THE NORTH-CAROLINA STAR.

THOMAS J. LEMAY, Editor

NORTH CAROLINA—"Powerful in intellectual, moral and physical resources, the land of our sires and home of our affections."

TERMS—Two Dollars in Advance.

VOL. XLIV. RALEIGH, WEDNESDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 9, 1853. NO. 7.

TERMS.—If paid strictly in advance, $2 per annum, $2 50 if paid within six months, and $3 at the end of the year.

ADVERTISING.—1 Square (16 lines) first insertion $1; and 25 cents for each subsequent insertion.

AGRICULTURAL.

LEACHED ASHES AS A MANURE.

Three years since I purchased a farm on which had accumulated a large quantity of old leached ashes that were considered by the former owner of no value. They lay in an exposed, slovenly manner, and by no means increased the good appearance or value of the property. Wishing to ascertain whether they were of any value, I drew several wagon loads and spread them on a light, sandy lot I was fallowing for wheat. I could not say how much I put per acre, but should think about 300 bushels, spreading them in a breadth about two rods wide, the length of the field and right across the lands.

Now for the result. The wheat on the whole field was about an average crop, yielding 20 bushels per acre. On the breadth where the ashes were spread, the wheat all through the fall and summer was much stronger and of a darker green color than on the rest of the field, and at harvest the straw was at least four inches higher, and several good judges who saw it agreed with me in thinking that the yield on the ashed part was 28 bushels per acre, or about 8 bus. per acre better than where no ashes were applied. I seeded down the land with clover and timothy, and the effect of the ashes on the clover was equally striking and beneficial as it was on the succeeding wheat crop.

In the fall of 1851 I spread a quantity of the same ashes on another lot I was preparing for wheat. The soil was a heavy clayey loam, and yields good crops of wheat when well summer fallowed. I could see very little benefit from the ashes.

OAT FODDER FOR HORSES.—At a discussion held at a meeting of the Darlington (Eng.) Farmer's Club, Dec. 8th on the best and cheapest mode of keeping draught horse during winter, Mr. Trotter said:

"I have paid some attention to the subject of keeping draught horses during winter.—For the last three years, I have adopted quite a different mode to what I previously followed. My method formerly was, to allow my draught horses each two bushels of oats per week, together with one bushel of beans, and as much hay as they could eat, generally clover hay. For the last three winters, I have fed them almost entirely on cut sheaf—cut into half inch chaff—which has been very great saving to me.

In an oat crop of about 40 strooks per acre which might yield near 60 bushels, the feed of a draught horse average two sheaves per week, which would be about a bushel and three pecks per week, if they had been thrashed out, which is a saving of a peck of oats per week, each horse, for what I formerly gave them, besides, I save the bushel of beans per week and the clover hay, which was a very considerable item—when I first changed my mode of feeding, the horses improved in condition wonderfully, thus showing that it suits them well. When they were worked very hard, I allowed them half a peck of oats at dinner time, besides the cut sheaf.

Last winter I had only 18 acres of oats, those kept 12 draught horses, besides four young mares occasionally. This quantity of oats would not have served me through the year, had I not pursued this system of feeding.

BENEFIT OF GUANO ON CORN. Mr. Barnes, of Winfield, Geo., writes to the Plough, that he tried a small quantity of Peruvian Guano this year, on corn, and not only got the money back expended for it, but seventy-five per cent advance on the cost. The crop was forty-nine bushels per acre, on poor land. We think this will do pretty well for an experiment. Few speculations turn out better—Mr. Barnes intends to increase his purchase of guano considerably another year, all of which will be applied to the extension of his corn crop.

The best way to apply Guano to corn is, to mix it half and half with Plaster of Paris or charcoal dust, spread broadcast at the rate 200 to 400 lbs. per acre, and then ploughed over four inches deep, it will take the young corn roots some little time to reach the guano, and in consequence of this, and in order to give it a good start, we would recommend when going below four inches, that only half of the guano be ploughed in, and the other half be dug in about an inch deep around the hills of the corn four to six inches from the stalks, the first time hoeing.

HOMILY.

The "Petersburg Intelligencer" reads its patrons a short discourse on the subject of raising potatoes, from which we make the following extract. The editor of the Intelligencer is hard down on the farmers of the old Dominion for eating Northern potatoes, which he says might be produced at home of a better quality, and sold cheaper than they can be bought, which is probably true. His closing remarks are thus delivered:

"We hear ninnies talk every day of the commercial independence of the South, and see them every day with a Yankee made fork, feeding themselves off of a Yankee made plate, containing Yankee potatoes served up on a Yankee made table, covered with a Yankee made table cloth, and the very Yankee made shirts which they wear, are hung out to dry on a Yankee made rope to which they are secured by Yankee made crotchets."

Give it to 'em, brother Syme, they deserve it all, and more besides. And your plain talk fits our North Carolina folk as well as your own good people of the Old Dominion; and to them we commend it, with the assurance that the half is not told.

Why, look into the tool houses of our farmers. They have Northern made ploughs, axes, dung forks, hay forks, shovels, hoes, drawing knives, augues, saws, gimblets, nails, screws, hammers, etc., etc.; and it really appears that if it were not for the enterprize and industry of the North, our people could produce nothing to eat or wear, or if they should make any thing, having nothing to put it in and no where to put it. Their children go to school to Northern teachers, and learn their A B C from Yankee books. They are clothed in Yankee cloths all the days of their sojourn on earth, and are wrapped in Yankee muslin when they die. And to cap the whole, it takes a Yankee to call back their spirit from the spirit land and make them hold converse with their weeping Southern friends on earth!

It is a most astonishing thing that Southern people are so dependent on the North: It must be owing to one of two causes, to wit: the love of ease, or the use of long stemmed pipes and Dan river sun cured tobacco. If the former, it is laziness; if the latter, it is the want of self-denial and energy. We are sure the Great Creator is not at fault, for He has scattered with profusion all the elements of independence and wealth, in every hill and valley of our State. Iron, copper, coal, lead, silver, gold, and even diamonds, are to be had for the search, and for the labor of mining.—No soil is more generous in its yield of the staple necessities of life. No atmosphere more redolent of sweetness and life sustaining qualities. No ever-flowing streams more constant and pure; and none more gracious of the timbers and grasses required for the use of man in the development of a great and glorious destiny. It is man who is at fault that these blessings are not improved, and that North Carolina is not, as she might be, one of the greatest countries on the face of this green earth.

But we are not without some strong rays of cheerful hope. The future is more promising than ever before of an awakening on the part the slumbering energies of old Rip's children. The shrill whistle of the locomotive and the reverberations of the lumbering train which shall soon pass through our hills and valleys, will startle them, and as their practical music and rich fruits shall become more appreciated, so shall follow the developments of our treasures and at least a partial deliverance from that humiliating bondage to distant and unbrotherly sections. Then push forward, the rail roads, South, East and West and the plank roads. Build factories and work shops; plough deep and work carefully, and in all things aim at greatness, goodness and truth, and North Carolina will yet be something before it is too late.

Salis. Watch.

Speech of D. F. Caldwell,

OF GUILFORD,

AGAINST AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION BY LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENT.

Delivered in the House of Commons, when the "Free Suffrage Bill" was before the House November, 1852.

MR. SPEAKER: Having delivered my views at some length upon this vexed and unprofitable question, during the session of our last Legislature, I did fondly hope and believe, at one time, that my duties here as a representative might all be faithfully and honestly discharged without my having again to open my mouth upon it. But in this vain hope I have been most sadly disappointed by being again compelled to take the floor in reply to the speech of my honorable friend from Wake (Judge Saunders.) But before proceeding further with my remarks, I deem it due to my self and the distinguished gentleman, to whom I propose to reply to observe that I do not expect to be able to bring one tithe of the ability to bear against this measure that he has displayed in advocating it here to-day. But this much I humbly trust I may promise without subjecting myself to the charge of egotism or vanity, (if gentlemen around me will encourage me with their attention while I am on the floor,) I promise them, that I shall exert myself to the utmost of my ability to prove to them, that it is neither our duty nor interest as representatives, or independent citizens of a free and sovereign State vote for this Bill. On the other hand I do most honestly and religiously believe it to be our sworn duty—a duty we owe alike to ourselves, to our constituents, and to our good and glorious old Commonwealth, to oppose this and all other attempts that may be made hereafter to alter or amend in any particular the present Constitution of the State by Legislative Enactment, by all the means in our power and to the last extremity, yes, even to the bitter end of all honest and honorable opposition, come such a proposition from what quarter it may. And why do I believe this to be our imperative duty? Is it because I believe our Constitution is perfect, and that the amendments are wrong or dangerous in themselves? No, Sir, by no means—I never have, nor do I ever expect to be guilty of so much stupidity and folly as to oppose so salutary a measure as that of *Equal Suffrage*. It embodies in itself too much equity and justice for me to oppose it if fairly and properly tendered. Before I could take this stand, or pursue this course, I will have first to prove false to myself, false to my friends, false to my country, yes, Sir, *false to them* one and all together. In other words, I cannot if I would oppose Equal Suffrage without falsifying myself and thereby giving a libel upon my character or good sense, one or both. Paradoxical as it may seem, I am in every way consistent in declaring that I am a friend to free and equal suffrage, at the same time I am opposing this bill for the simple reason that I am satisfied, that it will never be obtained in this way. Time, chance, accident, and every possible contingency, that can happen, are all against this legislative mode of amending the Constitution and render it improbable aye, impossible almost, to effect any thing in this way: As our experience, in this matter for the last six or eight years past plainly proves.—If it be true that the Democratic party in earnest in their attempts to give to the disfranchised portion of our fellow citizens, free suffrage, they ought forthwith to cease to spend their time and the people's money, by obstinately continuing to urge this bill. He labors in vain, in my judgment, to give free suffrage to the people of North Carolina, who tools to effect that desired object by this mode. Your candidates for offices may take the stump and canvass the State from centre to circumference, in every possible direction, and appeal to the passions and prejudices of the people, and thus dexterously manage to array the poor against the rich, and the east against the west, for the purpose of forcing this bill through these Halls; but they will find out at last, I hope, that this game will not answer their expectations. It is bad policy, in my judgment, to say nothing of morals, to do wrong even if good is likely to grow out of it. And if we were by common consent to pass this bill, and thereby establish a precedent in favour of amending the Constitution of this State by legislative enactment,—that is precisely the predicament we would place ourselves in. I care not, if true, as some have contended here, that equal suffrage is the twin sister of liberty, and just as much an inalienable right as liberty itself. Yes, Sir, they may be inherent rights, that are so completely indentified, that it is rendered morally impossible to keep them long separated in a free country, yet even in that case we are not called on or required to grant this right by this bill. No, not even if we are certain that it is a natural right—and the largest proportion of that glorious inheritance that has been purchased for us by our gallant fore-fathers and paid for in instalments of their own blood, nay, not if convinced that the most of it was forced from their mutilated bodies, by the last throbs of their patriotic hearts,—if in granting it, it is proposed to do it in such a way as to break down and destroy at once and forever all the checks and balances in the Government.

Let us not forget that it has long ago been said by a republican, patriot and sage, that where checks and balances cease in a Republic, there anarchy and despotism begin. If this affirmation be true, then it is no heresy to assert, that the wild and unbridled democracy of the State can, and more than likely would, prove to be a strong and many headed despot. What then will be the effect of this measure on the government of this State should it unfortunately pass? It will give free suffrage, but not equal suffrage. But this is not all it will do. If it was, I should not so seriously object to its passage. I honestly believe the extension of the right of suffrage, would not only add to the prosperity and happiness of our people, but to the strength and lasting glory of my native land. Consequently I have long and consistently advocated the policy of extending, at once, *Equal Suffrage* to all of our citizens by an open convention. This, however, in such a way as not to destroy the many checks and balances of our Government, which the present bill will do beyond question, if it is suffered to become a part and parcel of the constitution of North Carolina. We have been informed with considerable warmth and emphasis by the gentleman, who has just taken his seat, that there is no such a constitution in this confederacy as that of our own. The constitutions of all the other States grant every man the right of voting whether he pays or not. But here in North Carolina we make the lawyer, doctor, divine, the merchant, mechanic and soldier pay as much tax as any other class of our citizens, but will not let them have the privilege of voting for Senator, though our Senators are all elected on the taxation basis exclusively. Well, suppose, Mr. Speaker, all this be true, which I most cheerfully do, what then? Does it follow of necessity, that this bill ought to pass? Not at all. For if it was now instantly engrafted on the Constitution, it is a fact that ought to have powerful weight with us, that it would serve only to make it decidedly more unlike every other Constitution in the United States.

I take the position to remind the zealous friends of this measure, that no State in the Union has ever yet given all the people in their borders the right to vote at all their elections and at the same time, the further privilege of electing Senators and Commoners at the same time by the same body or class of voters and for a precisely equal term of years. They have been more guarded in the fancied prodigality, with which they have given the right of Suffrage to their people than to clothe them with any such power.—They have given all their people the right to vote, it is true, but they say to them that you must elect your Senators for a longer term of years. In many States the term of one third of the Senators expires every two years. Besides the Governor in many of these States, where all vote, is clothed with the veto power. Here our Governor has no such power, and this bill proposes to destroy all distinction between the Senate and House of Commons, and consequently, although the two branches are retained, yet one has no check upon the other. No State in this Union has given the right of Suffrage to every citizen on the same terms and conditions as proposed in the bill now on your table.—We will have approached nearer and Athenian Democracy here in North Carolina, if this bill passes than any other State in the federacy has yet dared to propose. The Con-House will see from these remarks, I trust, that I am altogether sincere when I declare again, that it is not to the boon proposed to be given that I object, but to the manner in which the Democrats on this floor declare it shall be granted if it be given at all, and to the results that are likely to flow from this sad and deplorable mutilation of our venerable old Constitution. Here is my difficulty, and I confess it is one of such magnitude in my own mind that as an honest man I cannot so far get over it as to vote for the project now before us. To speak plainly, I consider this legislative mode of amending the Constitution of a free people as a direct violation of all the republican doctrines and precedents bequeathed to us by our venerable sires. In fact it is precisely the one that the usurper Louis Napoleon took to overturn the Republic of France and make himself Emperor, and would no doubt suit the latitude of that unhappy land much better than any portion of this happy country.

The American people are not in the habit of forming or amending their Constitutions in this way. It is too insidious, indirect, tedious and expensive a method to be resorted to by an enlighted people any where. To advocate this mode in preference to that of a Convention, is to do nothing less than assert the odious doctrine that the servant is greater than his lord. If the Constitution of the State belonged to the Legislature in any sense of that word, this mode might with some show of propriety be adopted. But when we remember that the Constitution is the embodiment of all the powers reserved by the people, its absurdity is made clearly manifest.

I contend that the Constitution is that higher law, that is greater even than the conscience of the Legislator while in the employment of his constituents. It must from the very accessity of the case rule over and dictate to him in all of his legislative acts. If he be an honest man he cannot go beyond it. *It is the People's law* in the strictest sense of that term, and the only unexplainable one that they have, to stand up, as a mighty bulwark between them and their delegated agents. Hence the great propriety of keeping it out of legislative hands. If it be indeed true, that "all political power is," of right, vested in and derived from the only" —is it not reasonable to infer, (if we had no guides on this subject,) that no other power short of the people themselves, should have the right to touch the Constitution?

But it has been argued that the people have given us instructions on this point; and by twice electing David S. Reid to be Governor of the State, have authorized us to lay aside forthwith our proper and legitimate duties as Legislators, and proceed at once to do as he may think proper to direct us with the fundamental law of this Commonwealth. This I deny—I deny every syllable of it—I deny it all, from beginning to end.

It is true Governor Reid has canvassed this State three several times, was defeated once, and elected twice while advocating this measure. And here I would remark, there seems to be some improvement in the Democratic creed, in this respect for the will of a majority. And I shall not expect to hear any further opposition to the people's being consulted at the polls as to the call of a Convention. But to proceed. The first time, Gov Reid was elected by a very small majority. This, I contend, was given to him in consequence of some unfortunate differences and jealousies, local in their character, that then existed in the Whig ranks. In his second election his majority was somewhat increased. This originated from other causes, that might be easily enumerated, did time permit. I do not deny, however, that Gov. Reid gained hundreds, and it may be, thousands, of votes by waging a constant war, as he and thousands of his *partizan* friends did upon the Constitution, which I admit is imperfect in many of its leading provisions. This I shall attempt to shew presently; but I will first hint at a few, a very few, things, to show how it was that many members came to receive their *instructions* to vote for this *liberty-destroying measure*. And when I have given you the "*modus operandi*," by which Democratic partizans, more to advance party interests, than to better the Constitution, "*revolutioned*" it into favour, and themselves into seats in this Hall, you will agree with me, I apprehend, that there never has been a more contemptible and glaring political *fraud* practiced upon any people from the days of Adam down to the present hour.

Partizan politicians in the east, did not scruple to take the stump and therefrom declare *most positively* to the people in that quarter, that if they did not go for free suffrage by legislative enactment, the west would be certain to force them into an open convention, and by this means manage to strip them (the east) of their strength and power. Whilst their confederates in the west, *less scrupulous, if possible*, with inimitable skill, managed by deception to ride into the Legislature upon the same hobby, by taking a different direction. They asserted with equal confidence to their fellow citizens in the west, "that they never could obtain their proper weight and influence in the Legislative councils of the State until they could secure *free suffrage*, which it was worse than among hopeless or securing a convention as matters now stand. The only way to effect that with certainty was to go first for free suffrage by legislative enactment and then we could succeed in getting a convention called. Call the people to a feast, and it will be impossible to coax or *wheedle* them to sit down at different tables; one of which is groaning beneath *sweet and inviting luxuries*, and the other furnished with nothing better than *bones, crusts, and cold water*.—Let us go for free suffrage *now*, and *then* we can with more force, influence and propriety than ever, call for a further change, or one table for all the guests. The very principle by which individuals are made equal sharers in political right, would necessarily prevail, when the same question arises between *communities*. The Constitution of this State is a strong aristocratic old castle, and so well guarded that we never can take it if we march up to it *directly in front*, and there commence the attack—we must attack it insidiously, we must get out the corner stone, before we can hope to succeed. Free suffrage by legislative enactment may well be termed a wooden horse, and if we use the same precaution to introduce free suffrage into the Constitution that the Grecians did to introduce their famous Animal into Troy, then we can with certainty hope to storm the old-time-defying citadel, and bring it with a mighty crash, tumbling in ruins to the ground. Free suffrage is a levelling operation. It places every man upon the same footing. It gives the Senate no more power to resist the mass of our citizens than the House of Commons now possesses. This being the case we appeal to you, gentlemen, to know whose fault it will be then, if communities are not speedily thereafter made equal.

Yes, Mr Speaker, such were the arguments that gave many a member a seat here from the west. So it appears from this view of the case, that most persons both in the east and west have been deceived into the support of free suffrage by legislative enactment, for the avowed purpose of avoiding a convention on the one hand, and of paving the way for it on the other.

After making this brief explanation I am perfectly willing to leave it to any prudent man among us to say how far the instructions we have received from the people on this subject should go to induce us to continue our operations on the fundamental law of the State upon this legislative plan.

But here, lest I be misunderstood, suffer me to remark, that I do not think it possible to restore quiet to the people again, without first carrying out some of the reforms that have been mentioned. Yet I do most earnestly desire that in amending our Constitution no alteration shall ever be made in this way, notwithstanding the *royal edict* has gone forth to the world, that this bill SHALL pass. This is strong and *insolent* language to be thrown in the teeth, and sounded in the ears of gentlemen who are expected to amend the Constitution in advance of any action on the subject; yet I hope it will not deter any of us from voting against this bill. I am confident it *will not* if we have one drop of *Whig blood* flowing in our veins, or an atom of that spirit that characterised the Roundheads, and patriots in Cromwell's day. For *one*, I do here in my place, most solemnly declare I never can, and never will be *driven*, or flattered in to the support of this measure, under such circumstances. *No*, never,

"Tho' the rock of my last hope is shivered,
And its fragments are sunk in the wave;
Tho' I feel that my soul is delivered
To pain—I will not be their slave,"

a mere *collar dog to do their bidding*. There may be others here, however, who will take delight in meekly bowing with servile grace and cringing spirits to carry out *the behests of party*. If there be, let the friends of the constitution and order, rally as one man, and boldly strike for equal rights, and leave the timid and faint-hearted *alone in their glory*, to reap at some future day the reward of their cowardly timidity, for suffering the Constitution of their fathers to be put up section by section, *and one at a time*, to the lowest bidder. They will thus make it capital for reckless demagogues, and the mere foot ball of every party. This, sir, I look upon as the quintessence of agrarianism doubly distilled and refined.

For example, A. B. and C. all become candidates for the same seat in the Legislature. Mr. A. we will suppose is a gentleman, conservative, of good mind, fine manners, and finished education. He is in favor of electing judges for a term of twelve years. Mr. B. is also in favor of electing the Judges by the people; but not having the ability or address of Mr A. he is forced, from necessity, to become a little more democratic than his opponent, and declares himself for a term of eight years. Mr. B. having thus concluded his remarks, Mr. C. arises, and being far the inferior of his competitors, in every thing but *honesty*, resolves to profit by the cunning of Mr. B. and forthwith stumers out, "I goes for electing the judges for two years, if I can get it, and in no case for more than four years. To elect them for a longer period than that, would be decidedly aristocratic and oppressive. Our courts belong to the people, and the judges who preside in them should not only be elected by the people, but for so short a time as to make them feel that the people are their masters." Mr. C. continues "gentlemen, I is a poor, plain man, has not got much *education*, like A. and B. They are both college bred gentlemen and has studied professions, and made fortunes by one being a lawyer and the other a doctor, consequently cannot have as much feeling for you common folks as I have. Well may they go for Judges holding on for twelve and eight years—whilst I go for electing them every two years or four at farthest."

The result will likely be, that the conservatives will divide between A. and B., while the "*come outers*," from both parties of "*liberal views*," tickled with the argument, which their friend Mr. C. has advanced, rally to a man around his "STANDARD," triumphantly elect him to Raleigh, to display his wisdom and elocution, to a still greater and more astonishing extent, in reforming the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, we see by this fiction, how exceedingly objectionable this method of amending the Constitution is soon likely to become, if this bill passes: For I am conscious it will be but the prelude of what is yet before us. In addition to all this there are many, very many objections, that could with great force and reason be urged against this method of amending the Constitution. I most earnestly and solemnly protest against it, in the name and in behalf of the honest yeomanry, [illegible] *constitution-making* power in one and the same body of men—it is tedious, never ending.

By the time in this way it shall be provided in the Constitution for the election of the Judges, a Lieutenant Governor, Secretary, Treasurer, Comptroller, Justices of the Peace—the freehold qualification of voters and office holders removed and other things, that agitate the public mind, are finally passed upon, we will be all in our graves, and the *laws* and the Constitution so mixed and confused, that commissioners will have to be appointed to digest the Constitution itself, that we may know what it is. I am opposed to it, because I desire those delegates of the people, who pass on that sacred and organic law, made for the safety and protection of the people, to have nothing to influence and occupy their minds, but Constitutional questions. I desire them to be elected free from party considerations—free from all legislatives hobbies—their views of Constitutional reform neither favored nor impaired because they are in favor or against some popular measure in legislation. I deem it highly important, that the passage of laws, the election of Governor and other officers, and questions of Constitutional reform, should be kept separate—each question off's and on its own merits.

I am opposed to this mode because it must connect the Constitution with log rolling legislation and keep the public mind for many years disturbed and agitated with questions of Constitutional reforms, all of which could safely and quietly be settled by a Convention of the people themselves called on a fair and proper basis.

I am further opposed to it, because it tends to invade the very first principle of republican freedom, that "all political power is vested in and derived from the people only."—Let it be once established that the people have given up the power to begin, conduct, and complete such Constitutional reforms and restrictions as their best interests may require—in other words transfer the power of making laws and the Constitution, too, in the hands of their members to the Legislature, and they only retain the gracious privilege of approving what their *servants* may *propose* to them, where is the sovereignty of the people, then? They have given up their power. In one sense, it may be said to have been *derived* from the people, but *is it vested in them?*

The likening and comparison of Gov. Reid, by which he directs our attention to this mode of amending the Constitution of the United States, instead of inclining me favorably to this mode of amending our State Constitution, leads me directly the other way. The Government of North Carolina is based on the Constitutional majority of the people in mass. The Government of the United States is based on a Constitutional majority of *States*, each State, whether great or small, having the same vote and the same weight, and yet Governor Reid in his Message sees no difference between the character of the two Governments. What! the Federal Constitution, based on the Constitutional voice of Sovereign States, likened to the consolidated Government of North Carolina! Surely, this is consolidation in its full sense—conglomerated consolidation with a vengeance!!!

There is a great multitude of persons in North Carolina, who honestly think, and seriously argue, that two things are required to make up the strength of a State, wealth and men, *citizens*—and that in apportioning political privileges and power, *both* these elements, to wit: the people and their wealth, *taxes* ought mutually to be considered and respected. And as a large majority of the Southern States, slaveholding States, south of the Patomac, apportion and divide political power for both Houses of their Assembly among the people of their several counties according to the number of the people or voters in each county or district, as the Constitutions of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida will show, this becomes a question worthy of consideration. Our present Constitution professes to divide political rights among our several counties according to the tax each county pays into the Public Treasury, without any reference to the population of the county, its voters, or the number of soldiers it can furnish in the hour of peril and danger.

A large and respectable multitude of people in North Carolina say that it is right that in one branch of the General Assembly at least, property alone should be represented; that each district or county in the Senate should be represented according to its wealth—*according to its taxes* not inquiring whether it gives four hundred, or four thousand votes. Although this mode of dividing political power is *declared* in the Constitution to be the correct one yet it is not carried out by the *provisions* of the Constitution itself—For instance, by reference to the census and the State taxes of several counties of 1850*—if you look to the counties of Beaufort, Bertie, Bladen, Brunswick, Camden, Carteret, Caswell, Chowan, Columbus, Currituck, Duplin, Edgecombe, Franklin, Gates, Greene, Halifax, Hertford, Hyde, Johnson, Jones, Lenoir, Macon, Mecklenburg, Nash, Northampton, Onslow, Pasquotank, Perquimans, Person, Pitt, Rockingham, Sampson, Tyrrell, Warren, Washington, and Wayne, 36 counties, with a white population of only 192,141, with a federal population of only 301,387, voters only 33,204, paying taxes into the Treasury only $77,767,82, and yet these 36 counties elect 27 Senators according to the former apportionment (and the recent one makes the disparity still greater) 27 Senators.

The counties of Alamance, Alexander, Anson, Ashe, Buncombe, Burke, Cabarrus, Caldwell, Catawba, Chatham, Cherokee, Cleaveland, Craven, Cumberland, Davidson, Davie, Forsyth, Gaston, Granville, Guilford, Haywood, Henderson, Iredell, Jackson, Lincoln, McDowell, Macon, Madison, Montgomery, Moore, New-Hanover, Orange, Randolph, Robeson, Rowan, Rutherford, Stanly, Stokes, Surry, Union, Wake, Watauga, Wilkes and Yancy, 43 in number, with a white population of 359,217; in Federal population 419,154,—voters 53,213, paying a tax of $79,659,31, are represented by 23 Senators. So here are 45 counties in the State paying more than half the State taxes—having 167,076 majority of white population; 144,766 majority of the federal population of the whole State; and 19,959 majority of the voters, have only 23 Senators, whilst the other 36 counties have 27 Senators. Here is represented, in plain figures, a great inequality—seemingly a great injustice in the division of political [illegible] the basis of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, &c. Here 36 counties, having in them only about one fourth of the white population of the State, but having 27 Senators, control the whole Legislature of the State. Here 36 counties govern 45 counties. Here those who in paying taxes, pay the *less* sum, govern those who in paying taxes, pay the *greatest* sum. Here 192,141 white inhabitants govern, and are the masters of 359,217 white inhabitants. Here those who are only 304,388 in Federal numbers govern and are masters of those who are 419,154 in Federal numbers. Here 33,204 voters govern and control 53,213 voters.—Yes, in the Senate 23 thousand voters elect 27 Senators and 54 thousand voters elect but 23.

A clear and decided majority in the Senate, is about equal to having the whole Senate, then 33 thousand voters from 36 counties control the whole State.

And here I would most respectfully ask who among these 33 thousand voters of the minority on questions of taxation, and some other questions of a more important and delicate character, will give the controlling vote? In those 36 counties, will the negro and land holder elect *their* 27 Senators? No. It is clear that those who have little interest in either will elect a majority of Senators, the whole 27. Gov. Reid in two of his messages, with evident concern, delicately alludes to dangers, mischief and agitation, tending to destroy the State's harmony, when our attention is directed to those things. In plain English he means, that when you increase the power of voters who do not own land and negroes, you are approaching dangerous ground. Does it make any difference in what section of the State such voters live? Is the non-slaveholder in one section of the State, more an honest patriot than in another? Gov. Reid and other gentlemen seem *so to think*, otherwise they would not press with so much zeal *their* plan, falsely called *free and equal suffrage*, when any sensible man, who will look into this matter, calculate and think for himself, will see at once that the tendency of this very *miscalled* plan, is to place the control of the Senate entirely in the hands of a very decided and striking minority of voters in 36 counties in the State. A majority of the voters in these 36 counties have but little interest in the matters of paying taxes on land and slaves. The majority in *each* county or district elects the Senator. These things I throw out for examination and the consideration of Gov. Reid, and ask him when *reflecting so freely* on convention-men, to answer and say into whose hands, by his wise and *statesman like plan*, will he place the controlling power of the Senate! I reflect on the patriotism of no portion of my fellow citizens of North Carolina. I answer the illiberal reflections of Gov. Reid. I would have him look in his own glass, and make him answer for and to himself. Say that representation in the Senate is properly based on taxes alone, and that the men, who leave their homes, risk their *lives*, and in the battle-fields shed their blood in the defence of our liberty, our fire sides, our wives, our children, and our property, are not to be *counted* at all, in dividing out political privileges, then let us carry this principle out *fairly*. The ratio or amount of public taxes necessary to entitle a county or district to a Senator is the sum of $2766 in round numbers. The counties of Caswell, Craven, Cumberland, Edgecombe, Granville, Guilford, Halifax, Mecklenburg, New Hanover, Wake and Warren, 12 counties, in 1851 paid into the Treasury public taxes to the amount of $50,321 25, which sum divided by $2766, shows that these 11 counties are entitled to 18 Senators, and yet they are allowed to vote for and have only eleven Senators, 7 Senators less than the true number to which their tax entitles them.—The counties of Wake, New Hanover, Edgecombe, Cumberland, Craven, Granville, and Halifax, 7 counties, paid in the year 1851, into the public treasury, taxes to the amount of $35,892 33; which divided by $2766, shows that these counties are entitled to 13 Senators; and yet according to the provisions of the Constitution they are allowed only 7 Senators,—six less than their true and proper number. The counties of Wake, New Hanover, Edgecombe and Cumberland, in 1851, paid taxes into the Treasury to the amount of $22,432, 41; which divided by the ratio $2766, shows that they are entitled to 8 Senators—*two each*; whereas, by the provision of the Constitution, they only get 4 Senators—*one to each county*.* I repeat, are not these four counties (looking solely to the taxes paid by them,) entitled to two Senators each? If so, why should they not have them? Why compel them to hand half their taxes over to some neighboring county or district, to give the citizens of said neighboring county or district the right to elect their Senator, a member in whose election they have no voice, although they furnish the taxes that entitles him to his seat, and who, when elected, as often as any other way, neutralizes or kills the vote of the Senator for the county that furnishes the taxes? If any of the counties named have taxes enough for one Senator and a fraction over, which, when united to the taxes of a neighboring county entitles that neighboring county to another Senator, why not let each county share in the benefit of these united taxes, by uniting their votes also in electing *this* other Senator? Why have not some of these questions of equality and justice struck Governor Reid and his patriotic friends? I ask *how* are all these things to be regulated and *when* without a convention?

The Convention mode of amending the Constitution, the old fashioned republican plan, has been assailed on the score of economy, and attempts are constantly being made to scare the people out of the right to retain their organic law in *their* own hands by talking about the expense of a Convention

We are not permitted to know what Governor Reid's Free Suffrage has already cost the State. I venture the opinion, that if we had added up the costs of advertisements and pay of members of the Assembly, whilst discussing this question in three successive Sessions, it would amount to a sum little less than the expense of attending the Convention in 1835. If after all this, it fails to get a two-thirds vote in the Senate, as I am persuaded will be the case, then we have incurred by way of State debt a good round sum of thousands *for nothing*, for an *experiment* that failed. To elect other Governors it may be renewed, the same expense incurred, and a *failure again*.—If this abortive process shall be again attempted, the like expense incurred, and there be like failures time after time, in attempting to effect the other changes yet behind, and arise in their fury and destroy their deceivers.

According to the Convention mode, one expenditure completes the work. If the people decide against it but little expense is incurred. If the Convention is called, the delegates will likely agree on all the amendments really needed and desired by the people, who will ratify the same, and again become quiet, happy, and contented.

The Governor says that the calling of a Convention of the people is impossible.—This may be so, if his wise counsels prevail. I may be asked how are you going to get a Convention? In answer, first consult the people themselves.—Perhaps they want no convention and prefer the Constitution as it is.—If so, all is well. If, however it shall be ascertained by a very decisive and imposing majority of the votes of the people, that they desire amendments, all true republican representatives, in deference to the decided voice of a large majority of the people, would say let them elect their delegates on the federal basis and go into convention. I respect the rights of a minority. The rights of a minority ought not only to be respected, but firmly, faithfully and steadily maintained. Should the majority in favor of a convention be small, the duties of the representatives, in yielding to the call, might be different from what it would be, where the majority should be large and unequivocal.—So 45 counties, having 359,227 white, and 469,145 federal population, and 53,213 voters, paying the greater part of the taxes, have rights as well as the 36 counties having 192,141 white, 404,388 federal population, and 33,254 voters, paying less than half the taxes. And to turn these large majorities with their 23 members in the Senate for relief to that body, in which the said minorities have 27 members, and then require that they shall secure in such body a majority vote of two thirds; to wit 30 voters out of 50, for a measure of relief due to them, before they can ever get it, is securing the rights of a minority to an extent required in no free Republican Government.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken with some warmth, and at much greater length than I anticipated I should, when I commenced my remarks. But having once fairly gotten under way, I could not well keep from uttering all I have expressed, and would not, if I could. I will have to be remodeled entirely before I can think one way and speak another, or sit tamely by and witness as gross an outrage as I believe this to be on the People's vested rights and have nothing to say in the way of remonstance.

We should not unnerate feeble instrumentalities. The mightest oak, that ever grew in the forest, or that ever battled with the storms of Heaven, may at last be pecked to death by little diminutive sap-suckers, and nothing be left, in the end, to mark the spot where it stood in its towering strength and beauty, but a miserably deformed and rotten old trunk.—If this bill passes, it is possible for it to be devoured by political sap-suckers and hungry wood cockes.

*In this calculation, I have taken the rates of the five years, and the taxes of the large counties, paid by them in 1851. This lacks something of being correct. It is however sufficiently so to give consideration to a most important principle,—a principle of public right and concern, in which, when understood, the people will feel a deep interest. I have so calculated, because these counties for the last few years have exceeded in the increase of their taxes and population. If they so continue to increase for a few years more, the injustice and inequality, to which I call attention, will become too manifest to be kept longer out of view by the popular cry of individual equality, under the deceptive show of free suffrage by Legislative enactment.