

THE IREDELL EXPRESS.

A Family Newspaper—Devoted to Politics, Agriculture, Manufactures, Commerce, and Miscellaneous Reading.

Vol. III.

Statesville, N. C., Friday, July 6, 1860.

No. 31

TERMS OF ADVERTISING. One Dollar a square for the first week, and Twenty-five Cents for every week thereafter. Sixteen lines or less will make a square. Deductions made in favor of standing matter as follows: 3 Mos. 6 Mos. 1 Year. One square, \$3.50, \$5.50, \$8.00. Two squares, 7.00, 10.00, 14.00. Three squares, 10.00, 15.00, 20.00. When directions are not given how often to insert an Advertisement, it will be published until ordered out.

Our Social Circle.

For the "Ireduell Express." Dedicated to the "Social Circle." As one of the invited members of the "Circle," I salute, though late, that charmed ring. Thanks to St. Ledger's generous heart for establishing this means of enlivening many hearts and homes, by forming a band of earnest souls and active minds to spread abroad a healthy and beneficial influence. May his best and highest hopes be realized. To the homeless wanderer, the "Circle" brings the sound of familiar voices—"Voices heard before, on the side of Long Ago,"—and that same cheer and animates his heart. Through the "Circle" we meet again our friends, we interchange our thoughts and feelings, we delight in their reflection as of old, and the oldest of us, despite the realities around us which, with sorer look, point out, grow young again. Indeed, the "Circle" is peculiarly suited to the culture of the best feelings and emotions our natures are capable of. Sparkling wit, gentle humor, deep thought, biting sarcasm, or cold speculations, may do much to amuse or instruct; indeed, all are properly within the province of the "Circle," but the simple exposition of our feelings as prompted by affection, or a heartfelt interest in the welfare of others, forms the high and precious privilege of the members. The letter, then, that shows our experiences—dimly showed forth as they may—engages our earnest attention. Mrs. Browning tells us that letters should be "our talk put down on paper." The hand-grip, the heart-throb, the speaking eye, the love-awakened smile, and the sweet voice that is low, get deep as the well of the heart is deep; all are seen in the letters of "those we love, and those that love us," when we read them either on the manuscript or the printed sheet. How often have some of us seen or felt all these in life's journey! To St. Ledger—the patron saint of the "Circle"—I offer my thanks for his good will, and promise to be his co-laborer. To Mary L., my warmest admiration is due; and that she may often brighten the "Circle" is my wish. "Pilgrim," who lately came to ask the hospitality of the "Circle," has my sympathy and regard, such as is due from an exile to a pilgrim. And where are the others? What has checked the warbling of the mountain stream, "Linnette"? Why is the gentle "Minnie Moss" silent? From "The Oaks" we have heard, and have been delighted. "The Pines," too, have their eloquent representative; then will not some spirit move the energies and inspire the hearts of those last mentioned to represent the "Laurel" and the "Ivy"?

good and wise man has said, "love your friends, but don't pull down your own hedge," by which he means, I suppose, get as much amusement as possible out of your friends, but keep behind a coat of mail yourself, in short, take care of No. 1. Much as has been spoken and written about friendship, in all sorts of ways, ethically, sentimentally, satirically, farcically, sententiously, religiously, politico-economically, critically and hypocritically, yet some think it still remains to be proved whether the thing itself be a reality or only a philosophical whimsy, a "dagger of the mind," or an absolute nonentity. I believe it to be a myth, floating in the watery brain of the Transcendentalist. There, I think I have thrown a brand among you, which will stir you all up, for doubtless most of you will warmly dissent. Now, though thus courting contradiction, pray do not judge me a pelantic wrangler. I merely love it for the piquancy and sparkling vivacity it imparts to social intercourse, and I prefer it in the easy, entertaining and instructive style; and it must be conceded, my badinage to the contrary, that it is to the "social circle" that we must, almost exclusively, look for pure earthly happiness, and as an antidote to the appalling horrors of that gloomy and terrible *Apophrosion*, Death, which but too frequently and painfully forces the door of our thoughts, when deprived of the society of the congenial ones of our species. For my own part, I confess that I fear death: the fear of death is common to all Religion and Philosophy may welcome it, and passion may disregard its approach, but our instinct, which is always true, first commands us to fear. It is not the pain of dying, but it is the *penya moria*, the array of death, and dread of being alone in the dark, dark grave, that makes the brain seethe and the mind reel while brooding on the certain, but stealthy and unannounced coming of that shapeless phantom, Death! What a cheering solace, then, is the fellowship of kindred minds. It is wise to become attached for we are very dependent on each other, particularly are the males dependent on the females, who are so gentle, so affectionate, so true in sorrow, so untiring and untiring in sickness. Let us extract all the pleasure we can, then, from kind intercourse, commencing of thought and mingling of sympathies, in frequent contributions to the "Social Circle."

Yours, &c., ANGUS.

From the Raleigh Register. Discussion Between the gubernatorial Candidates, at Goldsboro. LARGE INTELLIGENT & ATTENTIVE AUDIENCE. POOL GLOUOUSLY TRIUMPHANT. Ellis' own friends admitting his utter demotion!

The discussion opened at 11 o'clock, 26th ult. at the Court House. Gov. Ellis made the opening speech. He commenced by complimenting the Democracy of Wayne, and congratulating himself upon the vote he received two years ago saying it was an indication of their adherence to the time honored principles of the Democratic party. He said that the Opposition Convention which met in Raleigh and nominated his competitor, had presented a new issue to the people of this State, which was no less than a change in the time-honored Constitution which had been adopted by our Revolutionary fathers in 1784, and that this proposition had been made the main point between his competitor and himself; that it was a proposition to annul a sacred compromise between the East and West to which the Convention of 1855 had given form and shape—that this compromise was put in the Constitution to secure the East against paying an unjust proportion of the taxes,—that the proposition to tax slaves according to value instead of taxing them as polls, would increase the taxation of the East, which was already paying its full proportion. He said this was the second Congressional District, and that it paid into the Treasury one hundred and five thousand dollars, whilst the 8th Congressional District, where they had large appropriations to build Railroads paid only forty-three thousand dollars into the Treasury, that the large County of Burke, which gave many more votes than the County of Wayne, had \$500,000 expended in it for Railroads the interest on which was 30,000 a year, and that it would take the taxes paid by that County 7 years to pay the interest for a single year on the amount expended in it from the Public Treasury. He said, by ad valorem taxation the taxes of the East would be increased, and those of the West diminished and in that way the West would lose one or two Senators, but that his competitor advocated an open Convention on the federal basis, and when that Convention assembled, the West would have the power in it, and that they would change the basis of representation in the Senate to prevent the loss of Senators—that he was a Western man and knew their views and that they would not consent to the loss of a Senator. He then went on to show that Mr. Pool had voted against Gorell's Bill for a Convention, and also Turner's Bill in the last Legislature, which he said was inconsistent with his present position. He said the Opposition platform would tax everything and would exempt nothing—in proof of which he would call attention to an amendment offered by Mr. Turner of Orange, in the Opposition Convention, proposing to exempt tin cups, &c. which was voted down, showing that they refused to

exempt tin cups, and that if they would go down as low as tin cups, he supposed they would go as low as anything, and a party which would do that ought to be called the "Tin Cup Party"; that any Government that would tax a poor man's necessities was the worst species of tyranny; that ad valorem would break into the corn-crib and the smoke house; that he himself was a poor man, and that he did not want an ad valorem tax; that he was in favor of taxing luxuries more than necessities; that the private billiard table argued luxury and ought to be taxed more than a man's land of equal value. He then went on to refer to Mr. Pool's votes on the subject of ad valorem and said if those propositions were not the same as that which he now advocates, why did he not introduce his present proposition in the Legislature?—He said ad valorem would drive slaves from the State—that the wealthy man could take his slaves on the Railroad and carry them to Arkansas where they would earn more than they do in North Carolina.

He said there were two ways to equalize taxation—one by putting it up on negroes, and the other by bringing it down on land; that Mr. Pool was for increasing taxes on negroes, whilst he was for decreasing them on land; that the Public Treasury would permit a decrease in the present amount raised.—Here ended Mr. Ellis' first speech.

MR. POOL'S REPLY. He said this was the first time he had appeared before the people of Wayne—that he knew they were opposed to him politically, but that when he appeared before the people of N. C., of whatever political faith, he was appearing before his countrymen who cherished the principles of American liberty, that every man had a right to entertain and express his political opinions,—that he knew the people of Wayne County, though opposed to his politics, were North Carolina gentlemen, and were willing to hear both sides of the question fairly discussed—that his competitor, instead of coming up fairly to the issue between them, and discussing it upon facts and principles, had taken in unsupported assertion, and dealt in his time in skirmishing on the out post of the question,—that he had involved himself in contradictions which he should take pains to point out to the audience. His competitor had said that there was a proposition to alter a compromise which had been effected between the East and West, which had been made for the benefit of the East. He (Mr. Pool) did not see any ground for asserting that this was a compromise for the benefit of the East—that the East had voted against it by overwhelming majorities in every county, and he proceeded to show the votes of the various counties on the subject.

Table with 2 columns: County Name and Votes. Eastern Counties: Wayne 28, Beaufort 96, Bertie 90, Currituck 22, Camden 66, Chowan 7, Columbus 3, Edgecombe 29, Franklin 85, Gates 12, Green 9, Hertford 7, Hyde 2, Johnston 73, Lenoir 54, Martin 14, Nash 12, Northampton 18, Pasquotank 7, Pitt 82, Perquimans 10, Tyrrell 1, Washington 14. Western Counties: Anson 815, Buncombe 1322, Burke 1359, Davidson 1034, Haywood 431, Ireduell 1194, Lincoln 1887, Mecklenburg 1097, Rowan 1570, Rockingham 612, Rutherford 1557, Surry 1751, Stokes 1061, Wilkes 1767, Yancey 564.

How then could his competitor say that this was a compromise for the benefit of the East? and urge before an Eastern audience that it was adopted for the protection of their interest when it had been forced upon them so plainly against their wishes? that his competitor was raising the cry of East and West; that he deprecated appeals to sectional feelings upon a great question of justice and equality; that his competitor had represented his platform as proposing to strike out a provision of the present constitution and put nothing in its place; that the constitution of N. Carolina permitted the legislature to tax everything according to value except slaves; that it permitted no tax to be placed upon slaves under 12 and over 50, and on those between those ages it permitted no higher tax than that placed upon white

polls; that the proposition was now to strike out this restriction and to put in its place a provision that every species of property may be taxed according to its value, with power in the legislature to discriminate only in favor of the "native products of our State, and the industrial pursuits of her citizens." That this would not only allow slaves to be taxed according to value as property, but compel the legislature so to tax them, and at the same time to tax all the leading subjects of taxation in the same way, giving it power to discriminate only in favor of "native products and industrial pursuits." That this would give a substantial guarantee and protection against unequal taxation, not only to the slave owner, but also to the land owner, to the owner of bank stock and of money interest, and all other leading investments of capital. Much has been said about protection to the slave owner. Where is the protection in the constitution to the land owner? and the owner of other property? He has none and as the result of it, the land is taxed 20 cents on the hundred dollars valuation, while the slave is taxed only 6 cts. in the aggregate. There was a protection in the constitution in 1835 to the land owner for the Senate was elected by and represented but the owners of land. Free Suffrage annulled this provision of the constitution and left the land owner with protection. My competitor and his party did all in their power to effect this, having none of the sacred reverence for the compromises of the constitution so ostentatiously paraded here to day. They talk much of the protection to the slave owner, but have no regard to the interest of the poor land owner. I voted for Free Suffrage because it gave equality at the ballot box, and I deemed that equality of more importance than the protection which was sacrificed to gain it.

I am now in favor of equality at the tax box, and I am met by the cry that it will annul the constitutional protection to slave owners. But the proposition of our platform, while it would break down the present mode of protection to slave owners in order to gain that equality at the tax box, it at the same time proposes to insert in the constitution another and a better protection to the slave owner, as well as to the land owner, and the owner of other property. My competitor did sacrifice the land owner's protection for the sake of equality at the ballot box, and gave him nothing in its place, but an increase of his taxes, and now he is unwilling to take equality at the tax box, because he fears that some protection to the negro will be taken away; and even when the proposition to gain that equality contains a provision of ample protection to the negro, and at the same time to restore the lost guarantee and protection which the land owner enjoyed under the constitution of '35. My competitor has misled us into the belief that we would strike out and insert nothing, whereas we propose not only to strike out but also to insert, so that under the constitution, when tax is raised upon one species of property, it must also be raised upon others, compelling every man to pay for the support of the government which protects him in the enjoyment of his property in proportion to the value of the protection which he enjoys. If one man is protected in the enjoyment of \$1,000, and another in the enjoyment of \$10,000, it is a clear principle of justice that one should pay ten times as much as the other towards the support of the government. Who says it is right that the man who has \$1,000 worth of land should pay as much as the man who owns \$10,000 worth? No earthly reason can be assigned why there should be a difference when you come to apply this rule to the owners of slaves. But my competitor will not come up to this point, but runs off into a long talk about tin cups, the old woman's goose-eggs, chickens, &c., in order to prejudice the minds of the poor man against a system of taxation which is clearly and justly for his benefit. He pretends that he is a poor man himself, calls himself a poor man, and says he is one of them, and he does not want Ad Valorem. I am now talking to poor men, and if he is one of them let him sit there and me talk to him. But I understood him to make some strong appeals to the interest and prejudices of the rich slave owner.—He said I would increase the taxation of the East, because the great slave interest is in the East, and increase the tax on slaves so much as to drive them from the State. As we have only a certain amount of revenue to raise for the support of the State government, can it be explained to the poor men here how an Ad Valorem system of taxation, which he says would so largely increase the taxes of the rich, would also increase the taxes of the poor? He must know that to raise a given amount, if the taxes of the rich are increased, the taxes of the poor must be decreased. To raise a given amount, a system that would tax a rich man according to his wealth, would certainly tax a poor man according to his poverty. He plays awhile to the rich, and then turns around and plays to the poor, and says

that he is one of them.—He has two strings to his bow, but unfortunately for him, when he uses one, he is obliged to break the other. He seems to have been aware of this, and, therefore, finds it necessary to claim personal fellowship with the poor man, and throw dust in his eyes about tin cups, goose-eggs, &c. He says, any party that would tax tin cups ought to be called the "tin cup party." He does not state directly that either myself or any member of my party propose to tax those things, for he knows that it is distinctly disclaimed in every section; but he says that it is an inference which he draws from our platform. Then let us examine the platform of both parties, and see which is the "tin cup party" and who is the tin cup man.—He seems to mistake that our purpose is not to put a revenue bill in the constitution, when it is simply to insert a great principle of equality and justice, and to compel the legislature to observe it in passing revenue laws. The Legislature now has power to tax the tin cups and goose-eggs of the poor according to their value, but has no power to tax the slaves of the rich. We declare no duty of power. We would give the legislature the same power to tax slaves according to value which it now has to tax other property in that way, and in giving that power, we would compel the legislature to tax all leading subjects of capital upon one uniform rate of value, so that one can be taxed no higher than another; but at the same time, our platform proposes to discriminate and to discriminate only in favor of our "native products and industrial pursuits." This is the plain letter of the platform put in print for the world to read, and yet our opponents persist in misrepresenting it. It is in the following words: "that the constitution may be so modified '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 industrial pursuits of her citizens.'"

Now, the best way to discriminate in favor of industrial pursuits, is to give the legislature, elected by an industrial people, power to exempt from taxation those articles necessary to carry on the operations of labor. This is a question of power, and the legislature, fresh from the people, can, from time to time, exercise it in accordance with the will and interest of the people. But the Democratic platform is a very different affair. Undertaking to prescribe the duty of the legislature in passing a revenue law, it holds on to the prohibition in the constitution which forbids them to tax slaves according to value, but in regard to every other species of property it goes on in the following words: "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."—It would bear then upon every species of property in all sections of the State, and it asserts the duty of the legislature to make it do so.

I ask my competitor if tin cups are not one species of property? He answered yesterday that they were.—Then let him tell us how much he can bear upon a tin cup. Are goose-eggs a species of property? Then how much would he bear upon the old woman's goose-eggs. He must "bear" upon them some if he would "bear" upon every species of property. It would seem that my competitor is the "tin cup" man, and his party the "tin cup" party. He seems to have been aware of this unfortunate position in which his party has placed him, and can find no way to get out of it, except by taking the start of us and endeavoring to put it upon our shoulders, when it was upon his. My competitor is not the originator of this system of tactics. It is not original with him. It is upon the old principle of thief crying "stop thief!" In his Raleigh speech, behind my back, and when my friends were not allowed to correct any mis-statements of my position, he raised this unjust cry against me, when it really belonged to his own shoulders, and then printed it in pamphlet form, and has been sending it by thousands, to the incumbrance of the mails, all over the State, into all the cross roads and dark corners, wherever it was calculated to deceive the people as to our relative positions. Let it be understood that my competitor is the "tin cup" man and his party is the "tin cup" party. But this game of my competitor could serve only to throw dust in the poorer and more ignorant classes, and deceive them into opposition to a measure calculated for their good.—But my competitor is evidently preaching principally for the vote of the slave owner. He says that equal taxation drives slaves from the State. I say that any man who would leave the State because he has to pay his just proportion of his taxes, would leave his country for his country's good.—But where would he carry his slaves?—Every southern State, except North Carolina, and perhaps Virginia, taxes slaves as property and not as persons. North Carolina alone

knows Western men, and I say Western men know him about as well.—Here is an extract from the Asheville Advocate, published in the extreme West. It makes a correct prediction of my competitor's course in the East. Hear it: "We would call the attention of our Eastern friends to a remark of Col. Gaither's in his speech before our County Convention. He said no doubt, it would be used against Mr. Pool in the East, that if the West got a Convention, the Constitution would be torn to pieces. The West simply asked that the slaves may be taxed according to value. She would be content with that amendment. And this we believe to be the view of all thinking men here." "Since I have been in Goldsboro' I have received letters from several prominent Western men which I have here before me, complaining of the imputation which my competitor is casting upon their purposes. They ask me to assure the Eastern people that they have no such purpose or desire, and spurn the imputation of such sinister motives, and it is my purpose to do it before every Eastern audience. My competitor says I voted against two Convention bills in the last Legislature, and that it is inconsistent with my present position. I voted to lay Turner's Bill upon the table, because it proposed to submit the Legislative act to a decision of the people, and had objectionable features in reference to the mode for taking the vote upon it, and proposed a Convention for various purposes objectionable to me. I voted against Gorell's Bill because it did not specify that the Convention was to be called on the federal basis. I would vote against both those propositions now. But my competitor says if I did not like these propositions and those of Mr. Bodose and others, about Ad Valorem taxation, why did I not introduce my present proposition to change the Constitution of the State? I will answer him. I was sent to the Legislature to pass statutes, and not to change the fundamental law of the land; upon points that had never been brought to the attention of my constituents. Any member of the Legislature who would vote to change the Constitution on a point that had never been met before his constituents would betray the trust confided in him, and be unworthy the confidence of those who sent him there. Does my competitor dare to deny the truth of this proposition before this audience? He does not. Then this question is answered. He says he would bring down the tax on land and not put it up on negroes. Then he would decrease the amount of revenue raised, and would not have enough to support the State government. He would, therefore, be obliged to put it up on something. Let him tell us where he would put it. He intimated that the Treasury would permit a reduction on the present amount raised, but does not tell us how or where. He is not able to tell us. I thought so in the last Legislature, and made a speech urging a reduction. His party refused to reduce it. But this does not alter the principle.—Whether you collect much or little, it ought to be collected upon the principle of equality. Every man should pay for the support of the government in proportion to the protection he enjoys. He speaks of taxing luxuries more than necessities, and says that a government that taxes necessities is a tyranny. I do not propose to tax necessities at all. We propose to leave the details of taxation to the Legislature, compelling it only to tax the leading subjects of capital, and other things, when taxed at all, according to their value. But the present system does tax necessities—a sugar and coffee, salt and calico and everything that a poor man buys from a store in the State; and it taxes them 50 cents on every \$100 valuation—while the slave owner only pays 6 cents on the \$100 valuation. Then, according to my competitor, his system of taxation is a tyranny, and I call upon him to help me to change it, and to wipe out this blot of tyranny from the jurisprudence of the State. He asks me what I would exempt under the discriminating clause in our platform, whether I would exempt cattle and stock and other things?—I tell him I would exempt nothing in the Constitution, but would give power to the Legislature, to discriminate only in favor of the "native products and industrial pursuits of my State." But his platform makes it the duty of the Legislature to bear upon every species of property equally, excepting only negroes. He would bear "as equally as practicable," upon stock and farming utensils, and "other necessities," and thus make the government of the State, as he confesses, a tyranny.

The above is believed to be a correct report of the main speeches of both gentlemen, and the reader will see that Mr. Pool's arguments are unanswerable. In the short speech which closed the discussion Mr. Pool was most happy, and brought his opponent "up standing" several times. WAYNE.