

It is even wise to abstain from laws, which, however wise and good in themselves, have the semblance of inequality, which find no response in the heart of the citizen, and which will be evaded with little remorse. The wisdom of legislation is especially seen in grafting laws on conscience.

Dr. Channing.

SALISBURY, ROWAN COUNTY, N. C. MONDAY, MARCH 28, 1831.

[VOL. XI. NO. 564.]

The Bureau of the Western Carolinian will be published every week, by JOHN B. CRAWFORD, Publisher of the Law of Congress.

### MISCELLANEOUS.

**NATURAL DREAD OF DEATH.**  
From the Christian Examiner.  
It seems to us strange, it seems as if all were wrong, in a world where, from the very constitution of things, death must close every scene of human life, where it hath reigned for ages over all generations, where the very air we breathe and the dust we tread upon was once animated life—it seems to us most strange and wrong, that this most common, necessary expedient, and certain of all events, should bring such horror and desolation with it; that it should bring such tremendous agitation, as if it were some awful and unprecedented phenomenon; that it should be more than death—a shock, a catastrophe, a convulsion; as if nature, instead of holding on its steady course, were falling into irretrievable ruins.

And that which is strange, is our strangeness to this event. Call sickness, we repeat, call pain an approach to death. Call the weariness and failure of the limbs and senses, call decay, dying. It is so; it is a gradual loosening of the cords of life, and a breaking up of its reservoirs and resources. So shall they all, one and another, give way. "I feel"—will the thoughtful man say—"I feel the pang of suffering, as it were, piercing and cutting asunder, one by one, the fine and invisible bonds that hold me to the earth. I feel the gushing current of life within me to be wearing away its own channels. I feel the sharpness of every keen emotion, and of every acute and far penetrating thought, as if it were shortening the moments of the soul's coexistence and conflict with the body." So it is, and so it shall be, till at last, "the silver word is loosened, and the golden bowl is broken, and the pitcher is broken at the fountain, and the wheel is broken at the cistern, and the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns unto God who gave it."

No; it is not a strange dispensation. Death is the fellow of all earthly; the friend of man alone. It is not an anomaly; it is not a monster in the creation. It is the law, and the lot of nature.  
Not to thy eternal resting place, shalt thou retire alone.  
Thou shalt lie down  
With patriarchs of the infant world, with kings,  
The powerful of the earth, the wise and good,  
The forms and hues of ages past,  
All in one mighty sepulchre. The hills,  
Rock-ribbed, and ancient as the sun; the vales,  
Stretching in pensive quietness between!  
The venerable woods, rivers that move  
In majesty, and complaining brooks,  
That make the meadows green, and poured  
round all,  
Old Ocean's gray and melancholy waste—  
Are but the solemn decorations all,  
Of the great tomb of man.  
But of what is it the tomb? Does the spirit die? Do the blest affections of the soul go down into the dark and silent grave? Oh! no. "The narrow house, and pall, and breathless darkness," and funeral train—these belong not to the soul. They proclaim only the body's dissolution. They but celebrate the vanishing away of the shadow of existence. Man does not die, though the forms of popular speech thus announce his exit. He does not die. We bury not our friend, but only form the vehicle in which, for a time, our friend lived. That cold, impassive clay, is not the friend, the parent, the child, the companion, the cherished being. No, it is not; blessed be God that we can say—It is not! It is the material world only that earth claims. It is "dust" only that "descends to dust." The grave!—let us break its awful spell, its dread dominion. It is the place where man lays down his weakness, his infirmity; his diseases and sorrows, that he may rise up to a new and glorious life. It is the place where man ceases—in all that is frail and decaying—ceases to be man; that he may be, in glory and blessedness, an angel of light!  
Why, then, should we fear death, save as the wicked fear, and must fear? Why dread to lay down that frail body in its resting place, and th...

ry aching head, on the pillow of its repose? Why tremble at this—that in the long sleep of the tomb, the body shall suffer disease no more, and pain no more, and hear no more the cries of want nor the groans of distress,—and far retired from the turmoil of life, that violence and change shall pass lightly over it, and the elements shall beat and the storms shall sigh unheard around its lowly bed?—Say ye aged, and infirm, is it the greatest of evils to die? Say ye children of care and toil! say ye afflicted and tempted! is it the greatest of evils to die?

Oh! no. Come the last hour, in God's own time!—and a good life and a glorious hope shall make it welcome. Come the hour of release!—and affliction shall make it welcome. Come the re-union with the loved and lost on earth!—and the passionate yearnings of affections, and the strong aspirations of faith, shall bear us to their blessed land. Come death to this body—this burdened, tempted, frail, failing, dying body!—and to the soul, come freedom, light, and joy, unceasing!—come the immortal life!—"He that liveth"—saith the conqueror over the Devil—"he that liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

### ELECTION BY BALLOT.

From the Nottingham (England) Review.  
Of all questions connected with reform, none have made so much progress in so short a time as the Ballot; this, indeed, with sensible men appears the *sine qua non*; without this, all other measures of Reform will be falterings and ineffectual; but this will secure that freedom of election which is so desirable in all countries where there is a shadow of liberty, but more especially in a country like England, where the power of money and influence has so long reigned with unopposed sway; the ballot alone can oppose this power effectually, and render elections in their result what they ought to be, the expression of the people's will.

No persons have done half so much for the ballot as the Duke of Newcastle, Earl Grosvenor, and those other Peers, who have served notices to quit on their tenantry, for their open votes at the last election, & yet the Duke, in his strange attack on Sir T. Denman, in the House of Lords on Friday night "claims the benefit of independence for himself, and therefore would allow it to others." What must his tenantry think of such a monstrous assertion! Independence indeed! yes, but is it not punishable in all those of his tenantry who asserted it, by ejection from their dwellings? "He would do to others as he wished to be done unto himself!"—What would the Duke of Newcastle say if, taking him at his word, the king's Ministers should give him notice to quit all the crown lands on the ground of his voting against ministers? and yet, would this not be equal justice? would this not be treating him as he has done to others?—and what right would such a nobleman have to complain! The Duke afterwards introduced the question of ballot, which he said he hoped would be scouted by all men. And why? because it would take from him the odious power which he claims, of doing what he will with his own; in other words, it would take from him his power over the borough of Newark where the popular feelings, if uncontrolled by his influence, would at once elect honest and independent men to represent them in Parliament, and refuse to be any longer saddled with a nominee which the Lord of Clumber sent amongst them. The chief objection to the ballot urged by the Duke was, that "it would be disgraceful to the country; now an Englishman fought openly, spoke openly, and acted openly." The Duke should have added, and was ruined for so doing. But as this is an argument used by some whom we much respect, we will answer it; yet not in our own words, but in much better than any we can use, from the article in the Westminster Review, to which we have more than once directed the attention of our readers:  
"Among the opponents of the bal-

lot in Parliament, are some who can not so much be said to argue, as to groan, and use inarticulate cries against it. Of this kind are those who say, they hope that they shall not live to witness the time, when Englishmen shall not have the spirit to deliver their vote in the face of day. It would be as honest, and about as wise, to say, they hope not to live to witness the time when every Englishman shall not have his carriage and four. If they were to say, which would be the only thing to the purpose, that they hoped not to live to see the day when an Englishman would not go to hustings, and fearlessly vote for the man of his choice, without regard to the dictation of any person upon earth; the falshood of the pretext would be too glaring to be successful, even in a country where as much is done by hypocrisy as in England. It is a matter of fact, notorious and undisputed, that a great majority of those who vote for Members of Parliament in England, proceed to hustings under the influence of what they either hope to receive or dread to suffer, and prostitute themselves in the infamous manner, by voting not according to the dictates of their own minds, but like crouching slaves, at the will of another. Are these the circumstances in which votes are commonly given in England, and are men found who say they hope not to live to see the day when Englishmen will be afraid to vote openly? Patience would be found to hear them in no assembly, we think, upon earth, but one composed of the very men who suborn such votes. Courage to vote as Englishmen vote, at the command of those by whom they are bought or driven, is the courage of the slave, when he lends his body to the lash. Are there men who pretend a horror at the prospect of paring with this, and receiving in exchange for the protection of secrecy, because secrecy would degrade the people?

During the last summer, when popular excitement was high, every effort was used by the opponents of convention to allay the just indignation of our people, and to prevent them from resorting to any decisive measure of redress. They assured the people that the tariff would be attacked in detail, and that much would be done for their relief. They told them that the President had taken a decided stand against internal improvements, and that that portion of the system might be considered as abolished. They told them that the public debt would shortly be extinguished, and that as soon as it would be, a reduction of the tariff to the revenue standard would assuredly take place. They persuaded them, in short, that things were coming right—that the most encouraging manifestations had been given by the majority of a returning sense of justice—that a convention, therefore, would be premature and useless—that every thing would be done which our people wished, provided they were moderate and patient, but that they would defeat themselves by any thing like precipitate or intemperate proceedings. Influenced by these promises and assurances, thousands who were in favor of convention, determined to postpone that measure, and to await the issue of another session. Convention, therefore, was defeated, and the people have been anxiously expecting the fruits of their continued moderation. And how has that moderation been rewarded? Another session of Congress has come and gone, and what has been done to relieve the South?

Has the tariff been repealed or modified? It has not. The executive recommendation to revise it, and every effort to modify or reduce it, were all treated with the most profound and supercilious indifference. The proposition to repeal the duty on Salt—the proposition to reduce the duty on Sugar—the petitions and memorials to reduce the duty upon Iron—were all rejected, and it was even with the utmost difficulty that their advocates could obtain a hearing. Nor is this all. The majority not only contumaciously rejected every effort at reduc-

tion, but have sanctioned and circulated far and wide, a Report from the committee on manufactures, vindicating the tariff in the most unqualified terms, and expressing their fixed determination not to allow a single item to be altered. So much for the scheme of attacking and destroying the tariff in detail.

Has any evidence been afforded of a returning sense of justice? None whatever. On the contrary, and as if it were done expressly to destroy the delusion of our people upon that point, a bill was introduced by the committee on manufactures—not to repeal or reduce the tariff—but to repeal the Act of the preceding session reducing the duty on Salt, and consequently to restore that duty to its original amount. The bill was not passed—but it was not rejected. It lies upon the table, to be taken up at the next session, when the combination will be fully organized and disciplined to carry it. So much for the returning sense of justice.

Has the system of Internal Improvements been abandoned? It has not. On the contrary it goes on almost as vigorously and extravagantly as before. In the list of Acts passed at the last session will be found Acts making appropriations for roads and surveys, and internal improvements—for extending the Cumberland road—and for the improvement of rivers, &c. The President has placed his veto on none of these acts. Why he has not, it is useless to enquire, nor do we know at present how many millions are appropriated by them. So much for the abolition of internal improvements.

Has any evidence been furnished of a disposition to respect the Constitution or the Rights of the States? None whatever. On the contrary the majority have committed additional violations of that sacred instrument, and additional invasions of the sovereignty of the States. Amongst the most flagrant of these is their refusal to repeal the 25th section of the Judiciary Act, by which they have deliberately affirmed the supremacy of the federal court over the courts of the States, and subjected the States to the dominion of a tribunal created by themselves. Upon this subject we invite all, who may not yet have read it, to peruse the Report of the Judiciary Committee.

Can the public debt be soon paid off? It cannot. The obvious determination of the majority is that it shall not. For this purpose no effort has been or will be spared to create extravagant demands upon the Treasury.

But even if the public debt should be extinguished in a few years hence, is there any rational probability that the Tariff will then be repealed? We think not. In that event we fear that instead of repealing the present system of taxation, it will be continued for the purpose of dividing the annual surplus in the treasury amongst the States—or, in other words, that Congress will resort to another dangerous infraction of the Constitution for the purpose of perpetuating and augmenting the injustice and oppression which it has already fixed upon the South.

What then is our prospect? Increased poverty, slavery and degradation. What is our duty? Shall we hope on against hope? Or acquiesce and submit without further murmuring or struggle? Or determine neither to be duped again by fallacious predictions and assurances, nor to be longer trampled with impunity by an interested combination?

### Charleston Mercury.

The following extract of a letter is from the Washington correspondent of the New York Daily Advertiser, under date of Feb. 22.  
"Mr. Dudley, of the Senate, has incurred the censure of his late confidential and political friends.—The committee on internal improvements is composed of two who are friendly to the system, and of two who are opposed to it, and Mr. Dudley is the fifth member. Just at this time, it would appear, that he is far non-committal. Mr. Calhoun's friends are

disposed to compel Mr. Van Buren "to show his hand." Mr. Hayne, of South Carolina, enquired yesterday, whether the committee on internal improvements, to whom had been referred that part of the president's message on that subject, would report during the session. The enquiry enabled Mr. Tyler, a member of the committee, to state, that he had drawn a report responsive to the message, in which Mr. Poindexter, another member of the committee, had concurred, which had been submitted to the committee, and had been for some in possession of the Senator of New York (Mr. Dudley,) who had for reasons best known to himself, and which he was bound to suppose were satisfactory to him, declined to express any opinion on the subject either one way or the other, and had thereby prevented any report from being made. Mr. Dudley in a few words, justified his course, by saying he did not consider the country would be benefited by the making of a report on the subject. Mr. Hendricks said he and another member of the committee were in favor of internal improvements, and did not doubt the power of the general government to construct them; but that he thought, when so much business was before the Senate, its time ought not to be occupied in the discussion of an abstract principle. Mr. Poindexter said the report drawn by the Senator from Virginia was a very able document, and would, he had no doubt, be entirely conclusive and satisfactory to the people of the United States against the system; on account of the waste of public money, and its corrupting influence provided it could meet the public eye; but that the Senator from New York had prevented the presentation of the report, and that the responsibility rested with him. The remarks of Mr. Tyler and of Mr. Poindexter, although addressed to, were intended for Mr. Van Buren. Mr. Dudley's situation was a very unpleasant one, and it was apparent that he so considered it; but "non-committal was the order."

**Passion.**—What is more unpleasant, and what so much derogates from the character of an amiable, beautiful or accomplished woman, as to behold her in a passion? for a young lady to become enraged at the misdemeanor of a servant; or because her milliner failed in executing her command in proper season; or that her dress did not precisely suit her taste; or from any other trifling motive, at once discovers the want of amiability, as well as of sufficient strength of mind to suppress her temper. Such an one would never be selected as the partner of a sensible man, such could never kindle exalted admiration, true respect, or genuine love. I do not wish to applaud those tame beings who have not a sufficiency of spirit to resent an insult, or to uphold an opinion against the obstinacy of some jockanapes; nevertheless all this might be done in temperate language, and with such a diffident bearing as is the true characteristic of a delicate female. What is more admirable than to witness a young and beautiful female, timidly adducing strenuous arguments in opposition to some positive theory of the lords of the creation; and while her good sense and sound doctrine carry triumph with them, to see the deep blush of virtue stealing over her forehead at her own success.

The Grand Jury of Bibb county, Ga. have presented the contemplated establishment of a Branch of the U. S. Bank at Macon as an evil, prejudicial to the best interests of our State institutions, and not conducive of any good to our fellow citizens generally. They say in conclusion—"We therefore representing as we believe, fairly, the feelings of this community, do solemnly protest against the establishment of a branch of the United States Bank in this place; and farther express our decided disapprobation, as well against the establishment, as the continuance here, of an unauthorized Agency, which we believe to be in direct violation of the statute law of this State; and to this subject we call the attention of our Electors." Ch. Mer.