whig party*, of men like EVERETT, Choate, and their associates, whose CONSERVATISM, CULTURE and PATRIOTISM REBELLED AGAINST THE REPUBLICAN ALLIANCE. Besides these, there are many thousands in the Northern States *who seldom attend the polls* and whose voices have not been heard amidst the clamors that surround them. To all these let us appeal: let us solemnly demand a general revolt of the virtue and loyalty of the country against the pernicious principles that threaten its safety, and when all the forces are arrayed in their proper ranks, we shall be able to see what remains to hope or fear."

There are Breckinridge's own words, testifying that Everett is a "noble and true" patriot, "whose conservatism, culture and patriotism rebelled against the Republican alliance!" And yet some of Breckinridge's whipper-snapper, simpletonian supporters in the South, are swearing that Everett is an Abolitionist, unworthy of the countenance and support of