The Weekly Carolina Era.

TRI-WEEKLY & WEEKLY BY THE
ERA PUBLISHING COMPANY.

Rates of Subscription:

TRI-WEEKLY—One year, in advance, $3 00
6 months, in advance, 2 00
3 months, in advance, 1 00
1 month, in advance, 50

WEEKLY—One year, in advance, 1 00
Six months, in advance, 50

The *Sentinel* says we have failed as an Editor. If the columns of the *Sentinel* furnish an example of a perfect Editor we humbly and devoutly thank God that we have failed.

The Republicans of Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Ohio, and Iowa are all in the field, all united, active, and harmonious. A good result may be expected from each.

A friend sending us a club of subscribers to the *Era* writes:

"To-day I met persons from Guilford. That county as well as Forsyth, will roll up a rousing majority against the Convention. Our people remember the Convention of 1861. This Convention is called in the interest of the same parties whose settled determination now as then is to rule or ruin this Southern country.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We are compelled, for the present, to decline the publication of many valuable communications, on hand, on account of their *length*. *Short, pointed* articles are the only ones we can publish until after the election.

The Democrats, says the *Tribune*, do not yet have smooth sailing in the New Hampshire Legislature. Not only does Judge Smith in the Senate refuse to lend himself to any purely partisan schemes, but in the House the Labor Reformers insist upon eating the oysters and leaving the Democrats with the shells.

WHAT'S THE MATTER.

How does it happen that the *Sentinel* volunteers, in advance of an attack, a defence of General Leach's "moral character" "and his reputation for truth and honor." Who has assailed ? and what is the charge against As the defence is made, let us the accusation.

THE VOICE OF A PROPHET.

"*I tell you that our party is gone up and this State will go for the Republicans in the Presidential election.*" "*I tell you if we go into an election we will be badly defeated,*"

Conservative Senator Love, of Jackson, in the debate on the Convention act.

THE CHIEF IN MOTION.

The *Sentinel* informs us that Mr. Speaker Jarvis is soon to address the people of the West in favor of a Convention.

The prompt action of the U. S. authorites in capturing and indicting the perpetrators of the recent outrages in Rutherford county, has demoralized and scattered many of the Ku Klux camps. It is necessary to get them together again for the election. The head of the Conservative party in the State therefore goes to Cleaveland and Rutherford to reorganize.

THERE are two ways of changing the Constitution of the State. One *according to law*—the other *by Revolution*. By the first method provided in the Constitution, it may be changed through a Convention, or by Legislative enactment. By the Revolutionary method, which is that proposed by the Conservative party, the Constitution may be overthrown without bloodshed—provided the proper tribunal to which they may address themselves chooses to recognise an assemblage which Judge Ruffin in a similar case declared was only a "CAUCUS" of private persons, unauthorized by law, and whose acts would be void.

The Legislature, at its late session, did not curtail expenses in any respect, but rather increased them; and therefore the only hope for relief that we know of is to have a State Convention to change the Constitution. For the sake of honesty and economy let us have a Convention.—*Char. Democrat.*

What will the "youth and inexperience" say to this thrust from a leading organ of their party? They say they are opposed to amending the Constitution by Legislative enactment for fear somebody interested in the State debt will bribe them. The *Democrat* seems to think the Legislature neither honest or economical, and therefore wants a Convention, we infer, to get rid of it. We suggest again, it is *cheaper for them to resign.*

The old Constitution, with hardly a material change, was offered to the people in 1866, and the same Conservative leaders who clamor now to go back to the old times, *then* voted down that Constitution, and justified their action upon the authority of Judge Ruffin's letter. This was their only ground of opposition to it; for at the same election they voted for and adopted the ordinance of emancipation. Conscientious constitutional scruples were stronger with them then than love of property. They voted for the emancipation ordinance and gave up their slaves, but they could not give up the words of the Constitution and Judge Ruffin's exposition of it: "That no Convention of the people shall be called by the General Assembly unless with the concurrence of two-thirds of each House of the General Assembly;" so they voted down the Constitution of 1866.

The Carolina Era.

Vol. 1. RALEIGH, N. C., THURSDAY, JULY 6th, 1871. No. 5.

WHAT IMPEACHMENT COST—A RARE AND EXPENSIVE BOOK.

The Books of the Auditor's and Treasurer's offices show that the Impeachment Trial cost the people of the State the enormous sum of sixty-one thousand five hundred and forty-eight dollars and fifty-five cents. Here are the items:

Three extra lawyers, 44 days,	$ 3,000.00
Reporting, 1 man and staff 44 days,	4,375.00
Printing and stitching,	5,615.51
Paper,	2,840.40
Pay of witnesses,	5,655.20
Pay of members, 170 at $5 per day,	37,400.00
Pay of clerks, door-keepers, &c,,	2,464.00
Fuel and lights $24.00, 44 cords wood $176.00,	200.00
	$61,548.55
Add, for a clerk and messenger for the lawyers,	350.00
And we have	$61,898.55

Gov. Graham, Gov. Bragg and Judge Merrimon received at the rate of $22.72⅞ per day each for their services to help seven other leading Conservative lawyers, appointed by the House, to prosecute Gov. Holden. Seventeen thousand eight hundred and thirty dollars of this money was wasted or given away to party favorites. Three thousand of it to extra high-priced lawyers to help seven others appointed by the House—who, it seems, couldn't help themselves.

Twelve thousand nine hundred and ninety dollars for making a book of the proceedings and speeches in the case, which the people will never see, unless they buy it from the Conservative Public Printer.

Is not this monstrous, in the present bankrupt condition of the State? Will it be tolerated in a party which got into power upon false promises of economy, retrenchment and reform?

The Conservative party is all-powerful in the State now. They can make the laws—they can control the finances of the State—they can depose and turn out every public officer in the State if they choose, and they should, therefore, justly be held accountable to the people for their profligate and ruinous expenditure. No wonder they had to almost double the tax to meet the demands of their reckless extravagance.

If they paid, as we have proved, twelve thousand nine hundred and ninety dollars for one single book—how much would they make a Convention cost the people? Arguing from the foregoing established facts, not less than $500,000.

TWO KINDS OF HOMESTEADS.

The Republican homestead is good against all kinds of debts—*both old and new*—and it is sustained by the decision of the present Supreme Court in the case of *Hill* vs. *Kessler*.

The Democratic lawyers who are looking to Judgeships under the Convention movement, say that a homestead is good only as to debts contracted since the adoption of the Constitution. They denounced the decision of the Supreme Court as partizan, and publicly rejoiced when Judge Brooks made a decision sustaining their views.

The Legislature in the first Convention bill, proposed to restrict the Convention on this subject, and declared that the decision of the Supreme Court should form a part of the new Constitution. In the present Convention bill that provision is omitted, *and why?* The Democratic lawyers who lead the party would not allow it to be inserted. Many of them are interested largely in old Court judgments, and some of them expect to be Judges, and they are publicly committed against the Republican homestead. To accomplish their purpose, they have made a Democratic Executive Committee composed of a very large majority of lawyers, and most of the candidates for Convention are lawyers. The Convention will provide that the Judges and Magistrates shall be appointed for life by the present Legislature—and thus they will be independent of the people. The lawyers will thus have control of the State, and the power of the old slave aristocracy will be restored and secured.

The Democratic homestead will be put in the Constitution, and the Judges for life will decide *that it only extends* to new debts. The poor men, without office, position or credit, will have to work for a homestead and pay their old debts; and nine out of ten will die paupers, and leave ignorant and penniless families.

With the Republican homestead the poor men of the country can live in ease and comfort, educate their families, and leave them a home until the youngest child is of age.

Which of these two homesteads will the people take? The matter will be decided at the ballot-box in August. It is almost a question of life or death with thousands of families who are now contented and happy.

Republicans, be true to your high and noble charity to the poor! Homestead men, be true to your country, your families, and your homes!

A friend writing from Caldwell county, says:

"As to the proposed election for Convention or no Convention, the great body of the people look upon the whole thing with suspicion. Except the lawyers, and village politicians, wealthy land-holders and money slylocks, very few seem to be in favor of the measure. I believe the vote at the election will be a small one."

USELESS OFFICERS UNDER THE OLD CONSTITUTION, DISPENSED WITH BY THE NEW.

Under the old Constitution there were several thousand more office-holders than there are under the present.

There were 90 County Court clerks who received annually from the people on an average not less than $1,000 each, and an annual extra allowance of $100, making $99,000.

There were ninety county Solicitors, who received at least $600 in each of the counties, where there were four jury terms of the County Court, and $100 extra annual allowance—in all $63,000.

Under the new system there are 12 Solicitors against 98 State and county Solicitors under the old Constitution. These 12 Solicitors are paid by the State $20 for a two weeks' Court twice a year in each county—which costs to the State, for these 12 Solicitors, per annum, $3,600.

Eight Solicitors, under the old plan, would cost just the same, as, although the circuits were fewer, Courts would be held in just as many counties as they are now, and the cost would be the same. So that the cheapness of the present plan consists in dispensing with the ninety county solicitors who cost nine thousand dollars per annum more than is now paid for the same service.

There were *six thousand* or more magistrates appointed for life to carry out party ends and purposes, *and for nothing else.* We have the authority of the Editor of the *Sentinel* for saying, that at one session alone more than 1200 new magistrates were made, many of whom, he declared, were "perjurers, forgers, and disreputable men."

The increased number of Judges which the convenience of the people demanded, and which several Governors recommended before the war, amounts to nothing. The salary was fixed at its present figure, before the adoption of the present Constitution, by the same party which now wants to lower it because they are OUT.

Not to speak of the saving in the abolition of four jury terms of the County Court, the amount saved by abolishing the offices of County Court clerk and county solicitor is $18,000 per annum in the shape of extra allowances alone—$3,000 more than the increased expenditure under the new Constitution for five new Judges.

The habit of the Conservative party is to make speeches and write about the burdens of a Constitution which they have never read.

UNDER DURESS.

A young and inexperienced youth of the name of Moore, from the appropriately named county of Craven, who, as a Senator last winter, acting under oath, voted all the time *against* the Convention act, now comes out, and under *calico* influence, *orates* in favor of the same to small squads of the "outside, all the talent" party—declaring, according to the Wilmington *Journal*, "that a party caucus whipped in the dissenting members and compelled them to vote against their convictions"—"one of whom he was which," we suppose. So far as we know, unless as to himself, this assertion of Mr. Moore's cannot be sustained; and we notice it now, only to take the opportunity to reproduce the proof that the Convention act never would have passed, if a reckless, daring, revolutionary minority had not driven it through the Legislature in spite of the caucus determination of their party to the contrary.

When the Convention bill was on its passage in the Senate, (see report in *Daily Telegram*, April 1,) Mr. Love, Senator from Jackson, "hoped what he proposed to say would not be misconstrued. This bill now is just the same bill we have once passed. What is the use of this repetition? I protest today against it, and I but utter the sentiments of an overwhelming majority of the Conservative caucus. A few party leaders now attempt to lash you in. Are you now going to cower to them and turn back, allowing a few leaders to lash you into their views? I learn from prominent men of this State, *that it will not be expedient to call this Convention.* I oppose this extreme Radicalism (of the Conservative party.) A hopeless minority is endeavoring to drive a majority. I call upon men who have given me their views in private, to get up here like men and Senators and say, that this action is impolitic, unwise and untimely, and unless they do so, *I tell you that our party is gone up*, and this State will go for the Republicans in the Presidential election."

In stating the fact that "*an overwhelming majority of the Conservative caucus*" had decided against this bill as "*impolitic, unwise and untimely*," Mr. Love said, "that he was governed and guided mostly in reference to his action, by what was said by the gentleman from Rowan, Mr. Robbins. I don't think I will attend any more caucuses of this General Assembly, when men go and pledge one thing, come out, and are driven into another by a minority. Many in the House tell me they voted for this bill under protest, *but I tell you if we go into an election we will be badly defeated!*"

Mr. Yates, of the Charlotte *Democrat* in commenting upon the opinion of the Hon. B. F. Moore, adds:

When such men as Bragg, Merrimon, Moore, Graham and Vance and Wilson say that the Convention Act is constitutional, we feel satisfied that it is so, and care very little of opinions to the contrary, especially of those so-called Judges who are afraid of being turned out of office.

Mr. Yates characterizes the Judges of the Supreme Court as *so-called Judges*, and intimates that their opinions are prompted by interested motives. It is well understood that in the division of the Convention spoils four of his great *legal lights* are to have judicial honors, and why may they not be influenced by interested motives. The *desire* to get into office is as strong as the *fear* of being turned out, so that upon this question of interest both parties are about equal, and let us see which side is best sustained by precedent and authority.

The Supreme Court Judges are gentlemen of high character, and have in various positions enjoyed public confidence, and the bitterest partizan cannot truthfully say any thing against their honor, ability and integrity, except that they are the friends and supporters of the government, *the lawful government of their country.*

Judges Pearson and Reade were members of the old Supreme Court and were elevated to their present position by the entire vote of the Republican and Democratic parties. They are learned and incorruptible Judges, and is it posible that their fidelity to the Union, and opposition to the present revolutionary democracy can deprive them of the high character which they have won by a life long devotion to those principles upon which all good government is founded?

The opinion of the Judges of the Supreme Court for which they are now so bitterly assailed by the Democracy, is the opinion which until recently was entertained by Mr. Yates, Gov. Bragg, the whole Democratic party, and a large number of the leading Whig lawyers of the State. Has Mr. Yates, and his old party friends no interested motives for their sudden and unaccountable change of opinion on such a vital and fundamental question? What interested motive had Judge Ruffin for his letter to the Wilmington *Journal* in 1866, in opposition to the Constitution then submitted to the people. That Constitution was substantially the same as the old Constitution, and Judge Ruffin's principal objection was to the unconstitutional manner in which the Convention, which framed it was called. Judge Ruffin was a great lawyer, an incorruptible Judge, and in his farewell address to his countrymen, he ably and eloquently expresses opinions which are the same as those now entertained by the Judges of the Supreme Court in the present revolutionary Convention movement.

We have certainly fallen on evil times, when a cool and temperate man like Mr. Yates, so far forgets the political history of the past, and for party purposes unjustly assails Judges for expressing opinions which have so frequently received legislative sanction, and which he and his old party so long and so strenuously maintained, and which were advocated by the best legal talent of the State.

We cannot account for this "new departure" on the part of Mr. Yates and the old Democrats, upon any other ground, than their thirst for office and power. The Supreme Court is now one of the great bulwarks of Constitutional government, and we are not surprised that it is so malignantly assailed, by anti-homestead men, office seekers, and wild and unscrupulous revolutionists.

THE *Sentinel* denies our statement that "NINETY NINE DOLLARS A DAY" was paid by the Conservatives to "a reporter" to write down what was said and done in the Impeachment Trial, and attempts to explain how the money was paid, thus:

"The sum paid, whatever the amount, was paid for a *staff of reporters* consisting for the greater portion of the time of five or six persons. Taking the *Organ's* figures as correct, the pay did not amount to $20 per day per man—and for professional men, working some eighteen hours per day each."

The *Sentinel's* explanation makes the matter worse, for "a staff of reporters" "of six persons" would make $120 per diem for the whole expense of reporting instead of $99, as we stated. We stick to our assertion that "a reporter" was paid $99 a day for this useless work. The contract was made with *one man* and *one man* received the money. What he did with it after he got it, or among how many he distributed the proceeds of this extravagant expenditure doesn't matter. The expense to the tax payers of the State *was* $99 per diem and the aggregate expenditure just what we stated $41,373.44 and the *Sentinel* does not deny it. And for what good purpose? That an expensive book of 3,000 pages which the people will never see, might be got up to put "money in the purse" of public printers and favorites. Such is the Conservative idea of economy. Thousands for the party's pets—not a cent for the education or for public improvements for the people.

SEVERAL Conservative organs are republishing mutilated and garbled extracts from the Western Address to show the inconsistency of the position of leading Republicans then and now. That address does not advocate or suggest in any part of it, a Convention called upon the plan proposed now. There was a necessity for a Convention then; there is none now. Why? Because the present Constitution has made all the reforms in the Constitution of 1835 which the signers of the Western Address demanded. They denounced the latter instrument as odious and anti-republican, and asked for it to be thoroughly changed. It has been thoroughly changed by the Constitution of 1868. What more, therefore, do the people want?

This Address asked for—

1. Equal representation according to population, and not according to wealth and taxes. *The Constitution of 1868 ordains it.*

2. The ad valorem tax. *The Constitution of 1868 ordains it.*

3. Universal suffrage. *The Constitution of 1868 ordains it.*

4. Eligibility of all men to office. *The Constitution of 1868 ordains it.*

5. Abolition of property qualifications for office. *The Constitution of 1868 ordains it.*

6. The establishment of the office of Lieutenant Governor. *The Constitution of 1868 ordains it.*

7. The election of all the State Executive officers by the people. *The Constitution of 1868 ordains it.*

8. The election of Judges by the people. *The Constitution of 1868 ordains it.*

9. The election of Justices of the Peace by the people. *The Constitution of 1868 ordains it.*

Every practical and useful reform advocated twenty years ago by the gentlemen who signed the Western Address may be found in the Constitution of 1868—*every single one.* What matters it *how* they got there, so they *are* there, the fundamental law of the land—and why do Conservative papers omit to publish that part of the address which shows that it insisted on these changes? Why, but to deceive the people.

The *Sentinel* calls us an "old fire eater." So he called Gov. Bragg, Mr. Bledsoe, Gov. Ellis, Col. Fisher, Burton Craig, Mr. Dortch, Judge Biggs and many other good men in the State, before the war and *throughout the war.* This was the chosen epithet used by Mr. Turner, when he ran *as Governor Holden's candidate* for the Confederate Congress in 1863, against Baldy Arrington. Gov. Holden and Mr. Turner in close amity and Union *then*, denounced Mr. Arrington as a *destructive*, and did all they could to overthrow the Confederate cause. Gov. Holden adhered to his principles after the war closed and went with the Republican party. Mr. Turner and his clique having failed in their effort to get special favors from President Johnson, so as to oppress and disfranchise the "old fire eaters," and secessionists, such men as we have named above, organized a new rebellion against the Government, and have been carrying it on ever since. Strange, the men who in 1863, were denounced by the true and faithful Confederates of that day, as Buffaloes or Tories, who were all the time in sympathy and often in correspondence with the U. S. authorities, are now the leaders of an organization hostile to the Government, and seeking its overthrow. This double dealing and unfaithful set never rebelled *until the rebellion was over.* They took care not to fight while there was any fight going on—but as soon as it was over, and they got none of the spoils of victory, bummer like, they turned against the U. S. government, from which they expected such things, and assuming themselves to be the *flower* of Southern chivalry, pretend now to lament the "lost cause" which they did all in their power to overthrow. Whew! Take away the stink!

$20 PER DAY FOR PROFESSIONAL MEN, 50 CTS. FOR THE LABORER.

The *Sentinel* speaks of this sum, $20, paid per diem to each of the "*staff of reporters*" of the Impeachment Trial in such a way as to leave us to infer that such a sum is reasonable "for a professional man."

If this is the rate of compensation "for profession men" of the Conservative party, how much is it likely a Convention of that party, with all its members of the legal profession and "a staff of reporters" as numerous as the military household of the Emperor of Germany, will cost the people. Of course the gas of the Convention will have to be bottled and preserved, and that can only be done by short hand reporters at from $20 to *ninety-nine dollars* a day. You one armed or wooden legged Federal or Confederate soldier, following your plow and a sorry ox, over stony, stumpy ground, for less than 50 cts a day, what do you think of this "all talent" party which jeopardizes your homestead, and fixes the daily compensation of "professional men" at TWENTY DOLLARS.

Twenty two dollars per day was the extra allowance paid to each of the extra lawyers in the Holden Trial. We are a failure as an orator according to the *Sentinel* and Citizen, and since our complete rout and overthrow in the mountains recently, by Mr. Tom Johnston of Buncombe and Mr. W. W. Fleming (see Citizen and *Sentinel*) we are afraid to speak in public on the stage. With becoming modesty, therefore through this obscure paper, with an humble and a contrite heart, sensible of our own imperfections, subdued in spirit by the recollection of an overwhelming defeat, overawed, overshadowed and utterly confounded by those eminent and August statesmen Fleming of McDowel and Johnston of Buncombe, whose reputations have reached the extremest confines of Turkey Cove and Sandy Mush, we beg to ask, what about that *twenty two dollars* a day each to *three extra* lawyers to prosecute Gov. Holden, aggregating $3000 *for forty-four days work?* What about that *twelve thousand nine hundred dollars* paid a reporter and printer for a worthless and unnecessary book. We are no orator. We are a plain man; but facts appeal to us and to the people, oftentimes, more eloquently than even the classic and polished rhetoric of the sublime and handsome Johnson, or the resounding declamation of the fragile, fierce, fiery, furious Fleming.

So we again state these eloquent facts in Conservative economics—$3000 for three extra lawyers for forty-four days—twenty-two dollars per diem each; $12.900 for a book to print their speeches in, for them and their friends to read.

What about it Messrs Johnson, Fleming, Citizen and *Sentinel*, perhaps the Rev. Sutherland will answer for you, as he is the grand interlocutor of the party West.

THE "OUTSIDE" "ALL THE TALENT" PARTY.

Seven of the ablest Conservative lawyers in the House were selected last session to prosecute Gov. Holden. They represented the *elite* of the Conservative party, and according to Conservative cant, were all of the "best men" and all the "best talent" in the State. Yet they caved in, and confessed their incompetency, before the trial begun, and admitted by their conduct that an "old County Court" was the only tribunal before which they had capacity to practice. Hence their zeal to re-establish those Courts. The seven elected, chosen, tried and sworn incapables of the House broke down, and had to employ Gov. Graham, Gov. Bragg and Judge Merrimon, at a very heavy expense to the people, to conduct the trial, and, as we have heard, to draw the articles of impeachment—not being able to do so simple a thing themselves.

The number of lawyers appearing for the Conservative party on that trial has never been equalled in the State. Even Swepson, only had seven or eight Conservative lawyers to defend him, when he was arrested by Gov. Caldwell for stealing seven millions of bonds.

Let "all the talent" stay "outside," if it cannot conduct a prosecution for an assault and battery.

The New York *World*, the inspiration and leading spirit in the "new departure," in a fit of forced candor shows its hand. With fair words and fine phrases it has sought to delude the unthinking into the belief that the Democratic party, in abandoning its opposition to the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, had accepted them and their logical sequences *in toto*. Not so, however. It still refuses to abide by the laws of Congress for the protection of each and every citizen in the rights guaranteed him by the fourteenth amendment, under which the Ku Klux bill, as it is called, was framed and passed. It is nonsensical to talk of "acceptance" or "acquiescence" in the legitimate results of the war without recognizing the validity of these amendments and their full scope. This the Democracy refuses to do, and until it does concede the power of the General Government to protect its citizens in every State of the Union, it is the same old treasonable organization, which the patriotism of the country must unite in defeating.

IT is said we have had four Conventions in this State called in the way now proposed by the Conservative party. This statement is disingenuous and calculated, if not intended, to deceive the people. The Constitution of 1776 contained no provision for its amendment, therefore the only way a Convention could be assembled to amend it was in the way proposed in 1835. But in amending that old Constitution then in many other important particulars, two methods for its *future* amendment were provided for, and were again inserted in the Constitution of 1868, and all other modes are therefore excluded. An attempt to alter the Constitution in any other way than one of the two modes provided by it, has, therefore, by the highest judicial authority of the State, been pronounced irregular and revolutionary.

The Weekly Carolina Era.

Rates of Advertising:

One square, one time, - - - - - $1 00
" " two times, - - - - - 1 50
" " three times, - - - - - 2 00

A square is the width of a column, and 1¼ inches deep.

☞ Contract Advertisements taken at proportionately low rates.

Professional Cards, not exceeding 1 square, will be published one year for $12.

SWAMP LANDS.

Sometime last winter the Greensboro' *Republican* published the following, which is in point now:

"The Board of Education about a year ago, contracted with certain parties for the sale of the Swamp Lands in Hyde and Carteret for $50,000,—the first payment being due in October, 1870. At once the Conservative party was in a flame of indignation. It was asserted that Pilgrim Ashley and the Republican Board of Education had swindled the State out of all but incalculable thousands by this infamous job. The statisticians of the party made out, by figures that could not lie, that these lands were worth *three or four millions of dollars.*

The *Sentinel* asserted that the company which bought the lands had, before the purchase, sold a small portion of them for $90,000. It was a swindle unheard of in immaculate North Carolina!

Mark now the sequel. October came and the purchasers were *unable to pay* the first installment of about $6,000, and by the terms of the sale the contract became void, and Superintendant Ashley reported that the State could 'still rejoice in the possession of the three hundred thousand acres more or less of unclaimed, untaxable, unprofitable, wild waste of swamp, over which the moor fowl wings his way unscared, and through whose jungles the serpent and the bear make leisurely their way.' But the Conservative party wouldn't 'rejoice!' When it was sold they were mad, and when they found it was *not* sold, *presto*, they were madder still! At once Graham, the elder son of his daddy, 'went for' the delinquent purchasers. He introduced a resolution directing the Board of Education to enforce the violated contract at all hazards. Senator Warren, and all others who knew the lands, declared that they were not worth $50,000, and that the State would never get another offer for that amount, and that the contract should by all means be enforced.

Some of the Senators had the sense to see how the thing looked, and declared that they could not go back on themselves. Having vowed on the stump that the lands were worth *millions* they would stick to it. Having sworn that the horse was *sixteen feet high* they would not fall an inch. So the resolution of John, the son of King William the First, did not at that time prevail."

As everybody knows, the Conservative Legislature subsequent to the publication of this article, ratified the sale of these lands for $50,000, and thus confuted all their allegations in the campaign of 1870—that the sale originally made by Republicans was a swindle.

That there was no *necessity* for paying extra lawyers $3.000 of the people's money to prosecute Gov. Holden is apparent enough. Mr. Conigland, one of Gov. Holden's Counsel, but a strong Conservative, in his speech in the Impeachment trial, said of this matter.

"The house of representatives selected seven of their most distinguished members to conduct this impeachment, and fully competent to do so, gentlemen of such learning and experience that they may literally be termed the "seven wise men" of that body. But we find united with them three learned members of the bar who have occupied the highest positions within the gift of the state, the very weight of whose names carries with it great influence. Why is such a course resorted to, so unprecedented that few, if any, examples of the sort, can be found in the history of impeachment in England or America. Are the offences of the respondent so unheard of, are his crimes so black, that all avenues of escape must be closed on him? Or are you and his judges, so prejudiced in his favor, that you must be coaxed, flattered, and wooed and won into meting out to him simple justice? Or does it arise from a fixed purpose to ruin and degrade an obnoxious political opponent? I ask the honorable managers, elected as they were to conduct the trial of this impeachment, and so fully competent to do so, why they have united with themselves three counsel, among the most distinguished of the North Carolina bar, to aid in the prosecution of the respondent? I beg permission to tell them that the body they represent should not contend for victory in this case—that it is as much their duty, as it is the duty of the respondent's counsel, to see that he shall have a fair and impartial trial, and that in retaining associates, a course, at least so unusual, they leave the impression upon the public mind, of an over-zealous purpose to secure his conviction.

SHOWING THEIR TEETH.

At the recent Conservative Convention which nominated Hon. John Kerr, as a candidate for Convention in Caswell county, we find the following in their proceedings:

"Mr. Hodnett then introduced some resolutions which he retains, instructing our delegates to urge the incorporation of the homestead law in the new constitution as it is now in our present constitution, and also a prohibition upon the Supreme Court Judges from declaring it unconstitutional in all time to come.

The resolutions were VOTED DOWN, not because of the homestead provision, which the delegates will support, but on account of the clause *absurdly* attempting to *fetter the judges in their judicial functions.*"

So it seems the Conservatives are against "fettering" anybody who may wish to destroy the homestead. If they can't "fetter" the Judges—how will they preserve the homestead?

WHAT VALLANDIGHAM MEDITATED.

The following is an extract from correspondence of the Cincinnati *Gazette*:

I had a talk with one of Mr. Vallandigham's near relatives, to whom he often spoke freely. He said his new departure idea was two years old, and had been thoroughly studied. His papers were voluminous. He had written a complete autobiography. One of his favorite hopes was to make a 4th of July oration at the centennial anniversary in 1876, and he commenced the preparation of it. He loved the Calhoun theory in politics, but thought it died with the echoes of the last gun at Appomattox Courthouse. He wanted negro suffrage kept out of politics. It was on its. Let us see how it worked. If well, why well. If not, let the people remedy it. He believed that they were ready for a new constitution, and feared sometimes a military dictatorship. The new departure was against his prejudices, but he believed it the best for the country.

When professed and recognized party organs, in effect apologize for and palliate such occurrences as the Rutherford outrage, it is high time the people of all parties, and of no party, stopped to think.

The country is rapidly drifting toward anarchy, and even monarchy appears in the distance. If these ends are reached, the people have to thank politicians, and party influences therefor.—*Telegram.*