

THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

BRUNER & JAMES,
Editors & Proprietors.



NEW SERIES.
VOLUME VI—NUMBER 9.

SALISBURY, N. C., THURSDAY, JULY 5, 1849.

REPORT OF THE

Committee on the state of the Church, with the proceedings thereon.—Published by the Order of the Thirty-third Convention, held in St. Luke's Church, Salisbury, N. C.

The Committee on the state of the Church, respectfully report: That from the Bishop's Address, and the Parochial Reports presented to this Convention, they find the number of Baptisms to have been—

Adults 144, Children 460—in all	604
Confirmations,	233
Communicants,	2129
Candidates for Orders,	6
Number of Clergy—Presbyters 34	
Deacons 6	

Making, with the Bishop, in all 41 Churches Consecrated, 2

Ordinations—Presbyters 5, Deacon 1, total 6 These statistics being compared with those of 1847, (there being none given in the Report of 1848,) show an increase of 11 of the Clergy, of 233 Communicants, 228 Baptisms.

While the Committee find such cause of thankfulness to God for these manifestations of the Church's increase, they deplore the existence among its members of great agitation and alarm, arising from the impression that doctrines have been preached not in accordance with the Liturgy and Articles of this Church, and that ceremonies and practices have been introduced either unauthorized by the customs of this Church, or in plain violation of its rubrics. As it is not the business of the Committee to say, they do not say, whether or not such doctrines have been preached, or such practices introduced; but they state as their full conviction, that whether the case be so or not, the far greater part of the Clergy are entirely opposed to any such departure from the doctrines of the Church,—that they desire the introduction of no ceremonies unauthorized by the customs of this Church, and are still less tolerant of such as violate the rubrics. Another cause of alarm, as the Committee believe, has been found in the supposition that a society has existed in this Diocese, whose character and practices are at variance with the spirit if not with the laws of this Church. The Committee have assurance, on which they entirely rely, that no such society is at present in existence in this Diocese.

R. S. MASON, Chairman.

BRETHREN OF THE CLERGY: In the Report on the state of the Church, made by members of your order, reference is made to excitement in the Diocese, growing out of the idea that doctrines are promulgated and practices encouraged among us more or less repugnant to the authorized doctrines and usages of our branch of the Church. As these doctrines and practices are not specified, your Bishop can address you only in general terms. But he does by way of charge, hereby address you and authorize you, when you return to your several parishes, to assure your people, that no efforts shall be wanting on his part, so long as God may give him jurisdiction in North Carolina, to hinder the introduction of any doctrine or the introduction of any practice—come from whatever quarter it may—not in strict accordance with the Liturgy of our Church, as illustrated and defined by those standards of interpretation authorized by the Church itself.

In respect to a particular question, which has agitated the Diocese of late, the question of auricular confession, I may here express my conviction that the Book of Common Prayer, our standard of Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship, does not authorize any clergyman of this Church to teach or enforce such confession as necessary to salvation; and that the only confession which it authorizes, is the voluntary confession of the penitent, in accordance with the exhortation in the office for the Holy Communion.

L. SILLIMAN IVES,
Bishop of North Carolina.

WHEREAS, in the Report of the Committee on the state of the Church, mention is made of certain rumors of doctrine not in accordance with the principles of the Protestant Episcopal Church; and whereas, while in the opinion of this Convention the Church encourages her members to seek, whenever necessary, the godly counsel and advice of her pastors, yet she nowhere requires the practice of auricular confession and private absolution; and whereas, in the language of the late Bishop Holm, "the Church of Rome makes auricular confession, the private confession to the Priest, by every individual, of all his sins of thought, word and deed, an indispensable condition of forgiveness,—the Churchman justly deems auricular confession, and private absolution, and encroachment on the rights of conscience—an invasion of the prerogative of the Searcher of hearts,—and, with some exceptions, hostile to domestic and social happiness, and licentious and corrupting in its tendency;" and whereas, a communication from the Right Rev. Bishop of this Diocese has been made to the Clergy during this Convention, expressing his views, which this Convention have heard with great satisfaction, and to which they desire to give extended circulation. Therefore

Resolved, That 1000 copies of the Report of the Committee on the State of the Church, together with the Charge of the Bishop and this Preamble, be published in Pamphlet form and distributed by the Secretary to the different Parishes.

[From the Minutes.]
EDWARD LEE WINSLOW,
Secretary.

A GREAT STATE.

Old Massachusetts, says an exchange, has ever taken the lead in what is good, useful, and profitable. She established the first school in the United States, the first academy, the first college. She set up the first press, printed the first book and the first newspaper. She planted the first apple tree, and caught the first whale. She coined the first money, and hoisted the first national flag. She made the first canal, and the first rail road. She invented the first mouse-trap and washing machine, and sent the first ship to discover islands and continents in the South Sea. She produced the first philosopher, and made the first pin. She fired the first gun in the Revolution, and gave John Bull his first beating, and put her hand first to the Declaration of Independence. She invented Yankee Doodle, and gave a name forever to the "Universal Yankee Nation." Truly, a great State is Massachusetts.

MORE PLANETS.—Another new planet has been discovered by Sig. Espairs, a Neapolitan astronomer. This is the ninth new heavenly body which has been added to the solar system by the discoveries of the last four years.

Terms of the Watchman.
Subscription, per year, Two Dollars—payable in advance. But if not paid in advance, Two Dollars and fifty cts. will be charged.
Advertisements inserted at \$1 for the first, and 25 cts. for each subsequent insertion. Court orders charged 25 per cent. higher than these rates. A liberal deduction to those who advertise by the year.
Letters to the Editors must be post paid.

To Treat Peach Trees.—The peach trees are only of a few years duration now, after which they wither and die. It has been suggested that grubs are the cause of this early decay, and that they can be destroyed by removing the ground around the root of the tree and adding wood ashes or newly burnt lime, which should be left till fall and then removed so that the frost can get to them. If this is properly managed, the latter will effect the destruction of the worms without injuring the tree.

The above receipt for destroying the grubs in Peach Trees, we find, is going the rounds of the newspapers; and as we have tried the experiment and know something of its practical effects, it is not amiss to relate our experience. We made the application of wood ashes to some half dozen young trees this Spring, first scraping away the ground around the root of the trees as above described. Soon after the leaves put out we discovered that all was not right. They commenced crisping or curling, and continued to grow worse and worse. After a while a small reddish brown insect, with barely perceptible animal life, made its appearance on the leaves, by thousands; and as they slowly disappeared, the leaves began to droop. Taking the alarm we forthwith removed the ashes from the roots to return the soil; and in doing so, found the roots highly colored by the effects of the ashes, and the bark so tender that it was easily removed with the finger nail. We were too late: The ashes had done the work: The leaves withered and dried up; and our trees, the subject of two or three years' attention, were all killed.

But we are not convinced, nevertheless, that the bad effects of the ashes in this case must necessarily attend its application in all cases. But we are convinced, however, that a caution against using too much ashes should accompany this receipt. They should be applied sparingly. Otherwise, unless the trees are large, mischief will ensue. We would not risk more than a half pint to each tree of one or two years' growth. Old ones will bear more; and when full grown, we have found that a gallon is not too much.

Cotton Blossoms.—We have received from Mr. Rufus Reid, of Mount Mourne, Iredell county, a cotton blossom, which must have opened on the 28th June. This is early, when we consider the backwardness of the Spring, the late frost, &c. The earliest blossoms reported to us last year, were by Mr. R. S. McKENZIE; and they opened on the same day, the 28th June. So that, we should suppose, there is no very material difference between the prospect of the cotton crop in this section of country, this year, and that of last year, at a corresponding period of its growth. We learn that cotton blossoms are very plenty in the Jersey Settlement, in Davidson county; and that they were probably in advance of Mr. Reid. Be this as it may, Mr. R. has offered the best evidence that they are out, and is therefore entitled to the honor of producing the first one.

Prospectuses.—We have received at our office, within the last two or three months, several different prospectuses of papers now published, and proposed to be published, in North Carolina, which, in point of workmanship, would have been a disgrace to any printing office in the State twenty years ago. We take occasion to notify those, therefore, who may hereafter wish to put out such papers, that if they will send their manuscripts to this office, we will do them up a job that will, at least, look respectable.

Riots in Philadelphia.—The city of Philadelphia appears to be infested with a worse class of rowdies than even New York. Almost every Sunday witnesses a riot between the rival fire companies. If a fire occurs on that day it is a matter of course that a fight follows; and frequently when there is no fire, a false alarm is raised, that the firemen may assemble, and the usual treat be enjoyed.—Broken heads and bloody noses are the common results. But on Sunday the 17th the exhibition was on a grander scale, as will be seen by the following account:—

Philadelphia, June 17.

It appears that during the alarm of fire this morning, the adherents of the Moving company seized the carriage of the Franklin company and threw it into the Delaware. About noon the friends of the Franklin collected in considerable numbers and took possession of the Engine house of the Moving company. This led to a desperate and deadly struggle, both parties being armed with pistols, knives, and various descriptions of missiles. They went into the fight with the precision and coolness of soldiers of the Moving company party being headed by a desperate set known as "Killers." They marched up to each other in regular platoons, and after having discharged

ed their guns, went at it with dirks, knives and clubs.

A man by the name of Gillis, who was leading the Franklin company, was shot through the heart and instantly killed.—About 15 were wounded, some dangerously.

The fight lasted an hour and a half, the line of combatants stretching from the corner of 8th and Fitzwater to Broad street, the residents of which were much alarmed.

Two men suspected of being the murderers of Gillis are in custody, the only arrests that have been made as yet, though the mayor and sheriff have a large posse in pursuit of the rioters.

Col. Benton and Mr. Calhoun.

We subjoin farther extracts from the speech of Col. Benton. They will not fail to attract the attention of the reader, and if we are not mistaken, to convince him that the memory of Mr. Calhoun, where, his own acts are concerned, is at least as treacherous as it is extraordinary. The copy from which we extract, is not a full report of Benton's speech. It is furnished by the Courier & Enquirer, and the substance of some portions, as the reader will see, is given in brief by the editors. The first portion which we shall quote relates to the Missouri question, and is in the words of the Courier & Enquirer:

"In 1820, he says, Mr. Calhoun being a member of President Monroe's Cabinet, was required to give his opinion in writing on the question of the power of Congress to prohibit slavery in territories, and on the constitutionality of the 8th section of the act for the admission of Missouri into the Union, and which section applied the anti-slavery clause of the Ordinance of 1787, to more than half of the whole Territory of Louisiana. Mr. Calhoun then gave his written opinion in favor of the constitutionality of the act; and no whisper was ever heard from him to the contrary, until the introduction of his firebrand resolutions twenty seven years after. These resolutions, Mr. Benton says, were introduced by Mr. Calhoun, to make a test for himself at the Presidential election which no Northern man could stand. Before the debate came on, however, the proofs of the opinion, which Mr. Calhoun gave in 1820, were brought forward to his utter confusion and the entire prostration of his resolutions. These proofs consisted of the original interrogation propounded to his Cabinet by Mr. Monroe, in his own handwriting and the draft of a letter from him to a friend, stating that these questions were answered affirmatively by every member of the Cabinet. Mr. Calhoun of course included. In addition to these records is a passage from the Diary of J. Q. Adams, stating the same facts concerning the action of the members of Mr. Monroe's Cabinet. These testimonies Mr. Benton insists is overwhelming. Mr. Calhoun attempts to escape it by saying that Missouri, at the preceding session, had presented herself for admission as a member of the Union. She had formed a constitution and government, in accordance with an act of Congress. Her admission was refused on the ground that her constitution admitted of slavery; and she was remanded back to have the objectionable provision expunged. She refused to comply with the requisition, and at the next session again knocked at the door of Congress for admission, with her constitution as it originally stood. Mr. Calhoun says that Missouri was then a State,—that if refused admission to the Union she would still have been a State, independent of the Union and the probable centre of a new confederacy. None were willing to contribute to such a result, and to avoid it, the Northern members opposed to her admission, were forced to propose a compromise, which the South accepted.

Mr. Benton says that every part of this statement is erroneous, and to such a degree as to destroy all reliance upon Mr. Calhoun's memory. He says that during the compromise session he & Mr. Lowndes resided together, and that at the preceding session Missouri had presented her constitution, made under the act of Congress, and applied for admission into the Union. Now this is error. The constitution of Missouri followed, and did not precede the compromise act. That act was passed March 6th, 1820, the constitution framed under it was signed July 19th, of the same year; and was presented to Congress in the month of November following—Congress in that year having met on the second Monday in November.—Here then is an error of a year in point of time, and a transposition of events in point of fact. The constitution of Missouri was made after the compromise, and in pursuance of it; and not to know that much was to know nothing at all about it. Mr. Calhoun says the admission was refused, and the constitution remanded back, because it admitted slavery in Missouri. This is great error. The act of Congress under which the Missouri constitution was made admitted slavery in Missouri, and her constitution could not be, and was not, refused on that ground. The admission was not refused for that cause, nor

for any thing like it, nor for any thing in relation to slavery, but the direct opposite—for a clause in relation to free people of color, and by which, it was contended, the citizens of other States might be prevented from removing to the State of Missouri. The clause was this: "To prevent free negroes and mulattos from coming to, and settling in this State, under any pretext, whatever." The provision was found in clause 4, section 26, of article 3, of the constitution, and was objected to as being inconsistent with the constitution of the United States, and the rights of the States, as in some of those States free people of color might be citizens. This was the clause objected to, and not the one sanctioning slavery. Mr. Calhoun says the constitution was remanded back to the State to have the slavery clause expunged. It was not remanded for the purpose of having any thing expunged, but the contrary—to have something added—to obtain the legislative assent of the State to the joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress, declaring that the clause in question should never be so construed as to exclude from settlement, and the rights of citizenship, the citizens of other States emigrating to Missouri.

Mr. Calhoun says the State refused to comply with the requisition of Congress. This is more error. The State complied immediately; the legislative assent to the required construction of the objectionable clause being given on the 26th day of June, in the same year. He says the State knocked again with her constitution at the door of Congress at the next session, and that this gave rise to the most agitating discussion that ever took place in Congress. This is the very error of the moon. The State never applied to Congress again, but was admitted in the recess, and before next meeting of Congress, and by proclamation from President Monroe. The Proclamation was issued the 10th of August, 1820, in pursuance to the joint resolution of Congress of the 2d of March of that year, expressly framed to save the State from applying to Congress again, by referring it to the President to proclaim her admission as soon as she assented to the required construction of the objectionable article. The fact is, that Congress did not refuse to admit the State at all; on the contrary, passed a joint resolution at her first session of the presentation of the Constitution, for her admission "on a certain condition"—on compliance with which condition her admission was to be complete, without further proceeding on the part of Congress, and was to be so proclaimed by the President. All this appears in the legislative history of the country, and was authentically recited in the proclamation issued on the occasion.

Now this proclamation was issued from the cabinet of which Mr. Calhoun was a member, and appears to have been completely forgotten by him as was the cabinet decision of the same year in favor of the power of Congress to legislate upon the subject of slavery in territories, and to abolish it in territories; for that was the effect of the compromise act of 1820. He actually forgets that Missouri was admitted upon a proclamation issued from the cabinet council of which he was a member! and goes on to substitute the wanderings of his imagination for the legislative history of the country, in giving a supposed circumstantial account of what took place between himself and Mr. Lowndes, after the second rejection of the Missouri constitution, and which led to the conclusions which, according to him, produced the compromise. "To back out, or compromise, was the only alternative left; and the latter was eagerly seized upon to avoid the disgrace of the former." So says Mr. Calhoun; and so saying; he postpones the compromise a whole year, and couples it with an event to which it does not belong, and makes it the effect of a cause which never existed. It is postponed from the session '19-'20 to the session '20-'21; and it is connected with the final admission of Missouri, after she had become a State, instead of being connected with the preliminary act which authorized her to form a State constitution. Never was such blundering seen!

We next have a parallel between the Missouri Compromise and the Wilmot proviso:

Mr. Benton, after thus establishing the fact that Mr. Calhoun gave his sanction to the compromise act which admitted Missouri, goes on to show that it is in the very words of the Wilmot Proviso. He thinks, therefore, that this should be called the Calhoun proviso, because Mr. Calhoun was nearly thirty years ahead of Wilmot in its support, because his position was then higher, being a member of the Cabinet, because he was successful, and Mr. Wilmot was not, and finally because Wilmot's proviso is a weak contrivance to prevent slavery from being where it is not, and where it never will be; while Calhoun's proviso was a manly blow to kill slavery, where it then existed, by law, and where it would now exist in point of fact, if that blow had not been struck. The proviso of Mr. Calhoun actually abolished slavery where it existed by law—in all the upper half of Louisiana—from 36°—30° to 49°, and from the Mississippi to the Rocky Mountains—over a territory nearly a thousand miles square

—nearly a million square miles—enough to make twenty states of 50,000 square miles each—more in fact than all California, and New Mexico and Oregon put together. Over all this vast territory the proviso, supported by Calhoun, abolished slavery—abolished it, then existing by law, and shut it up from the slave emigration of the South. And now what comes of the *dogma*, in his mouth, and that of his followers, so recently invented, of no power in Congress to legislate upon the subject of slavery in territories!—What becomes, in their mouths, of the new fangled point of honor, just felt for the first time in thirty years, of insult to slave States in their exclusion from settlement to the territories bought by the blood and treasure of the whole Union? Louisiana was a territory, and Congress legislated upon slavery out of a million of square miles of it, and Mr. Calhoun supported that legislation. Louisiana was a territory acquired by the treasure, if not by the blood, of the whole Union; and the proviso of 1820, supported by Mr. Calhoun, shut up one half of it from slave emigration. If that is insult, he and his followers have stood being insulted most remarkably well for about thirty years; and perhaps would consult their own self-respect, and lose nothing in public opinion, if they should continue standing it with like fortitude, for the remainder of their lives.

This action of Mr. Calhoun is quoted to shut the mouths of Mr. C. and his followers:

"He proceeds to say that in giving his cabinet support, where his voice was so potential to the abolition of slavery over a million of square miles in Louisiana, Mr. Calhoun did more than any one man has ever done towards abolishing slavery in the world. Holding, as he then did, the one fifth part of the veto power, and commanding as his position was, as a southern man and a cabinet minister—the largest question ever started of free or slave soil, was then in his hands; and he decided it in favor of free. It was an immense boon to the anti-slavery party, then so numerous and ardent; but it was not the only service which he rendered them. Texas was then ours—a part of Louisiana—to the lower Rio Grande;—large enough to form six great or ten common States. It was all slave territory, and looked to as the natural outlet of the southern slave population. It was given to the King of Spain—given away by treaty, and that treaty the work of Mr. Monroe's cabinet—Mr. Calhoun being a member. And here there is no room for denial and non-recollection. For a long time Mr. Adams bore the blame of that cession. A friend of Mr. Calhoun reproached him with it in the House of Representatives. Mr. Adams was then alive, and present, and soon vindicated the truth of history. He showed that there was a division in the cabinet, upon the point; he was against it—Mr. Calhoun for it—and Mr. Calhoun being a southern man, and the majority of that cabinet southern, he carried the day, and Texas was lost. I was not then in public life, but I wrote against that act, blaming Mr. Adams when I should have blamed Mr. Calhoun. By that cession the expansion of slavery was stopped; the growth of slave states in the southwest was stopped; three hundred and fifty thousand square miles subject to American slavery, was cut off from American dominion, and presented to a foreign king. This was another great gratification to the abolitionists; but it was not all. There was a strip of land, about large enough for two states, lying upon the Arkansas and Red rivers, and between Texas and the 36 deg. 30 min. of north latitude. This strip having escaped the compromise line on one side, and the Texas cession on the other, was open to the formation of two respectable slave States. Mr. Calhoun was then still cabinet minister—Secretary at War—had the Indians under his care—and was riding the hobby of their civilization. He required this strip to be given up to the Indians for their permanent abode; and thus it, also, was lost to the slave States. All Louisiana was then gone from them except the fragment which was contained in the States of Missouri and Louisiana, and in the Territory of Arkansas. Even this fragment appeared to be too much to be left to the slave States, and a slice forty miles wide, and three hundred miles long, was cut off from Arkansas and given to the Indians; and the slaveholders with the slaves upon the slice, were required to remove from the cut off part, and fall back within the contracted limits. This was done by the Indian treaty—the treaty negotiated by a protégé of Mr. Calhoun's. He was then Vice President of the United States, and President of the Senate—I was a member of the Senate—opposed to the ratification of this treaty—and came within one or two votes of defeating it. The slightest help from Mr. Calhoun would have defeated it, and saved the slave State of Arkansas that territory, and those salt springs, the loss of which she now has to lament. Taken all together—the compromise—the Texas cession—the Indian domain and the slice from Arkansas, and Mr. Calhoun did more, in less time, to abolish slavery, diminish its area, and increase that of free soil, than

any man that has ever appeared on the face of the earth; and of this the anti-slavery party of the North were fully sensible, and duly grateful. They gave proof of their gratitude. Mr. Calhoun was then candidate for Vice President of the United States; he became the favorite of the North—beating even Mr. Adams, himself, on the free soil track. He beat him six votes in New York—ran head and neck with him through New Hampshire, Vermont and Rhode Island—was even through Massachusetts—and came a nose ahead on the northern track. He actually beat Mr. Adams in abolition states—and with justice. He had done more than him for free soil, and with more merit, being himself an inhabitant of slave soil. I told him all this in my first *Calhounian*, in the Senate of the United States, four days after he put in his fire brand resolutions, in my speech to show him to be the true author of the Mexican war."

The first thing which struck us, on reading the first extract, was the utter want of memory manifested by Mr. Calhoun, with regard to the circumstances attending the admission of Missouri, and the exceedingly awkward predicament in which it places him. That he did give his opinion, in favor of the power of Congress to exclude slavery from the territories, seems to be established by a mass of testimony which it is impossible to resist. It we recollect, however, Mr. C. claims irresponsibility for all acts done before he arrived at the age of forty, though before that time had been a candidate for the Presidency. When the idea of divorcing Bank and State was broached at the extra session of 1837, and Mr. Calhoun had become a friend of it, his speech in favor of the Bank, in 1816, was cast up to him. He insisted (if we remember) that he had on that occasion contended for the same principle; but when his speech was republished from the files of the *Intelligencer*, it was not to be found in it, though it had been reported by Mr. Gales, one of the most accurate stenographers that ever had a seat on the floor of either House.

It is to our minds perfectly evident, that Mr. Calhoun has, as he is here charged by Col. Benton, been of more service to the free soil party than any other man now living. We are far from attributing to him any improper motive in giving his decision in favor of the Missouri compromise, by which, in all human probability, the Union was preserved; yet his blindest admirer cannot shut his eyes to the glaring inconsistency of which he is guilty in charging with treason to the South, all those who refused to declare war against the Union, on the ground of opposition to a principle which he himself had been among the first to recognise. The time at which this recognition was made, is not the least remarkable of all the things connected with this subject. The doctrine that Congress has no right to prohibit slavery in the territories, is not, as Col. Benton supposes, "recently invented." It was well understood at the very time when Mr. C. gave this Cabinet opinion. In the debate on the Missouri question, Charles Cortesworth Pinckney, representing Mr. Calhoun's own State in the Senate of the United States, in a speech, among the first, if not the very first, delivered on the Southern side, took the broad ground, not only that Congress had no right to restrict slavery in the territories, but that the Ordinance of 1787, relied on the support such an opinion, was an arbitrary exercise of power not granted by the State of Virginia in her act of cession of the Northwest territory—that the Congress enjoyed no such power under the Articles of Confederation, which were in operation at the time of the cession—that the Legislature of Virginia, by its act of 1788, recognized no such power—and that the confirmatory act of Congress of 1789 was illegal, because the new Constitution, by virtue of which Congress was then in session, conferred upon it no such power! We know not whether this speech was made before the cabinet opinion of Mr. Calhoun was given or not; but we do know that Mr. Pinckney expressed the general opinion of the South, such as it was then, and as it has continued to this day. It is fair to presume, therefore, that he could not have been ignorant of it, or unaffected by it.

If under these circumstances, there has been any treachery to the South, we ask who has been the traitor? Is it the man who conceived the treason, and put it in execution thirty years ago, or is it he, who misled by his great name, and blinded by his example, followed in his footsteps but six months ago?—*Richmond Whig.*

Love well, whip well.