

at the West or at the East, that they are pursuing a course that is impoverishing and ruinous.

Several of the Southern States furnish examples of this, though sometimes slow deterioration of the soil by continual cropping without making any return of the chemical elements of the produce carried off. In Johnston's Elements of Agricultural Chemistry and Geology we find the decay of fertility in these Southern States held forth as a warning to the cultivators of the rich soils of the West, in language which seems as if it had been prompted by some such vain and deceptive boast as that to which we have alluded. This standard authority thus writes: "Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina—once rich and fertile—by a long continued system of forced and exhausting culture, have become unproductive in many places, and vast tracts have been abandoned to apparently hopeless sterility. Such lands it is, indeed, possible to reclaim, but at what an expense of time, labor, manure and skillful management. It is to be hoped that the newer States will not thus sacrifice their future power and prospects to present and temporary wealth—that the fine lands of Ohio, Kentucky and the Prairie States, which now yield Indian corn and wheat, crop after crop, without manure, will not be so cropped till their strength and substance is gone; but that a better conducted and more skillful husbandry will continue, without diminishing the present crops, to secure a permanent fertility to that naturally rich and productive country."

This hope will certainly be disappointed if the farmers of the West are encouraged by those to whom they look for direction and guidance, to be heedless as to the means of restoring to the soil the elements of what they take from it in their crops, and to pay an attention to saving or applying these elements in the form of barn yard manure or animal excrement, or the concentrated fertilizers which within a few years have come so extensively into use. The elements that enter into the composition of a wheat or any other crop cannot be inexhaustible in any soil; and they must become rapidly decreased at the rate which is indicated by the chemical analysis of Sprague and others, according to which a crop of wheat carries off in silica, soda and potash, lime, phosphoric acid, and other organic elements alone about 56 lbs. for 1,000 lbs. of grain and straw produced. The soil is thus much poorer for every crop, and will soon show its ill treatment by scantier harvests.—Country Gentleman.

HO! FOR KANSAS.

At the solicitation of many friends, I will proceed to organize a Company of one hundred men, to proceed to Kansas, about the last of March.

This pioneer band needs the aid of the moneyed citizens. They go to a far off country for the purpose of securing homes, and at the same time to defend Southern institutions. They appeal to their native State, with the hope that their appeal will not be in vain.

It is impossible that the people of South Carolina can hear without emotion the news which daily comes to us from Kansas. The long and bitter animosities have at last ripened, and slavery and abolition, the North and the South, confront each other in the armed and deadly war. The issue has come, and to the people of the South, and of this State, to each and every slaveholder, the question addresses itself—What shall we do for Kansas?—Should we look listlessly, tamely on, while our friends, struggling by the host of abolition, are risking their fortunes perhaps shedding their blood in our behalf? Can we do nothing, give nothing of our abundance in such a cause?

We trust that these questions may be answered in a worthy and liberal manner. Let patriotism and State pride, and Southern spirit, be expressed in some suitable, practical form of aid for Kansas.

E. B. BELL.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

31st December, 1855.

CAPT. E. B. BELL—Dear Sir: In reply to your letter of the 28th, I must first repeat my proposition. The pledge was to give an hundred dollars to each company of one hundred men that might start for Kansas, I will pay to your treasurer the amount pledged. If my colleagues are not called upon to contribute to companies which may be raised in their own districts, they authorize me to say that each will contribute handsomely to the aid of your company.

Your intention of appealing, through the press, to the spirit and patriotism of the people of the State, is admirable.—There are men scattered all over the State who are willing to go, but not in sufficient numbers to form a separate company in each district. Come out with your publication, and when you get one hundred men, solemnly pledged to go to Kansas, I feel authorized to pledge the South Carolina delegation for two hundred and fifty dollars.

You will certainly have the hundred dollars from me whenever you are ready to move with a hundred men. Or, should you fall in getting the full number of an hundred men, then you may call on me on the day that you start for as many dollars as you have men under pledge to go and to remain two years in Kansas.

Yours truly,

P. S. BROOKS.

Dickens has lengthened grown his prejudices against this country, if one may judge from this passage in his latest Christmas story: "Nevertheless, a rain I drank my cobler, julep, sling, or cocktail in all good will to my friend the General and my friends the Majors, Colonels and civilians, all full well knowing that whatever little notes my beamy eyes may have described in their; they belong to a kind generous, large-hearted, and great people."

Breathes there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself hath said, I will a family paper take, both for my own and children's sakes? If such there be, let him repent, and have this paper to him sent.

From the Wilmington Herald. A Speaker Elected.

Although the indications for the last two or three days, looked to the termination of the protracted struggle in the House of Representatives, by the election of a speaker, yet we were somewhat taken by surprise yesterday, upon receiving a telegraphic despatch, announcing that the Hon. Nathaniel P. Banks, Jr., of Massachusetts, has been chosen to that office. From the course pursued by Mr. Cingman in moving and supporting the plurality rule, by the operation of which the contest was ended, and his expressed opinion, that the adoption of this rule would lead to the defeat of Mr. Banks, we were led to expect a fulfillment of his confident prediction. But, in this we have been disappointed, and the representative of extreme sectionalism, is now the presiding officer of the House. For this result, the American members are not responsible. When the fight was narrowed down to a choice between Mr. Banks and Mr. Aiken of South Carolina, they supported the latter, but enough scattering votes were thrown for other candidates to secure Aiken's defeat.

The result was effected in this way. On Saturday, Mr. Smith of Tennessee, offered a resolution that the House proceed at once to ballot for a Speaker, and if after the roll shall have been called three times, no person shall have received a majority of all the votes cast, that the roll shall be called again, and the member who shall receive the largest number shall be declared elected. For this resolution Mr. Cingman, of the N. C. delegation alone voted. The resolution was adopted. Messrs. Orr and Fuller, the Democratic and American candidates for Speaker, then withdrew their names, and the House balloted three times ineffectually.

The House then proceeded to the one hundred and thirty third vote for Speaker, and the last vote under the plurality rule, with the following result: whole number of votes, 214; of these—

Table with 2 columns: Name, Votes. Mr. Banks received 103, Aiken 100, H. M. Fuller 6, L. D. Campbell 4, Wells 1.

The following is the vote in detail: For Mr. Banks.—Messrs. Allbright, Allison, Ball, Baird, Henry Bennett, Benson, Billingshurst, Bigham, Buffington, Burlingame, James H. Campbell, Lewis D. Campbell, Chaffee, Ezra Clark, Clawson, Colfax, Comings, Corvode, Craig, Cramlock, Danrell, Timothy Davis, Day, Dean, D. Witt, Dick, Dickson, Doble, Dumas, Ellis, Flagler, Galloway, Giddings, Gilbert, Granger, Grow, Robert H. Hall, Harkin, Holloway, Thomas H. Horton, Howard, Kelsey, King, Knapp, Knight, Knowlton, Knox, Kimmel, Leiter, Miss, Matteson, McCarty, Meacham, Kilian Miller, Morgan, Morrill, Mott, Murray, Nelson, Norton, Andrew Oliver, Parker, Parrot, Pelton Pennington, Perry, Pettit, Pike, Pringle, Purviance, Rutledge, Robbins, Roberts, Robinson, Sabin, Sage, Sapp, Sherman, Simmons, Spinney, Stanton, Strong, Tappan, Thorington, Thurston, Todd, Thorton, Tyson, Wade, Wallbridge, Waldron, Caldwell, C. Washburne, E. H. Washburne, C. Washburne, E. H. Washburne, Watson, Welch, Wood, Woodward and Woodworth—103.

For Mr. Aiken.—Messrs. Banks, Beld, Bond, S. Bennett, Boeck, Boyce, Bryan, Brank, Brooks, Burnett, Caldwell, John P. Campbell, Carlie, Carstairs, Cooke, Cingman, Howell Cobb, Williamson R. W. Cobb, Cox, Crawford, Davidson, Denver, Dowdell, Edmundson, Elliot, English, E. Heridge, East, Evans, Franklin, Florence, Foster, Thomas J. D. Fuller, Goode, Greenwood, Augustus Hall, J. Morrison Harris, Sampson W. Harris, Thomas L. Harris, Hebert, Hoffman, Houston, Jewett, George W. Jones, J. Glancy Jones, Keitt, Kelly, Kennell, Kilwell, Lake, Leitch, Landley Lumpkin, Alexander K. Marshall, Humphrey Marshall, Samuel S. Marshall, Maxwell, McMullen, McQueen, Smith Miller, Milson, Mordecai Oliver, Orr, Paine, Peck, Phelps, Porter, Powell, Puryear, Quitman, Reade, Ready, Ricard, Rivers, Ruffin, Rust, Sandidge, Savage, Shooter, Samuel A. Smith, William Smith, William H. Smith, Sneed, Stephens, Stewart, Swoje, Talbot, Tripp, Underwood, Vail, Walker, Warner, Watkins, Wells, Wheeler, Williams, Winslow, Daniel B. Wright, John V. Wright and Zolliker—100.

For Mr. Fuller.—Messrs. Broom, Clark, of New York, Cullen, Davis, of Maryland, Millward and Whitely—6.

For Mr. Campbell.—Messrs. Dunn, Harrison, Moore and Scott—4.

For Mr. Wells.—Mr. Hickman.

Mr. Benson of Maine, one of the tallers, announced that Nathaniel P. Banks, Jr., of Massachusetts, was duly elected Speaker.

Mr. A. K. Marshall raised the question that the House itself must declare the result, and that the clerk could neither do so himself nor delegate any one to do so. After some debate on this point, in which Messrs. East, Cingman, Cobb of Georgia, Smith of Alabama, Paine of North Carolina, H. Marshall, Campbell of Ohio, Herbert and Stuart participated, and during which

MR. AIKEN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA ASKED PERMISSION OF THE HOUSE TO CONDUCT THE GENTLEMEN FROM MASSACHUSETTS [MR. BANKS] TO THE CHAIR, AS THE DUTY OF ELECTED SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. Cingman offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That, by reason of the adoption of the proposition known as the plurality resolution, and the votes taken under it, the Hon. N. P. Banks, Jr., of Massachusetts, has been duly chosen Speaker, and is hereby so declared.

After some debate, the previous question was called on the resolution, and seconded, and ordered to be put.

The question was taken, and the resolution was adopted—yeas 156, nays 40.

Mr. Banks addressed the House as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: Before I proceed to complete my acceptance of the office to which I am elected, I avail myself of your indulgence to express my acknowledgements

for the distinguished honor conferred upon me.

It would afford me far greater pleasure, in taking the chair of the House, were I supported even by the self-assurances that I could bring to the discharge of its duties, always delicate and arduous, and now enlivened with a usual difficulty, any capability commensurate with their responsibility and dignity. I can only say that in so far as I am able I shall discharge the obligations resting upon me, with fidelity to the Constitution and with impartiality as it regards the rights of members of the House. I have no personal objects to accomplish. I am animated by the single desire that I may aid in some degree in maintaining the well-established principles of our Government in their original and American significance; in the development of the material interests of that portion of the continent we occupy, as far as we may do so within the limited and legitimate powers conferred upon us; in enlarging and swelling the capacity of our Government for beneficent influences at home and abroad; and, above all, in preserving intact and in perpetuity the priceless privileges transmitted to us.

I am, of course, aware that of my own strength I cannot hope to be equal to the perfect execution of the duties I now assume. I am therefore, as every man must be who stands in such presence, a supplicant for your co-operation and indulgence; and, accepting your honors with this declaration, I again offer you my thanks.

A round of applause followed the conclusion of this address. At the request of the Clerk, Mr. Giddings, of Ohio, as the senior member of the House, then administered the oath of office to the Speaker elect, as follows:—"You, Nathaniel P. Banks, do solemnly swear you will support the Constitution of the United States, so help you God."

A SPEAKER ELECTED

The protracted struggle for the Speakership was brought to a close last evening by the election of Hon. N. P. Banks. Nine full weeks were consumed before this result was attained, and it was finally brought about by the adoption of the plurality rule. Although it is absolutely certain that there is a majority of representatives in the House who agree with Mr. Banks on the sectional questions which now agitate the country, yet it has been demonstrated, again and again, that a portion of his own political friends would never agree to vote for him for Speaker, and hence that he could never be elected by a majority vote.

As we have remarked, the contest was finally terminated under the operation of the plurality rule. The votes taken during several days past had indicated that a Speaker could only be chosen by resorting to that rule. There was a strong repugnance amongst the national members to its adoption, more especially after the revolting declaration of Mr. Banks as to the test of superiority in the races. The southern Know Nothings manifested a determination against casting their votes for the Democratic nominees not less persistent than their refusal to vote for Mr. Banks. On Friday, however, propositions were made by Democrats to which the southern Know Nothings indicated a disposition to accede—the one proposing Mr. Oliver, an Old Line Whig, and the other Mr. Aiken, a National Democrat, for Speaker. The votes on these propositions, compared with that given on the same day on a resolution declaring Mr. Banks the Speaker, showed so little difference that it was exceedingly doubtful what would be the result upon the adoption of the plurality rule. At this point Mr. Smith, of Tennessee, believing that the chances of Mr. Aiken were at least equal to those of Mr. Banks, brought forward a resolution for the plurality rule. Mr. Orr immediately withdrew unconditionally his name as the Democratic nominee, and the resolution was adopted. The result was, as we have stated, the election of Mr. Banks by a plurality of three votes—Mr. Banks receiving 103 votes and Mr. Aiken 100.—see National American throwing their votes for Mr. Fuller, and four Republicans throwing theirs on Mr. L. D. Campbell. It is apparent that a perfect union of the national members (the four republicans voting for Mr. Campbell) would have elected Mr. Aiken by a plurality of three. Thus has ended the most extraordinary struggle that has ever occurred. Although the result is one which every national man will regret, yet as the Republicans have known majority in the House, and therefore were entitled to the Speakership, there is reason for acquiescing, inasmuch as it enables the machinery of government once more to move on.

[Washington Union, Feb. 3.]

THE SPEAKERSHIP.—We take the liberty says the South Carolinian of publishing the following extract of a letter received from a friend at Washington. It will be found interesting, as showing how Banks was elected Speaker:

"I suppose you have already learned that Banks is Speaker. Aiken would have been elected, if all the National Democrats had voted for him, but they did not—Lekman and Barkley, of Pennsylvania—would not vote for Aiken. So if all the Southern Know Nothings had voted for Aiken, he could have been elected; but two did not—Davis, of Maryland, and Cullen of Delaware.

"Again Aiken would have been elected if the three Northern twelve section Know Nothings, who voted for him on Friday, had voted for him on Saturday."

BURNED TO DEATH.—Mrs. Elizabeth Moore, nearly 80 years old, living near Helbron Post Office, was so badly burned by her clothes taking fire, on the night of the 20th instant, that she died on Tuesday morning, at 4 o'clock. Mrs. Moore had labored under mental aberration for several years, and was the object of constant watchfulness. Her husband, an octogenarian, occupied a bed in the room where the accident happened, and his eyes opened only to see the companion of his life enveloped in a sheet of flame, which proved almost her shroud.—[Spartanburg Spartan.

The Ledger.



LANCASTERVILLE, S. C.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, FEB. 15th, 1856.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.

The Hon. A. P. Butler will accept our thanks for copy of "Patent office Report, Part I 1854."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

F. M. D. Wintaboro. The receipt of your subscription appeared in last paper. We will with pleasure continue the paper.

E. M. M. Bordeaux. You surely can send a few dollars. Will you do so previous to 1st March?

W. B. H. P. Farmersville La. The two dollars never reached us. Perhaps you are mistaken. Send Louisiana money—it will answer.

H. J. E. Fairburn Ga. Georgia money will do.

OUR PROSPECTUS.

In another column we give a short prospectus of our new volume, which commences next week. We were rather too modest, and did not blow our horn very loud, for we think doing the thing is better than talking about it. It will not be superfluous however, to say, that in addition to what we have promised, we will shortly give a series of agricultural articles from "Long Grabs," a writer who has on previous occasions added to the worth of our paper by his contributions. The planting season being near at hand, these articles will be particularly interesting to our planting friends. Our ship is under full sail, and we will not suffer her to abate her speed. We solicit contributions from all who will write, and can write. We wish no "wishey washey" stuff however.

TIGHT TIMES IN LANCASTER.

On Thursday last we were sued by a party for the sum of eight dollars and seventy cents; when they were indebted to us for more than twice the amount. We judge from this circumstance, money matters must be pretty tight with some of our townsmen. It brings to our mind the conduct of a printer we once had in our employ. The poor fellow was very much involved, and never would have been able to pay all he owed. We did not know this however at the time a man called on us, and requested us as a favor to pay a note for a small amount he had on said printer. We did so—paid him the amount the note called for. Shortly after we had a settlement with our friend, the printer. "Look here," said he, "I will pay this note, you can take it out of my wages, but you will oblige me if you will take no more of my paper."

DR. CAUTHEN'S REPLY.

On Monday night last, we received the reply of our friend and Representative, Dr. W. C. CAUTHEN, to our interrogatory of the week before last. In order to give the Dr.'s reply in this number, it leaves us but little space to make any comment; we cannot, however, let it pass without saying something, as at the risk of displeasing friends and composers, we enter our protest, and unhesitatingly pronounce the Doctor's position not only a wrong one; but if adopted as the common position of the State, one which will do discredit to the State—one which will endanger the safety of the Union. If we know any thing about this matter, the Southern States will with one accord vote for the re-nomination of Genl Pierce. If we know any thing about it, the determination is, to re-elect a man, who as the Doctor himself declares, is second only to WASHINGTON as President. Even the South Carolinian, which opposed the sending of delegates to Cincinnati, now favors it, provided they go, with the understanding that only Genl PIERCE must be supported. For our life we can see no reason why South Carolina should continue to pursue a given course, merely because she has erred once. Because she has mistaken her true policy, must she, in her obstinacy, adhere to such a course? Because fifteen years ago, Medical practitioners used Peruvian bark as a remedy in intermittents, must they falsely pronounce it superior to quinine?—or will they say that opium is a better narcotic than morphine? But, admitting that South Carolina should pursue this policy, we are not advocating her departure from it. We ask it only on this special occasion. We say her influence will be felt. The numerical calculation of votes we care nothing about, the 8 votes may be the means of increasing the number six or eight fold. South Carolina is an influential State—more so we believe than any State in the Union. The recent proceedings in Congress confirm us in this opinion, for three of our delegation were spoken of, and warmly, for speaker. And still more do these proceedings show us— they show us that Constitutional men are still to be found in the National Legislature. The vote for Gov. AIKEN, 100 against 103 for BANKS, give us no ground for discouragement. Besides, if some who voted for Gen. AIKEN on Friday, had have voted for him on Saturday, he would have been elected. South Carolina by being represented at Cincinnati, may—we will not say give a death blow to Abolitionism—but, she may cripple and wound it as to paralyze the hydra-headed beast for a period. We are obliged to stop—may say more next week.

REPLY OF COL. BARNES.

The argument used by Col. BARNES for the State to keep aloof from Conventions, is the old fogy notion of the advocates of retrogression and "masterly inactivity."—The Col. must surely must place an undue amount of faith in the wisdom and correctness of the State, when he says that the other States are all wrong and South Carolina is right. Every State in the Union, every Southern State, is wrong in sending delegates to Cincinnati, but South Carolina, she is the embodiment of wisdom—of political sagacity.

If the advocates of the State being represented, have three arguments to support their position, we are sorry we can find but one to support the opposition; and that is, that we must adhere to the course we have ever pursued. We can prove this by Col. BARNES' own declaration. He would be willing for the State, through her delegates, on the 1st Monday in May, to declare herself in favor of the re-election of Genl Pierce, but she must not do so at Cincinnati—"something like whipping the devil round the stump."

As regards the constitutionality of the measure, a man would be more than a fool, to say it is, when we know it is not. But shall we of the South see Northern Abolitionists meeting in Convention to carry measures their way, and make no effort to forestall them? Is it not better to grapple with the enemy, than to passively fold our arms, and present our necks to be grappled by them? Can South Carolina become contaminated by being represented in that Convention, when the Legislature and the people send delegates, or Senators and Representatives to Washington to sit and confer with Free sellers their?

The last Nominating Convention assembled at Baltimore; the North met there. Is it a concession to meet them at Cincinnati? Franklin Pierce was the nominee of that Convention, he hailed from the State which cherished and honored one of the most ultra abolitionists of the North—John P. Hale—the South was suspicious, nothing good could come out of the North—she was rotten to the core, and the infection had spread over her whole domain—the Southern Press repudiated the idea of trusting a Northern man with Southern principles.—Franklin Pierce has proved himself to be a friend to, and supporter of Southern rights, and a President so popularly constitutional in all his acts, it is the desire of South Carolina, by being represented at Cincinnati, to make an effort to place this President another term in the Presidential Chair. Can the State, by declaring this sentiment at Columbia, do any good? Can it have any influence? This verily is a compromise measure, unconstitutional and injudicious, unwise and imprudent as Conventions and Concessions. We ask if South Carolina can compromise her dignity by going to Cincinnati? Can we not place confidence in the delegates we send there? Or may we not send them with instructions what course to pursue?

We write this at the eleventh hour, uncertain if it can be set up. Next week we will have more to say.

DEATH OF THE REV. ROBERT HENRY, D. D.

The Columbia papers of Thursday last, bring us the sad intelligence of the death of Dr. HENRY. Dr. HENRY at the time of his decease was Professor of Greek Literature in the South Carolina College. For the last thirty-six years he has been identified with the College, saving an intermission of three years, when he withdrew from its arduous duties. At one time he filled the office of President, and by his urbanity and winning manners, he secured the respect and affection of the Faculty and students. Dr. HENRY, at the time of his death was about 64 years of age. The greater portion of his life was spent in the service of the institution to which he gave by his profound learning and mature scholarship, a reputation ranking third in the United States.—His loss is great to the College and to the State. We annex the editorials of the Columbia papers.

Our community, says the Carolina Times, is called upon to mourn the death of this distinguished and estimable citizen, which occurred yesterday at 2 p. m. On Monday, he was seized with a congestive chill, the recurrence of which occasioned the sad and unexpected event.

The loss of Dr. Henry is one of no ordinary man—to his afflicted family and to the South Carolina College, it is indeed irreparable. His learning, piety, worth and the ability and fidelity with which he discharged his duties as a man, a Christian, and a Professor in our State institution, are too well known to require a more extended notice in this place. They will no doubt be presented to the public by other hands.

It is with the profound regret and sorrow, says the Carolinian, that we record the sudden demise of the Rev. Robert Henry, D. D. He expired at his residence in this city, yesterday afternoon, of congestive chill, of which he was seized the day previous.

For many long years Dr. Henry had been a distinguished professor in the South Carolina College. He was a profound scholar and filled the professorial chair of Greek Literature with great honor and ability and to the great benefit of the College. In his private relations he was meek and unobtrusive; greatly admired and beloved by all who were so fortunate as to be intimately associated with him. He has gone down to the grave amid the deep regrets of his late pupils, and of the entire community.

THE CAROLINA CULTIVATOR.

We are in receipt of the February number. This is another Southern Agricultural periodical which should be sustained by southern farmers. The present number contains much valuable information, some of which we will transfer to our columns. It is published by W. D. Cooke, Raleigh N. C. at \$1 a year.

A SPELL OF SUNSHINE.

The intense cold weather of last week, is succeeded by a pleasant spell. We now have clear, bracing weather; neither too cold or too warm. We hope it will continue so, for wood in this burg is as scarce as gold dust.

THE SOUTHERN CULTIVATOR.

The February number has come to hand. We give some extracts from it in our present number. Our agricultural friends are advised to take this journal; the price is only \$1.00 a year, which is amply repaid by the information it contains. It is published in Augusta Ga. by W. S. Jones.

Communications.

[For the Ledger.]

MR. EDITOR: In the Ledger of the 30th ult., you express a desire to hear from "our Senator and Representatives," in reference to the propriety of South Carolina being represented in the National Democratic Convention, to be held at Cincinnati.

I have no motive, whatever, to conceal my opinions. If it will gratify you, or any portion of my constituents, I will willingly define my position upon the question. I am then, utterly opposed to South Carolina's sending Delegates to the Cincinnati Convention. And as it has become so fashionable, in the discussion of this question, to quote men with high sounding titles, either in favor or against the move, I wish it distinctly understood, in the outset, that I am not opposed to it because this or that Editor—this or that Judge or General, is in favor of it; nor have I been influenced in making up my opinion by the mere fact, that this or that illustrious personage has opposed, or does now oppose it.

I have been opposed to this National Convention system from its very inception. An experience of fifteen years has gained it no favor with me. Notwithstanding I may be met with the remark, that it has given us a prok and a Pierce—both good and true men. Granted, and let me add, in reference to the latter, that he is, in my humble judgment, the most reliable President we have had since the "Father of our country" vacated the Presidential Chair. This, however, is no argument, in my opinion, in favor of this National Convention system, for these gentlemen received their nomination at this great political gambling shop more by accident, than otherwise; and more particularly was this the case with the nomination of Mr. Pierce. The Convention that nominated Mr. Pierce, balloted time after time, without success, for other gentlemen, perhaps not one time thinking of Mr. Pierce's name. When, this lucky thought occurred to the Convention, that each delegation should retire, and nominate, each, their man. This being done, were it not for the truth of the saying, that there is many a slip between the cup and the lip, Mr. Keitt's "Jupiter of the Senate"—our own Judge Butler—would have been the nominee of that Convention, and, of course, our present Chief Magistrate. The Georgia delegation was a little too slow, however. When they arrived at the door with the name of our good Senator, some other delegation was proposing the name of Mr. Pierce. The Georgia delegation guessed the nomination was a good one, and not wishing to disturb the then lucky shuffling of the cards, withdrew the name of Judge Butler, and Mr. Pierce was nominated. They guessed right that time, but who believes they would guess so well again? We do not wish to be very personal, but we do fear, that something of this sort, has nationalized our good Senator a little too much. He certainly has left, a little at least, of his well-remembered moorings. As to the cause, he is better informed than myself. This is a digression. Let me return.

I repeat, then, that the nomination of Messrs. Polk and Pierce was accidental, and that these National-Political Conventions, gotten up as they are, are criminal usurpations—they usurp the constitutional rights of the honest and unsuspecting people of the country. No, no, I presume, will have the hardihood to deny, that the Constitution of the United States, in the spirit of its provisions, contemplates that the election of President and Vice President, should be by the several States. And surely, Mr. Editor, no one, when he remembers that these Conventions are composed of delegates, who are the representatives of mere fragments of parties, in many States, will contend for a moment that they conduce, in the least, to carry out the spirit of that sacred instrument; but on the other hand, all except those whose judgments are warped by the shackles of party, must admit that the tendency of these Conventions is to defeat the aims of the Constitution in this particular.

To illustrate what I mean, when I say these Conventions are composed of the representatives of mere fragments of parties in many States, let me take the Cincinnati Convention as an example. By a rule, I believe, adopted by the Democratic party, each State is entitled to send to this Convention, as many delegates as it has members on joint ballot in Congress. Massachusetts, where Whiggery and Black Republicanism reigns supremely, sends scarcely a corporal's guard of reliable democrats can be found, will be entitled, according to this rule, to thirteen delegates in the Cincinnati Convention. New York, where the Democratic party is divided into Barn Burners, Hard Shells, Soft Shells, and probably as many other factions, is entitled to thirty-five delegates—the representatives of fragments of parties, South Carolina is almost entirely Democratic; but if she sends delegates to the Cincinnati Convention, only a fragment of the State will be represented; for a large number of the people of the State are opposed to, or indifferent about, sending delegates to that Convention. We trust that what we have said, will sufficiently illustrate our meaning on this point. But, says one, these Conventions do not elect—they only nominate, and the people can reject the nomination, if it does not suit them. It is true, that these Conventions only nominate, but the spell of party and the love of office is all-powerful, that the fragments are united thereby, and a nomination by the dominant party is almost equivalent to an election.—This National Convention system, therefore, is, as I have before remarked, a criminal

usurpation of the constitutional rights of the people. Hence my strongest opposition to it.

Apart from my objections to this national convention system, as violative of the spirit of the constitution of the United States, I have other reasons for being opposed to South Carolina's sending delegates to the Cincinnati Convention. She has always stood aloof from these Conventions, and I would like to see her preserve her consistency, unless by departing from the old path, she could be instrumental in doing some service to the cause of the south, or in securing to us a constitutional Union.—I know that Col. Orr, possibly to keep peace, though backwards, with Maj. B. F. Perry, the very embodiment of arrogance, egotism, and the very lowest unionism; as well as from a furious ambition for a higher seat or 'mission, has labored very hard to convince the people of the State, that South Carolina could do much for the cause of the Union and the South, in the Cincinnati Convention. I must confess however, that notwithstanding the plausibility of his arguments I have not been able to comprehend their force, if forcible they are.

Col. Orr contends that it is all important to the safety of the Union and the well being of the south, that Mr. Pierce should receive the nomination at the Cincinnati Convention. I would rejoice to see President Pierce re-elected to the Presidency, and I am more than willing to see South Carolina do anything, consistent with her honor, that lies in her power to do, to promote his re-election. I do not believe however, that Mr. Pierce's chances for re-election would be strengthened by South Carolina sending delegates to the Cincinnati Convention. I may be deceived, but I have not the remotest idea that if South Carolina had 20 votes instead of 8, she could secure the nomination of Mr. Pierce by that Convention. If all the States are fully represented, there will be 296 delegates, 176 from the North and only 120 from the South in the Cincinnati Convention. When I look at these figures, and remember that Mr. Pierce is an honest and honorable man—a man who has proved himself a defender of the constitution of the country, and when I consider that the great majority of the Northern people are hostile to the constitution, or that part of it at least that guarantees the rights of the South, I say, when I remember these things, who can, for a moment suppose, without a great change at the North, that it is at all probable, that Mr. Pierce will receive the nomination at Cincinnati.

Had the North known President Pierce as they now know him—had they have known him to be a man who would discharge the duties of the office of President, to the best of his abilities, and would preserve, protect and defend the constitution of the United States as he has sworn to do; I say if the North had known these things, four years ago, Mr. Pierce would not have been President of these United States. Now he has proved himself to be an honest and honorable man, the North has repudiated him.

Col. Orr tells us again, in effect, that we should not refuse to meet in Cincinnati, our Southern sister States, together with the conservative men of the North—to enable us to save a constitutional Union, and if this cannot be done, he tells us it will enable us to save ourselves and our Institutions. Now since the recent developments in Congress, I would like for Col. Orr to tell us who the conservative men of the North are. It appears from the developments in Congress, that the men at the North whom I have looked upon as good, and true men, are really no better than the slaves for their support of the Nebraska Kansas measure, they go home and tell their constituents that it is the best Free Soil measure ever passed by Congress.

If this be true, if they did the South justice in supporting this measure, they did not intend it, therefore deserve no credit for it. What will South Carolina or the South gain, by going into a Convention with such men? By South Carolina going into that Convention with her "Southern sister States" will it enable us, as Col. Orr would have us believe, to save ourselves and our Institutions? Such a proposition is perfectly preposterous—a monstrous proposition—and Col. Orr, either did not consider what he was saying, or did not believe it true. I am aware, Mr. Editor, that this is upon talk, but Col. Orr and several others in South Carolina ought to be plainly dealt with.—Cincinnati, Ohio, there is one of the last places on earth that I would select at which to meet, to consult about "Southern affairs." As I have said before, I would rejoice to see President Pierce re-elected, and I would sacrifice much to secure his re-election.—But I do not believe that President Pierce, or any other President, can arrest the progress of Northern fanaticism—it is a politico religious fanaticism, and I apprehend that nothing short of the sharp steel and heavy balls will arrest it. At all events the South must look to itself for safety.

I have not the vanity, Mr. Editor, to believe that what I have said, or may say, will influence our District or State to any course. But I will venture to suggest, as the South is almost unanimous in favor of the re-election of President Pierce, and as the North generally are opposed to it, that the surest plan to secure his nomination or election, is to call a Convention of the Southern States for that purpose, then let the conservative men of the North come forward and assist the South in his re-election. Let them show their faith by their works.

To sum up our views then Mr. Editor, upon this question; I am opposed to sending delegates to Cincinnati; because I look upon this National Convention a stem as a usurpation of the rights of the people, and, furthermore, because South Carolina has always stood aloof from these Conventions, and I would like to see her preserve her consistency; in the last place, because I cannot conceive of any possible good she can effect thereby.

W. C. CAUTHEN.