and freedom of speech and opinion.—These general truths, though they cannot be successfully controverted at this day, yet as they have been seldom admitted, in their length and breadth, in the practical operations of government, with success, some lawgivers have been led to deny that are founded in reason; and when these truths have at any time been suddenly embraced by the controlling minds among a people, the misfortune has been that they were applied in excess—without due regard to the actual condition of the people who were to be affected; and hence they have, so far, failed of success in some of the most highly civilized nations of Europe. But it is more to the point, to refer to the emancipation of the slaves of St. Domingo; one of the first explosive effects of the sudden recognition of the rights of man by the French people. It would be difficult to demonstrate, at this day, that the cause of humanity or of human progress has been in the slightest degree promoted by the abolition of slavery in that most fertile and beautiful island. It is, I believe, now, pretty well understood that British statesmen committed an error in the policy of West India emancipation, forced upon them by fanatical reformers. They were driven to adopt a sentiment, instead of practical truth, as the foundation of a radical change in the social condition of a people who were not prepared to appreciate or profit by it. Even the reformation in religion and church government, which commenced some three centuries ago, in the opinion of many of the most profound enquirers, has failed of that complete success which ought to have attended it, for the reason that the general truths and principles upon which it was founded were applied in excess. The zealous champions of reform, in throwing aside all observances which affect the senses, and in spiritualizing too much, there is reason to believe, have stayed the progress of rational and substantial reform, and checked the spread of religious restraints upon the evil passions of men. But this is a delicate subject, and I must forbear.

These examples may show that there are certain abstract truths and principles which, however incontrovertible in themselves, like every other good thing, may be and often are misconceived and abused in their application. It is the business of statesmen to apply them with safety, and to give them the utmost practical influence and effect consistent with the existing state of society. The most beautiful illustration of this sentiment, and the most striking example of the superiority of practical truth over the erratic axioms in the formation of government, to be found in all history, and one which claims the special attention of the people of this country at this moment, was exhibited by our ancestors, when, with their own recognition 'of the abstract truth of the equality of natural rights still vibrating on their tongues, they yet fearlessly set their seals to a covenant of union between the States, with an express recognition of African slavery, because whatever the jesuitical doctors of the North may say, the clauses in the Constitution relating to the importation of persons under such circumstances, and fixing the basis of direct taxes, and representation in Congress, I affirm, do amount to an express recognition of slavery.

From the North Carolina Argus.

Productiveness of Young Slaves.

A capital objection to the proposed system of equal taxation is, that young slaves are unprofitable. Now, a plain calculation will put this objection effectually down. It should be promised, however, that the unprofitableness of property constitutes no good reason why that property should go untaxed. If it did, everybody knows the State would be deprived of uncounted thousands, which our Democratic law givers have levied upon unprofitable property, without any of the squeamishness so loudly expressed in behalf of young slaves. Look into our present tax bill—the handiwork of the last Democratic Legislature—and see whether it is constructed upon any such erroneous principle of favor to unproductive property as they now assert in respect to slaves. Let it be remembered that, by unproductive property, every man of sense means such property as does not furnish either an annual profit from its use, or annual increase of value of itself. If it do neither of these things; it is certainly unproductive. If it do either, it cannot be said to be so. This is clear.—Now, applying this undoubted rule to our present tax bill, what do we see?—We see that it taxes *land*—land of every kind, according to value—whether good land, mountain side or dismal swamp, rich bottom or piney woods, cultivated or uncultivated, fee-simple or life-estate, lien for years or a bare entry—all—all is taxed, we repeat, ad valorem. There are about 26,000,000 of acres of land returned as taxable in North Carolina; of which it is certain, according to the census of 1850, not more than one-half is in any way improved; and we may safely estimate that millions upon millions of it, from which the State takes a yearly tribute, neither yields to the owners one cent of annual profit, nor increases one cent in value. So much for land.

Again: The present tax bill lays a rate of one half of one per cent. upon all the *purchases* of the merchant—not upon his *sales* or his *profits*, be it observed. Now, one of this class of our citizens buys, say, $5,000 worth of goods during the year and puts them on his shelves. The moment he does so, he is due the State $25. When does his investment become productive to him? Some of these goods lie on the shelves, unsold, for months and years—others he disposes of at no profit at all; and upon the whole, he may be required to pay a tax before he has earned a cent of profit from any of them. The poor merchant is compelled to take all risks of sale, of fire or of other casualty. He must pay promptly upon his *purchases*. Is this wise? Our Democracy say it is—for they have made it the law.—What becomes, then, of the new principles of taxation lately promulgated by E. G. Haywood & Co., in their Circular Address, that unproductive property ought not to be taxed? We might go on through the whole tax bills, and show that this new doctrine is no where recognised in it—but utterly discarded rather by the very party now insisting upon its application to slaves. But let the two striking instances which we have produced, suffice on this point; and let us come to the question, are young slaves productive? For the outcry seems to be chiefly against any change so as to tax slaves under twelve years of age. Everybody seems to think it right enough to tax beyond fifty.

And now we ask every man this question: Have you not seen persons who made nothing they ever went at, whether law, physic or farming, yet who, having started life with some estate in negro women, ended in competence, if not in large wealth? I know a lawyer who, besides his profession, which never was anything to him, had a negro woman with one female child. In ten years he could have bought out several of his brethren who started with him, and made a good figure at the bar. I know a gentleman who began farming with six negro women and two men. He has neither remarkable energy nor economy—but barely manages to make both ends meet, and hardly that. In twenty years he finds, himself the owner of fifty odd slaves, worth $50,000 or $35,000—the income of his patrimony. These are not singular instances. Every one can turn to such. Now, upon the new Democratic notion that young slaves are a dead charge and expense, all these men would have gone into insolvency long ago, instead of living in ease and riches.

But this is not all. See what a simple calculation, founded on indisputable fact, will do!

By the census of 1850, there were eight thousand slaves in North Carolina under one year old. Suppose one-half have died in the ten years which have elapsed. Is not fifty per cent a sufficient allowance on the score of mortality? We have, then, four thousand of these slaves yet living. They were worth in 1850, say $100 per head, and are worth now, say $700 per head. The expense of raising them to their seventh year, when they are worth, at least, their victuals and clothes, I assume to be at average of $25 per head per annum. Now state the account:

4000 slaves at $100 per head in 1850, worth	$400,000
4000 slaves at $700 per head in 1860, worth	2,800,000
Expenses of raising for 7 years, at $25 per head per annum	735,000
Net productiveness of the 4000 slaves in 1860	$2,065,000

Now these 4,000 slaves, thus quintupled in value in ten years, after deducting all charges for raising, have not yet paid one cent of taxes to county, town or State. Let any man compare this increase with that on land or money at interest or any other species of property, after taking out all losses, expenses and taxes, and let him say whether we have anything more productive? Whether we have anything that will bear a moderate tax so well? It is utterly untrue that young slaves are unproductive. Their annual increase in value, beyond all casualties and expenses, exceeds that on any other property we possess. The truth is, while the South west makes more than we do on grown slaves, we make more than they on young slaves and climate is better; provisions and clothing are cheaper, and, indeed, all the expenses of raising are considerably less with us. These considerations taken together, make this one of the most valuable and productive properties we have; and there is no reason founded in justice or sound policy why it should not be taxed.

AD VALOREM.

From the Raleigh Register.

THE "HORSE LEECH," AGAIN.

No wonder that Gov. Ellis, as he begins to snuff the Western breezes, feels no little uncomfortable at the idea of meeting, face to face, those hardy sons of honest toil, whom he has taken pains to depreciate in the East. But he must do it. There is no escape from it. He volunteered to raise the tune, and must face his own music. There are witnesses who heard him use the language attributed to him, and it will be worse than idle for him to deny it. If his object was to propitiate the East, and if he finds that he has failed to strengthen himself in that quarter, while he has weakened himself in the West, the only comfort which we can give him is to impress upon him the fact, that he is not the first public man who has made that sort of a blunder that Talleyrand defined to be "worse than a crime."

We have more than once alluded to the testimony regarding Gov. Ellis' language at Gatesville, furnished by the Murfreesboro' Citizen, and we now call attention to a repetition of it in the Citizen of the 31st ult. Here it is:

PERSONAL.—The Editor of this paper would re affirm the substantial correctness of his report of the Gatesville discussion between Gov. Ellis and Mr. Pool. The remark attributed to Gov. Ellis, to the effect that the East paid her full measure of taxation, heaped up, pressed down and running over, while the West, like the horse leech, still cried "give! give!" was made by that gentleman; and it is a piece of impertinence and bad taste for anybody at a distance, and not present on the occasion to deny it. *The Citizen is as "accurate" as most papers—the Charlotte Democrat to the contrary notwithstanding.*

Nothing can be more plain and explicit than the above, and we put it to Gov. Ellis to answer, and tell the public, what earthly motive had the Murfreesboro' Citizen, a rank Democrat, and strenuous advocate of his re-election, deliberately to misrepresent him, and persevere in doing so? Is it not the very extreme of absurdity?—Have you not, Governor, sentenced many a man to be hanged on less positive testimony than we have to convict you of comparing the West, the land of your birth, and the country which has more than once contributed to confer honorable station upon you, to A HORSE LEECH, WHOSE CRY IS GIVE, GIVE! You know you have, Governor, and we therefore feel justified in sentencing you now to be hanged—*on the horns of a dilemma.*

THE PRESS are everywhere sustaining Bell and Everett. Five papers in Missouri sustain the Union nominations made at Baltimore. A new Constitutional Union journal, published at Hamilton, Geo., under the name of the Harris County Enterprise, and another published at Marianna, Florida, entitled the West Florida Enterprise, both devoted to the zealous advocacy of the claims of Bell and Everett.

☞ It has transpired that the character of Mr. Sumner's speech was known to Republican Senators previous to its delivery. They were and are full of apprehensions as to its effect upon party interests.

From the Raleigh Register.

The Revelations of Quarrels.

We will not, in the present case, say that "when *Rogues* fall out, *honest* men get their dues," but will content ourself with pointing out—if, indeed, it be necessary to do so—the inferences to be drawn from the dispute raging between Mr. F. I. Wilson, on the one hand, and Gov. Ellis and his testifiers, on the other. In drawing these inferences we shall make no reference to the question of veracity between the parties—far from it. To use a common phrase, "if there is a lie out" amongst them, it is no part of our business to say, or even intimate, who told it. Looking at the character of the parties, we are extremely loth to think that there is any "lie out" between them. We choose rather to think that there is a misunderstanding, a sort of mutual misapprehension, which will, some time or other, when the passions have been cooled, and reason has resumed her throne, be explained to the entire satisfaction of all concerned; at least, we hope so, altho', candidly speaking, it looks at present, like "hoping against hope." But we know

"Hope springs eternal in the human breast
Man, never is, but always to be blest."

Let us, however, take a look at the revelations made by "this quarrel most unnatural." *Mr. Wilson* in his card shows that he is *frank* in nature, as well as name. He has "let the cat out of the bag" with a vengeance. Just hear what he says to Richardson, Brogden & Co.:

I recollect soon after the Democratic Convention was held, meeting Mr. Richardson in Gen. Brogden's office. The conversation turned upon the action of the Convention. I condemned the resolution in regard to Ad Valorem taxation, and expressed the opinion it would defeat the Democratic party. Mr. Richardson expressed the opinion that Gov. Ellis would be elected, but that we should lose the Legislature. I said, in substance, that as I was no longer in editorial life, I was not bound to take any active part, and that I should not do so. Indeed, I could not. I may have use the "finger turn" metaphor: but I have no recollection of it. I certainly then intended to vote for Gov. Ellis, but take no active part, as I could not, in the campaign. The only difference, as I understood it, between Mr. R. and myself, was that he thought we should lose the Legislature, while I thought we should lose the Governor. This no member of the Opposition ever heard me say. I think I contended that we should save the Legislature, because Ad Valorem Democrats would be run and elected in many counties.

Do not our readers perceive how we get at the truth by the medium of Democratic quarrels? Do they not see how desperate is the condition of the party in North Carolina? Do they not now estimate at their true value, the gasconades and vaunts of the Democracy that they will carry this State this Summer? *Wilson* thinks Ellis "is a gone hoss, and his eyes done set," while the clerical gentleman in the Treasury Department—*Richardson*—thinks our present Governor is alive and kicking, and sure to win the race, at the August sweep-stakes, tho' he, the aforesaid clerical *Richardson*, is in despair about the legislature. To his awakened fears there are visions of a turned out Clingman, and divers other turned-out concerns. We advise him in his gloomy moods to air himself on the "Heights of Georgetown, *"for 'arf an 'our."*

But this is not all, Mr. Wilson gives "a reason for the faith that is in him," that his party will carry the legislature. He thinks so because "ad valorem Democrats will be run and elected in many counties." Weeks ago, we charged upon the Standard, that it was its policy to run ad valorem Democratic candidates in counties in which ad valorem was strong, and anti-ad valorem Democratic candidates in counties in which ad valorem was weak, and lo! and behold! here is proof positive of the truth of the charge, furnished by the revelations of a Democratic quarrel. But this is not all—there is not only clear proof that the Democracy have made a platform as "cheating and juggling" as the infamous Cincinnati Platform, but that the most arbitrary, unjust and tyrannical party discipline is to be used to make it "go"—to make it cheat the people. Look at the Standard's course and the course of the Democracy of Wake county towards Mr. Bledsoe. Never was there a pig (we are not speaking now of Little Ad, for he is growing apace, but of his putative father) more coolly and deliberately slaughtered, than was Mr. Bledsoe by the Wake County Democratic Convention. And for what? Because he, the ablest man of their whole batch—and that is "damning him with faint praise"—advocates now what his Democratic colleagues in the last legislature advocated, and what the Standard said then, and *will not deny now*, was right and just—the true policy of the State,

"Ad valorem Democrats will be run and elected in many counties," quoth Mr. Wilson, late associate editor, and now the chief business man of the Raleigh Standard office. Ad valorem Democrats elected from "many counties!!" And for what? To *"disturb the sectional compromises of our Constitution, State or National?" To "introduce at this time into our State politics a question of Constitutional amendment affecting the basis on which our Revenue is raised?"* To do what the Democratic Convention declared *"to be premature, impolitic, dangerous and unjust?"* Mr. Wilson! Mr. Wilson! how *could* you have let *such* a cat out of the bag? But you *have let him out*, and we have "bulled" him. We would have given a trifle to have been present when Messrs. Wilson and Richardson were swapping opinions and trying conclusions in the right hand room of the Southern entrance of the Capitol. Gracious! it would have been as good as any play. There they were in hot discussion:

Wilson—"I tell you, sir, we shall lose the Governor's election."

Richardson—"Why the devil do you think so?"

Wilson—"Because ad valorem is strong and bound to carry."

Richardson—"I don't think so, by a horn full. I think we'll carry the Governor and lose the legislature."

Wilson—"Sir, you are as much mistaken as if you had lost your shirt. We shall run and elect ad valorem candidates in many counties."

Richardson—"Why, what will you do with the Platform?"

Wilson—"O! hang the platform! You are not, I hope, spooney enough to suppose that anybody cares a tinker's *cuss* about the platform?"

General Brogden—(For the first time cutting in with a face of horror and dismay)—"Why, gentlemen, what on airth are you talking about? One says we'll lose the Governor—t'other says we'll lose the legislature, and I'll jest tell you what it is, if you all talk outside, as you do inside, I'll be cornfoundered if we sharnt lose all, and I sharnt be off to Wayne next Winter; and thar is old *Coutes* next door, Richardson's "chief," and he, *Richardson*, a talking about losing the legislature! Why, is not that paramount to saying that Squire *Courts* sharnt arter next Winter sign narry other cowpon, and git clean out of the stocks? Drat my buttons if it t'aint, and *Richardson*, you ought to be ashamed of yourself to be a talking so here. And *Wilson*, thar's the Gavnur jist opposite. Spose he has hearn you? Do you think it 'll do him any good? Don't you think that blasted Pool won't give him fits enough without your giving him a spasm of your *own* manufactur? I hope to hear no more of such chat; thar's no use in taking two lickings, one in the prospective, and t'other in the future." At this point the curtain dropped on our fancy.

Carolina Watchman.

SALISBURY, N. C.

TUESDAY EVENING, JUNE 19, 1860.

FOR PRESIDENT,
HON. JOHN BELL,
OF TENNESSEE.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
HON. EDWARD EVERETT,
OF MASSACHUSETTS.

FOR GOVERNOR
JOHN POOL,
OF PASQUOTANK.

COUNTY CANDIDATES.

For the Senate,
DR. J. G. RAMSAY.

For the Commons,
F. E. SHOBER, Esq.,
H. C. JONES, Jr.

LOOK UPON

THIS PICTURE, AND ON THIS.

WHEREAS, threat incessantly exists in the present appeal to disturbing any mode of taxation, and it is of the national compact and right that all property of our Constitution, every should contribute its State or National, and that proportion towards the bill, we especially deprecate discussion of State: the introduction at this time

Resolved, That we regard the action of the Opposition time by the Opposition commenced a Convention of Party of North Carolina the people of the State to raise our State politics of a be called on the federal question of constitutional basis as early as practical amendment affecting the basis for the purpose of an basis upon which our revenue modifying the Constitution shall be raised, believing it that every species of property may be taxed according to its value, with power to discriminate only in favor of the native products of our State and the industrial pursuits of her citizens.—*Thirteenth Resolution of the Opposition platform.*

to be premature, impolitic, dangerous and unjust; at the same time we deem it the duty of the Legislature when passing some for the raising of revenue, so to adjust taxation, as to bear as equally as practicable within the limits of the Constitution, upon the various interests and classes of property in all sections of the State.—*Eleventh Resolution of the Democratic platform.*

☞ Bear it in mind that the anti-Ad Valorem Party propose in their Platform to tax every thing in the State, except Slaves, according to Value.

"There can be no doubt of the practicability and justice of the AD VALOREM system."—*Raleigh Standard, Feb. 2nd, 1859.*

☞ Let it be remembered that the Raleigh Standard thinks that the plan of running anti-AD VALOREM Democratic Candidates for the Legislature in all the Counties, would be "DISASTROUS" to the Democratic Party.

APPOINTMENTS.

The candidates for Governor, Messrs. Pool and Ellis, will speak at the following times and places, the speaking to commence at 11 o'clock, A. M.

Wednesday,	" 20th,	Wilksboro',	Wilkes.
Friday,	" 22d,	Lenoir,	Caldwell.
Saturday,	" 23d,	Morganton,	Burke.
Monday,	" 25th,	Marion,	McDowell.

The Candidates for Governor request us to publish the following additional appointments. They will speak at

Brownsville, Yancy,	Wednesday,	27th June.
Marshall, Madison,	Friday,	29th "
Asheville, Buncombe,	Saturday,	30th "
Waynesville, Haywood,	Monday,	2d July.
Webster, Jackson,	Tuesday,	3d "
Franklin, Macon,	Wednesday,	4th "
Hendersonville, Henderson,	Monday,	9th "
Columbus, Polk,	Tuesday,	10th "
Rutherfordton, Rutherford,	Wednesday,	11th "

PUBLIC SPEAKING.

The Candidates for the Senate and Commons in Rowan, will meet for public discussion in the Courthouse in Salisbury, on Saturday the 23d of June, instant. The whole County are invited to attend.

What do you think of them, Farmers?—The farmers of this section of the State who have so often been told that the object of the Know Nothings in agitating the ad valorem question was to take the tax off of land and put it on the niggers, will read with amazement the following declaration of the Hon. G. E. Badger, in a speech he made at Raleigh yesterday (Monday) week. We copy it from the *Raleigh Register*. Mr. Badger said:

"The paper I am reading from says that Gov. Ellis said 'the opposition proposes to take the tax off of land and put it on the negroes.' This must be a misprint. Gov. Ellis could not have intended to say what was false. It is not true—we don't propose to take the tax off of land and put it on negroes, but to make it equal."

That is it. Now when the non-slave-owning farmers hear any more of the demagogues say that the tax is to be taken off their land, tell them Mr. Badger says it is false, and that Mr. Badger is the K. N. daddy of the hobby and knows what it means.

Salisbury Banner.

Here we have in the above, another example of that systematic misrepresentation and unfairness which characterizes every thing the democratic press say on this subject of Equal Taxation. Let us examine it:

Mr. Badger quotes Gov. Ellis thus:—"the opposition propose to take the tax off of land and put it on the negroes." Judge Badger says, in reply, not so: "We do not propose to take the tax off of land and put it on the negroes, *but to make it equal.*" The *Banner* claps its hands and exclaims, there! we told you so. The tax is not to be taken off the lands—Judge Badger says so. Judge Badger also said—"*but to make it equal*"! Make what equal? The tax on lands and negroes. It is now unequal: One thousand dollars worth of lands pay *two dollars*. A negro worth one thousand dollars, pays but *eighty cents*. How will you make it equal? By raising it on the negro! That is one way.—Another way is by lowering it on lands. Between these two modes, the tax on land and negroes is to be made *equal*. But it is plain that Judge Badger is made say in effect it is not to be *reduced* on land, whereas he and every body else confidently expect that it will be lowered from twenty to ten cents, or thereabouts, on the hundred dollars value. Reducing it on one and raising it on the other, to make both equal. This is the obvious meaning of the language employed, otherwise, it is impossible to make the tax *equal*.—Why then misrepresent it? What, indeed, will the farmers think of such attempts to mislead their judgments. Is it possible for them to place confidence in a journal guilty of such shameless quibbling and deception.

THE BANNER.

Owing to our necessary absence from home during two days of the past week, and the engrossment of our time by other matters while at home, we have not been able to pay our respects to this paper, as some of our readers may have expected we would do. Nevertheless, there are some points on which we shall bestow some hurried notice.

Says the Banner, "without the slightest provocation the Watchman spoke of us as a *foreigner*—a *foreign imported* editor." We wrote it thus: "*foreign*, imported editor." Is it true that we did this "without the slightest provocation?" Everybody who reads the two papers know it is not true—they can't help it, and the *Banner* knew it too. We had provocation and did right to talk in that way, because it was behaving itself in an unbecoming manner, and because we were well satisfied that no *native-born* citizen would have used such language about our citizens, who never wronged him, in word or deed, after so short a residence in our midst. We reiterate all we have said as relating to this matter.

The Banner adverts to the woman in the Courthouse when the democrats held their meeting, and speaks of the "slur" we "cast upon respectable persons from the country—stigmatizing them as women to distinguish them from *ladies*,' and putting them on a level with *free negroes*." That is contemptible. We saw no white woman in the Courthouse at all. The Banner said that ladies graced with their presence the said meeting. We laughed at and made fun of it, and everybody else laughed at it, and the Banner got mad, and is seeking to prejudice the country people against us. But let us see: If there were "ladies" there, Mr. *Banner*, who treated them as such!—who waited on them and showed them to seats, and played the part towards them which is *customary on such occasions?* Which of your young democratic gallants made room for them, and showed them attention? Did anybody see anybody showing such customary civilities to any lady at that meeting? Now if there was a lady there it ought to have been done and would have been done, and somebody would know something about it. But who saw any such thing? Tell us! If there was a lady there, we venture to say there was not a democrat in the meeting who treated her with the usual courtesies on such occasions, and if they did not, it is their reproach. We assure the ladies of the country and town both, that if they should be pleased to grace a Whig meeting with their presence, our young gallants will not allow them to put themselves in some out-of-the-way place where they can neither see nor be seen, but will provide for them the most pleasant and honored places in the house, so that it shall never be a question for the newspapers whether or not they were present. It takes such democratic editors with *foreign* notions of propriety like our neighbor to brag on the presence of ladies in their meetings, after those ladies were treated with so much disrespect and indifference as not to become noticeable while present. We don't believe there were any (the State's witness excepted) in the meeting; but it is all the same, they were neglected if there.

The *Banner* seems to think that because we did not reproach it at the time it published C. F. Fisher's Postscript personally abusive of ourself and the editors of the *Observer* and *Patriot*, that therefore we have no right now to allude to that circumstance as a provocation. We think differently. It was the first act of uncourteousness, and however unprovoked and indefensible, we felt disposed to let it pass, and endeavored to persuade ourself that it was done through a *weakness* to serve those who had brought him here, upon whom, for all we knew, he was dependent for his success. The Fayetteville Observer took notice of it at the time, and treated it just as it deserved. We passed it over, but did not forget it. But when the *Banner* subsequently comes to speak of *our* uncourteousness in a matter less reprehensible, it could hardly expect us not to lift the veil on the past and remind it that its right to do so was marred by that most indefensible act of his in December last.

But we quote from the Banner as follows: "Now what was the article we admitted? It was the communication of C. F. Fisher in a reply to an attack made upon him by the notorious Jonathan Worth, which attack, or a portion of it, the Watchman copied, and which charged Mr. Fisher with an outrageous swindle upon the State. This, the Watchman copied—this infamous charge upon Mr. Fisher, with whom it has now the impudence to claim relationship. The Watchman republished this slander upon a townsman and a kinsman, and we had the assurance, being a stranger here, to give Mr. Fisher a place in our columns to repel the foul imputation. That is the whole affair."

The *Banner* is false in stating the case. We never objected to its publishing Fisher's reply to "Plebs" so far as we were concerned. But it was the *Postscript* to that reply, in which the author went out of his way, to assail the Watchman, with the most bitter personalities.

The blind *adder* strikes at random. A few words from us will scatter the remaining portion of the above quotation, with all that is built upon it, like chaff before the wind.

Mr. Fisher was replying to an article which appeared in the Greensborough Patriot, over the signature of "Plebs" and which he showed was written by Jonathan Worth, Esq. The *Banner* says we copied that communication "or a portion of it;" and enlarges upon that act of ours. What is the fact? *We did not publish one line of it—not one word, even.* Now Mr. Banner, what do you think of that?—what do you think of yourself? What will others think of you? In our *reply* to Mr. Fisher's Postscript, we alluded to the "Plebs" article and denied publishing it, because Mr. Fisher seemed to have the idea that we had done so. The *Banner* must have seen that denial. He could not avoid seeing it. And yet, in the face of that, it comes out here six months afterwards, and flatly and repeatedly charges us with a thing which is utterly without foundation. *No truth in it at all!*

We feel sorter like "Uncle Ben" did when he was accused of going into John Poston's mill and stealing a pair of Burr mill-stones. "Uncle Ben," said his nephew one day, and the lad was looking very sorrowful, for he loved his relative with a heart-touching affection—"John Poston says you went to his mill and stole his pair of Burr mill-stones." "Uncle Ben" fixed his eye on his nephew and asked, "did he tell you so, Robert?" "Yes, sir," was the prompt reply. "Did you ask him what I did with them?" "Yes sir; he said he saw you carrying them down the creek, and he hollered at you, and you dropped them and run with all your might." "Well, I thank him for that," said "Uncle Ben." "And when any man tells a lie on me, I want him to make it so big that no one will believe it—or else do it so clumsily as that it will contradict itself. I thank him."

So may we thank our neighbor. For in attempting to pierce us with the sharp pole he threatened us with some time ago, he received the promised the pain to his caudal extremity, and we now turn him loose upon our streets to gyrate, high and low, back street and fronts, lanes and alleys, a mirth provoking object to all.

Nor can the Banner, with Mr. Fisher to help him, find in our files, which are at their service, one word of personal abuse against the President of the North Carolina Rail Road—nothing to sustain their charges against us. Mutually unfortunate in making them, they are mutually involved in the disgrace of uttering words they cannot prove. Moreover, we ask that it may be noted, that this new found stranger friend of Mr. Fisher's—is the first man, we think, that ever coupled with his name the word "swindle." Even the "notorious" Jonathan did not, if we recollect aright, make that coupling. And in this view of the case, we think Mr. Fisher has need to exclaim, "save me from my friends—especially from my stranger friend, who would be important to save in an emergency."

But we quote again: "We desire a full understanding with the Watchman. The editor may understand once for all that we neither court his friendship nor fear him in any way possibly."

Why, did we ever accuse you of any such thing? We never have intimated such an idea; and making the declaration unbidden is not wise. It subjects you to suspicion, because you seem to fear others will suspect you. Wait until you are accused before you deny; otherwise your denial will become your accuser. "Understand" us as knowing nothing about your "fears," nor of the "friendships" you will not court. It is your business, not ours; but you will have to come to us to get that pan taken off, or it will stick like the leprosy.

We quote again: "We know our rights here and are determined to maintain them. We will attack no man or set of men and then shrink from our proper responsibility."

It is not always best to stick out stubbornly on one's rights. It teaches others to do the same, and very often those who plant themselves upon their "rights," find it inconvenient and unpleasant to concede to others the measure of rights they demand. It is due us, for instance that the Banner should take back all it has said about us as having published "Plebs"—every word of it—should clean up every thing it has said in that relation. If it is due us it is our *right* to claim it, and to claim that it shall be thoroughly done. The *right* principle would drive him to it like a spaniel. But we shall not claim any such *right*. The *Banner* may do just as he pleases about it. He may correct his falsehood or not. We don't care a pin which it does. He can't, however, escape his *proper responsibility*, and for his own sake he had, perhaps, better not "shrink" from it.

We quote once again: "Though we have no respect for the editor of the Watchman we still will notice him [Gracious Banner!] He may wage just such warfare as he may choose—we accept the battle in any form. We repeat what we said a couple of weeks ago—the Watchman has resorted to a fool's argument, and no gentleman or man of sense would resort to such."

We offer you battle in the field of truth and honor on all political subjects. There shall be no miserable quibbling—no deceiving the people by misrepresentation for party purposes; but a fair, candid statement of *facts* calculated to promote the best interests of the people and the peace of the country. If you will "accept battle in any form," take this.

Your repetition of former language will doubtless pass for its full worth. If our arguments are *true*, they can't be very foolish. Was it wise or foolish in you to spread yourself about our course towards Mr. Fisher before you had informed yourself on the subject? Was it wise or foolish in you to talk about "foolish things" said in a certain speech at Mocksville? Was it wise or foolish to talk about our candidates for the Commons as you did? Was it wise or foolish in you to make such a fuss about "the ladies who graced with their presence," &c., &c., when neither you nor your democratic friends in the meeting received and treated them as ladies. Was it gentlemanly in you to neglect ladies in that way? We submit that question to the ladies themselves, and by their decision will abide. If they decide for you, then you are a gentleman. If against you, why then, that alters the case; and may be, for once, we will plant ourself on our rights.

Orange Presbytery was in session at Hillsboro', last week. Delegates were sent from the Presbyterian Church in this place to prosecute a call for the Rev. Mr. Scherer, at Chapel Hill. The subject was brought up on Thursday morning, and was the cause of a discussion which consumed the whole day. There were incidental matters of more or less importance to be considered with the call, as relating to the Church at Chapel Hill. These were complicated, and of long standing, and it was upon them the discussion was chiefly expended. The Presbytery finally passed a resolution requesting the delegates from Salisbury Church to desist from the further prosecution of the call; and so our friends of that church in this place, are left to direct their search for a pastor in some other quarter.

☞ *The Candidates for Governor* met at Winston and Yadkinville last week. We have verbal reports, and they are cheering. At Winston our *dignified* Governor lost his temper and, it is said, used unbecoming language. It reminds us of the remark of a big Indian who was traveling and came to where two candidates were speaking. One of them was mad, and gesticulated with wrathful fury, while the other, with great good humor, put it to him in the cooled manner possible. The Indian watched these things for some time; and at last, turning away to pursue his journey, said—"uphm—dat mad man best. He no stand any chance. Indian laugh at him—White man too."

At Yadkinville, the Governor's speech was received with coldness; but Mr. Pool's with great enthusiasm. We asked "where was Ellis' friends that they did not cheer him?" Our informant promptly responded, "he didn't seem to have any there."

ACCEPTANCE OF MR. BELL.

Letter of Mr. Hunt to Mr. Bell.

BALTIMORE, May 11, 1860.

DEAR SIR: It has become my agreeable duty, as the presiding officer of the National Union Convention, which terminated its session in this city last evening, to inform you that you have received the nomination of that body as its candidate for the office of President of the United States.

After a frank interchange of sentiment, in which the merits of all the distinguished candidates presented for our consideration were canvassed in the most friendly spirit, the Convention resolved, with entire unanimity and great enthusiasm, to place your name before the American people as the chosen representative of its principles of constitutional liberty and union.

With a just appreciation of your known moderation and justice; your uniform support of wise and beneficent measures of legislation; your firm and heroic resistance of the repeal of the Missouri compromise and all kindred measures calculated to engender sectional discord; and your life-long devotion to the union, harmony, and prosperity of these States, it was decided with one accord that you are the man for the crisis, and that with your honored name inscribed on our banners an earnest appeal shall be made to the people to rally for the preservation of our national institutions. We feel, one and all, that your election to the Presidency would insure the integrity of our Government, restore the peace of the Union, and afford an unfailing guarantee for the supremacy of the Constitution and the Laws.

I have the honor to be, with high respect,
Your obedient servant,
WASHINGTON HUNT.

To the Hon. JOHN BELL.

Reply of Mr. Bell to Mr. Hunt.

NASHVILLE, May 21, 1860.

DEAR SIR: Official information of my nomination to the Presidency by the National Union Convention, of which you were the presiding officer, was communicated to me, by your letter of the 11th instant, at Philadelphia, on the eve of my departure with my family for my place of residence in Tennessee, and, diffident as I was of my worthiness, I did not hesitate to signify my intention to accept the position assigned to me by that distinguished and patriotic body. But for convenience, and under a sense of the propriety of acting in so grave a matter with greater deliberation, I concluded, as I informed you at the time by a private note, to defer a formal acceptance until after my arrival at home.

Now, that I have had all the leisure that I could desire for reflection upon the circumstances under which the nomination was made, the purity of the motives and the lofty spirit of patriotism by which the Convention was animated, as evinced in all its proceedings, I can appreciate more justly the honor done me by the nomination; and, though it might have been more fortunate for the country had it fallen on some one of the many distinguished statesmen whose names were brought to the notice of the Convention, rather than myself, I accept it, with all its responsibilities.

Whatever may be the issue of the ensuing canvass, as for myself I shall ever regard it as a proud distinction—one worth a life long effort to attain—to be pronounced worthy to receive the highest office in the Government at such a time as the present, and by such a Convention as that which recently met in Baltimore—a Convention far less imposing by the number of its members, large as it was, than by their high character. In it were men venerable alike for their age and their public services, who could not have been called from their voluntary retirement from public life but by the strongest sense of patriotic duty; others, though still in the prime of life, ranking with the first men of the country by honors and distinctions already acquired in high official positions, State and National; many of them statesmen worthy to fill the highest office in the Government; a still greater number occupying the highest rank in their respective professional pursuits; others distinguished by their intelligence and well earned influence in various walks of private life; and all animated and united by one spirit and one purpose, the result of a strong conviction that our political system, under the operation of a complication of disorders, is rapidly approaching a crisis when a speedy change must take place, indicating, as in diseases of the physical body, recovery or death.

The Convention, in discarding the use of platforms, exacts no pledges from those whom they deem worthy of the highest trusts under the Government; wisely considering that the surest guarantee of a man's future usefulness and fidelity to the great interests of the country, in any official station to which he may be chosen, is to be found in his past history connected with the public service. The pledge implied in my acceptance of the nomination of the National Union Convention is, that, should I be elected, I will not depart from the spirit and tenor of my past course; and the obligation to keep this pledge derives a double force from the consideration that none is required from me.

You, sir, in your letter containing the official announcement of my nomination, have been pleased to ascribe to me the merit of moderation and justice in my past public career. You have likewise given me credit for a uniform support of all wise and beneficent measures of legislation, for a firm resistance to all measures calculated to engender sectional discord, and for a life-long devotion to the union, harmony, and prosperity of those States. Whether your personal partiality has led you to overstate my merits as a public man or not, in your enumeration of them you have presented a summary basis of all sound American statesmanship. It may be objected that nothing is said in this summary, in express terms, of the obligations imposed by the Constitution; but the duty to respect and observe them is clearly implied; for, without the due observance, in the conduct of the Government, of the Constitution, its restrictions and requirements, fairly interpreted, accordance with its spirit and objects, there can be no and to sectional dis