

The Southerner.

TARBORO: JUNE 19.

FOR PRESIDENT, FRANKLIN PIERCE. OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT, WILLIAM R. KING, OF ALABAMA.

FOR GOVERNOR, DAVID S. REID.

Attention Commissioners!

We have been requested by several citizens to call your attention to the propriety of passing an ordinance, requiring all persons owning houses, lots, etc. to give them a thorough cleaning and liming, as it would surely conduce much to the health of our village, and save, far more than it would cost, both in trouble and expense. Look to it ye guardians of our person and property.

Free Suffrage.

In our last, we clearly showed that land qualifications were inserted in our Constitution, not for the purpose of protecting any interest, supporting any principle, or giving stability to our institutions, but simply to give an aristocratic caste to a portion of our fellow citizens. That they were entirely independent of, nor could they repeal, in the slightest degree affect, the compromises of the Constitution. That these were instituted, to effect the protection of the local interests of Eastern and Western Carolina, were absolutely necessary to insure just and equal legislation, and could not be removed without creating great dissatisfaction among a large portion of our people.

These compromises cannot inure to the oppression of either section, why then tamper with them, or advocate the means which will make them liable to be tampered with? The East have a negative on any oppressive enactment, which the West may wish to pass. The West are made the originators of all, and are necessarily free from danger. No measure can become law without the concurrent assent of both. Therefore, this compromise, "by giving to each portion of the community which may be unequally affected by legislative action, a negative on the others, prevents all partial or local legislation, and restricts its action to such measures as are designed for the protection and the good of the whole. In doing this, it secures, at the same time, the rights and liberty of the people regarded individually, as each portion consists of those who, whatever may be the diversity of interests among themselves, have the same interest in reference to the action of the government."

Mark this quotation, particularly the italicized portions; for it is the production of one of the greatest of statesmen, "Conservative," mark the words, for they emanated from the great apostle of your faith. He says, compromises between local interests are absolutely necessary to liberty; that these need protection; but, that whatever may be the diversity of interests in any one of these portions, as between poll tax, interest tax, or land tax, they have the same interest in reference to the action of the government. Can you, then, say that the repeal of this useless badge of exclusiveness, can argue in the least the destruction of one of the great protective principles of liberty and just legislation? No more of such. Cherish your monarchical hantling if you wish, but do not attempt to identify it with the most just and noble feature of our Constitution. We forbid the bans between your royal Hottentot and our maid of liberty.

But as to the manner of expunging this stain on our republican robe. In '35, we wish it to be remembered, the Convention adopted the Legislative, as the proper mode of amending the Constitution. To prove this, we have only to notice, that when the Convention proceeded to call up and act on the question, how amendments to the Constitution should be made, no other mode was spoken of. After the Convention had

passed all necessary provisions, this among the rest, then, and not until then, did they think of placing any check on the calling of future conventions; showing clearly that they considered conventions as intended to make radical changes, revolutions in our constitution, and not to be called for every simple amendment. The one was intended to trim and beautify, the other to uproot and replant.

Same say, however, that one is more democratic than the other. Let us see. The Legislative mode requires the amendment to be passed, first by three-fifths, next by two-thirds of the Legislature, then to be affirmed by a majority of the people. The Convention mode requires a vote of two-thirds (the largest number in the other mode) to call a convention, its adoption by that convention, and its affirmation by a majority of the people—both requiring a two-thirds vote of the Legislature, and both ultimately deriving their authority from the same power, the will of the majority. But Mr. Kerr says, if a majority of the people desire it at any time, the Legislature should call a Convention without regard to the merits of the amendments proposed. The same might be said on the other side, but we differ with him entirely; and to support ourselves, we quote from Judge Gaston's speech, on this subject in the Convention of '35, "That the deliberate will of the People ought ultimately to prevail, no one will deny; but that the temporary will of a majority, which may be produced by the effervescence of the moment, ought to do whatever it pleases—set up and put down Constitutions from day to day—no man can be so extravagant as to desire."

If this be true, shall we, to effect a simple unprincipled provision, think of using that means, which will jeopardize the admirable principles of our constitution? Shall we thrust aside the wisdom of our sages, and uproot the long-established, time-honored principles of republicanism? The principles of our Constitution are just and wise, their execution well provided for. In this respect there is not a better. And yet its dress is rather objectionable. A tinge of the "imperial purple" is upon it. It does no peculiar harm, yet it frets and annoys us. To illustrate, we sometimes see one whose principles we know and admire, yet we cannot bear the fancy cut of his coat, his imperial carriage, or shake with hearty good will his colored kids. So with our Constitution. We are well pleased with its principles, therefore we wish no new one, and the mother of Constitutions, a Convention, is not necessary. Its manners, however, need improvement, then let the teacher, the legislative mode, perform its duty. So may it be.

"We'll shout and sing For PIERCE and KING, And make the very welkin ring."

The Democratic editors, in the present campaign, have indeed a light and pleasant task. Their candidates, possessing all the capabilities and virtues of truly great men, they have simply to record the history of their acts, to arouse all the enthusiasm of the "lion-hearted democracy." In FRANKLIN PIERCE, they advocate, through merit alone, the bestowal of the highest honors on a man,—whose principles are written in his deeds, who, independent of all platforms, has exhibited in his services to his country a deep and abiding devotion to the true principles of democracy.

If it be asked, is he a strict constructionist? His votes in Congress answer, and prove him more so, than even "Old Hickory." Is he an economist? His strongest speeches in Congress were made in opposition to extravagant expenditures. Is he true to Southern Rights? The marked fidelity of the New Hampshire democracy, under his leadership, witnesses the fact. And his careful guardianship of them, is clearly evinced in the following, from a friendly letter, written a few months since to an editor, who advocated his claims to the position he now occupies: "With the exception of the year I was in the army, I have been wholly devoted to my profession, mingling but

little in politics, unless when the activity and recklessness of the dangerous element of abolitionism has demanded the best exertions of all true men."

His political robe is without spot or wrinkle, his conduct free from the slightest tinge of demagogism.

In our present acting Vice-President, whose bearing has been "so clear in his great office," and whose "virtues will plead like angels, trumpet-tongued, against his taking off," we have a "host" indeed. A son of our good old State, a long-tried and faithful public servant, WILLIAM R. KING would worthily wear any mantle of honor which either accident or design might drop on his shoulder.

With all to hope for, and nothing to fear, let us gayly spread our banner to the breeze and go "our way rejoicing."

BIOGRAPHY OF Gen. Franklin Pierce, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Franklin Pierce, the nominee of the Democratic National Convention, is the son of a revolutionary hero, who fought in the battles of Bunker's Hill, Lexington and Concord. He was born in 1804, at Hillsborough, N. H., and graduated at Bowdoin College, Maine—studied law and commenced a lucrative practice in Hillsborough county. He was elected at an early day to the Legislature of his State, and shortly after elected Speaker of the House.

In 1834 he was elected to Congress, in which body he filled a prominent and conspicuous place till 1838, at which period he became a Senator of the United States, and served till 1842-3. He resigned his seat in the Senate and returned to private life and the practice of the law in 1843.

In 1845 he was nominated for Governor of the State, but declined. President Polk offered him the Attorney Generalship, which he also declined, preferring private to public life.

In 1848 he volunteered as a soldier in the Mexican war, (not as an officer) and was appointed the first Colonel of the ten regiments then raised for the service of the United States. Subsequently, when a number of new Major Generals were appointed, he was made a Brigadier General.

He lost no time to repair to the field of battle, and reached Vera Cruz early enough for all the battles fought from the landing of the U. S. troops to the capture of the Halls of the Montezumas in the city of Mexico.

General Pierce's nomination is a thoroughly national one. The record of his life is that of an honest, unobtrusive patriot, who only sought public life to serve his country in the hour of danger.

The friends of Gen. Cass prefer him to all others as a second choice, and those of Mr. Buchanan are equally satisfied. Gen. Pierce, it is thought, will unite the democratic party more fully than any other candidate. X.

COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE SOUTHERNER.

Offences,

By JOE, A JERSEY MUTE.

From a long residence among all sorts of people, from the millionaire to the street beggar, I think it is fair to conclude that it is morally impossible to "live in peace with all men," or, more properly speaking, to be pleased with and please all men. Are you a Whig? Your neighbor is a Democrat. Do you intend to vote the whole Whig ticket? Your neighbor wishes you to cast your ticket in favor of his favorite Democratic candidate, but you prefer to side with the Whigs, and your neighbor is displeased with your independence. Are you a rich man? Your neighbor is a poor man. He wishes you to employ him in some kind of work, but you have no earthly occasion for "help," and your neighbor is angered with you, and thinks you close-fisted in your pecuniary notions. Are you an old bachelor, and do you neglect the society of the marriageable girls? They do not like you, and call you an unsocial and selfish man. Are you a poor man? You cannot buy fine clothes, of course. Rich folks, to say nothing of fops, turn up their noses when you happen to come in their way; they do not like to be seen in company with what they call basely-born people. Are you ugly? The girls do not like you for this reason, and no other. Are you a preacher? The wicked hate you. Are you a temperance man? The rum-sellers and rum-drinkers despise you. In doing good, you necessarily offend some sorts of people.

A southern lady visited a public institution, where she offered a gold piece to a boy, but it was refused from mo-

tives of delicacy. The lady was exasperated at the boy's refusal, and immediately left the institution, saying that good manners were not taught in the institution. More: A gentleman of South Carolina invited his friend, a Northerner, to go trouting with him; but the Northerner begged to be excused as he had something to attend to. The Southerner considered his friend's apology as intended for an insult, and struck him a heavy blow on the head with a cane, by which he was rendered insensible for some time. The assailant was arrested, brought before a magistrate, and fined \$500 for assault and battery.

A gentleman, who had for many years kept up a regular weekly correspondence with his brother, wrote a polite note to him, requesting payment of some money which had been lent to him, and a cessation of friendly correspondence between the two brothers was the result. A farmer handed a country paper to a city gentleman, who after looking it over, returned it to the farmer, observing that it was rather a poor sheet. His remark did not please the farmer, who told him that he was a poor judge of newspaper literature. A woman once asked me what I thought of her newly-born infant. To be sure it was a very ugly little thing. I said to its anxious mother. "It looks well enough, but"—and here I paused. My "but" led the woman to suspect that I had intended to have said something to the discredit of her infant, and she turned her smile into a frown.

A student was so wholly absorbed in meditation, as to be unaware of what was going on around him. His sister complained of his want of attention to her mental culture. As soon as she saw him (mechanically) look up at her, she greeted him with a smile, but he seemed to take no notice of it. Mortified at his neglect, she burst into tears, and repeatedly said, "My brother forgets me." Laborious students are sometimes subject to absence of mind, and hence this negligence.

A lady met a gentleman of her acquaintance in the street, and politely bowed to him, but he passed on without noticing her. She took offence at his neglecting to return her compliment. But she did not know that he was too short-sighted to distinguish objects at a distance. A man sent a letter to his brother, but the letter miscarried, and the consequence was that his relative did not answer his letter. The person who wrote, was offended at his brother's silence, and vowed never to write to him more.

A Scotchman of huge proportions boarded at a respectable house kept by three resident sisters. It was in the depth of winter when he was taken ill. The mistresses did not like to keep him during his sickness, and did not scruple to send him away. He repaired to the hospital, where he soon after died. His friends, hearing of the barbarity of his landladies, threatened to sue them. When he was sick, the mistresses of his boarding house were displeased with his misfortune. How different it is to avoid offending, or which is the same thing, displeasing people!

A gentleman, while lying in bed, burst a blood vessel, and vomited forth a large quantity of blood, spoiling the bed-clothes. It could not be helped, however. His landlady said that she wished he had never been born. Some men peevishly say that they wish their parents had not given them birth, because they know that their sins are many and great. Some people are angry because their parents have not money enough to ensure them from the horrors of poverty. Hence the total impossibility of pleasing all men. We must expect to incur the displeasure of some or other of our fellow-beings. We must please one man and offend another at the same time. We may have no enemy in the world, but we must offend occasionally. We must avoid running into friendships; for this course generally terminates in a series of petty quarrels. It is best to have very few friends, and these of most unexceptionable character. He who has only two or three friends, is subject to very little interruption, when engaged in useful and active employment.

TARBORO' MARKET, June 19.

Trade in produce continues dull, with little or no change in prices, and but little prospect of a renewal of boat navigation from this place for some time. Turpentine—Virgin dip, \$1 90; Old dip, \$1 80 to \$1 85. Scrape 40 cts. per 100 lbs. Tar, \$1 per barrel. Corn, \$2 75 to \$3 per bbl. Bacon, 11 to 12 1/2 cts. Lard, 11 to 12 1/2 cts. Cotton, 7 1/2 cts. Fish—none in market but whole Herrings at \$6 per bbl.

DIED,

In this place, on Friday the 4th inst. India Louise, daughter of Josiah S. and

Marie L. Pender, aged eight months and twenty three days.

LOOK UP,

Ye grieving ones, and when ye think of her, Give thanks, even while ye weep. It were not meet To murmur at her glory, nor desire To look her downward to time's ills again. Clay mourns for clay, but spirit soars to catch Some glimpse or sparkle of their spirit's joy Who wear the robes of immortality, And by such blessed tokens shapes its course More truly toward the skies.—Com

In this place, on Tuesday last, Baker, son of Mr. Wm. B. Howell, aged 2 years 6 months and 16 days.

County Candidates.

Election on Thursday, 5th Aug. next. We are authorized to announce Col. H. T. CLARK, as a candidate for re-election to the Senate of the next General Assembly.

We are authorized to announce WILLIAM NOBLEET, Esq., as a candidate for election to the House of Commons of the next General Assembly.

We are authorized to announce JAS. F. JENKINS, as a candidate for re-election as Sheriff of this county.

A Strong Certificate.

From the Steubenville Herald, March 25, 1851.

The reader is referred to an advertisement in another column, which gives the details of a wonderful cure from the use of V. Lane's Vermifuge, which is certified to have been effected, not in Maine, nor in Louisville, nor in Oregon, but here, almost in your midst. Read it, and judge for yourselves:—

Public attention is most respectfully invited to the plain, unvarnished statement of your own fellow-citizen, Mr. Stephens, whose child was wonderfully restored to health by the use of Dr. M'Lane's Vermifuge. Cross Creek Tp near Winterville, Jefferson Co. Ohio. March 19th 1851.

Messrs. J. Kidd & Co.—I have a little boy three years old the 16th day of this month, that has been very delicate in health for some time. After trying a great many other medicines, without receiving any benefit from their use, I was induced to try Dr. C. M'Lane's American Worm Specific, or Vermifuge, as put up by your honors—and wonderful to relate, after giving him two teaspoons full, he passed 150 worms, some of them very large, and others not thicker than a common sized knitting needle; since which time the little fellow has enjoyed excellent health, and is at this time getting very fleshy or fat, as the old women say. And I must say, I believe that if he had not taken the Vermifuge, he would ere this have been consigned to the tomb. JOSEPH V. STEPHENS.

For sale by Geo. Howard, Tarboro'—sold also by druggists and dealers generally—sold at wholesale by all the principal druggists in the United States.

Guano.

10 Tons No. 1 Peruvian Guano, for sale by John Myers & Son, Washington, 11th June, 1852.

A GARB,

Truth Will Prevail.

I was greatly surprised to see published, in several papers of the State, the proceedings of the Trustees of the Franklin Institute, relative to the "recent events," which, they say, caused them to suspend the exercises of the school for the present session. Now, if the said Trustees had been satisfied with merely passing the resolutions, and had not taken so much pains to give them publicity, I should have passed them by as the "idle wind" and unworthy of my notice, as the citizens in the neighborhood were generally acquainted with the circumstances. But as they have thought proper to publish them, and as there is a resolution among their proceedings respecting a difficulty between the teacher of the school and myself, in which not only great injustice is displayed, but it may actually (and very naturally too) be construed into a reflection on my conduct in the matter, I cannot in justice to myself and family remain silent. In the resolution alluded to, they state that the course of their principal was in their opinion honorable and that they deem him a gentleman &c. withholding any expression of their opinion as to my conduct, thereby leaving the public to infer, it was the reverse (i. e.) dishonorable and ungentlemanly. Now whether it was their intention to produce such an impression I shall not assert. (I will leave that to their own consciences.) One thing is certain, they have done it, and it is my duty in vindication of my course and the cause of Truth, to give a brief his-

tory of my connection with the school, as well as some of the events that distinguished it, during its short career.

When it was proposed to have a school in my neighborhood a few years since, I was among the first to encourage which I did materially by giving my land on which the academy was to be, and furthermore by giving one hundred dollars to pay for the building of the academy. After the reading of the report, D. S. Richardson the "gentlemanly principal" was called to teach. Of course at this time the school had my best wishes for its prosperity; for laying all other reasons aside, it was certainly greatly to my interest to have a school in the neighborhood. I had several boys of my own to be educated. The school had not continued long however, before I found my teacher was not competent in many respects and did not exercise the proper discipline, and I predicted long ago the school would go down unless a better teacher was employed. In this connection, it may be proper to state, that intercourse between the teachers and myself for a year or two past has been very friendly, owing to the many causes. First, a brother of the teacher came to our place a minister— from one of the New England States, and had not been here long, before he was requested as a Trustee by one of the same, to give the Rev'd Mr. Richardson an opportunity to preach to the school one evening in the academy, which he reluctantly agreed to after some hesitation, under the impression that it would not be repeated. But in this I was disappointed—it was repeated and the first who took any steps to stop proceedings, which no doubt caused the ill will of the teacher, his brother, may not be irrelevant here to remark that the Rev'd Mr. Richardson did not sojourn very long with us, after we stopped his proceedings with the slaves.

Now what farmer or owner of land in North Carolina would permit a preacher, just from a northern State, whose principles were unknown, to hold his course with his negroes during their sojourn when perhaps none or a very few persons were present?

From this time my dealings with the teacher were rather limited, and I attributed to nothing else, but his course towards his brother's proceedings with the negroes. I did not know his brother's object was in preaching to the slaves, but I did know such an example would prove dangerous to our institutions. Shortly afterwards I saw very trivial offence, he, the teacher, punished one of my sons very severely with a cow hide, and I thought it was done from prejudice, and consequently took my boy from school. Is there a man in our State, who has the honor of his child at heart, that would allow him to a teacher he thought prejudiced against him? No, not one. And this act, I have no doubt I incurred the displeasure of some of the Trustees, who seemed very anxious for me to send again. And I will here state one of the present Trustees told me about that time, that he would believe the teacher on his oath, and he greatly surprised that he should give consent to the publishing of such a publication. And I will also remark that Dr. Sills, the most intelligent and the most respectable of the Trustees, withdrew from the meeting and would have nothing to do with such ridiculous proceedings. After I stopped my son from school, the prejudice of the teacher towards my family did not stop, for at the very next examination, he had the male portion of my family "confronted" in a dialogue at a public exhibition. I could have endured the other part very enough, but "there is a time when forbearance ceases to be a virtue." And as soon as I heard he said it was intended as a reflection on my family, I attacked him on sight and would have given him the chastisement he deserved but he shrunk like a coward and I concluded I would let him pass on his bad behaviour. From that time I had had any difficulty with him, and the "recent unfortunate events," which called forth the action of the Trustees.

As I have gone somewhat into particulars in order to get at the whole truth, I will state the cause of the difficulty which is as follows. Three of the boys left school a short time since, and as it looked bad to see boys going off without some excuse, I understood this "gentlemanly principal" charged that the boys that left school were induced in so doing by me or some member of my family on account of our hospitality to the school. For this barefaced and unfounded charge I attempted to punish him again and was prevented by some gentlemen who happened to be present.

The consequent action of the Trustees and the course of some of the boys (which I forbear to notice in consequence of their youthful indiscretion) having already been published—I will not refer to them further than to say that I think the course of the boys was