

1  
Staunton, Va.  
22<sup>nd</sup> March 95

Gov Elias Carr  
Raleigh, N.C.

Dear Governor,

Your favor of 19<sup>th</sup> inst  
forwarded me from Hillsboro, just  
received. I am sorry to find that  
you propose to treat the private  
stockholders in the U.C.R.R. in no  
better way than was proposed in the  
bill in the bill which you say should  
have been "titled a bill to destroy  
the State's property," especially when  
the defeat of that bill was effected  
chiefly by the opposition to the tax  
surrender feature, and which oppo-  
sition was so strong, that the  
friends of the bill agreed to strike  
that feature out rather than ~~lose~~



W

the shoils feature of getting possession of the property, out out of your hands. This phase of the situation became alarming, as we knew the Unionists were fond of shoils, & therefore feared that the bill might be rushed through as amended. But even this was prevented, by those who opposed it on account of the tax surrender feature. This obligation, together with common fairness, I should think would suggest to you a truce between us on this question. And accordingly, I have so expressed my faith in you to some of the private stockholders. Further than this, ~~and~~ I repeat, what I said in my last letter, that the position of the private stockholders in resting upon their Constitutional rights, was the only safe guard



the State had to prevent the plunder of her property in this Road by the Party in power. Another road, our position takes the Road out of politics: and gives the State a good income on her stock.

You say you "fail to see the logic of my argument" that the sentiment of the people of the State is with us, as indicated by the action of the two <sup>lost</sup> Legislatures. If the action of one Legislature dominated by Democrats, and another by Populists and Republicans, is not more the exponent of the sentiment of the people, than the individual opinion of any Governor, then I can cite further, the fact that our position stood the test ~~through~~ in the Legislature, in the days of the Whigs and ante bellum Democrats — through



4  
War Times — through Republican  
Reconstruction — and through  
latter day Democracy. During  
all of which time no Governor  
even assailed it, though I have  
heard that Governor Jarrvis  
thought some little political  
capital could be made by  
doing so. But this is merely  
heresay. At any rate, he did not.  
And when it has been assailed in  
the Courts of the State, they have  
sustained us every time, through  
all these years.

But, Governor, take your own  
dictum, in which I agree with  
you, <sup>in the main</sup> that "If there is one sen-  
timent more prominent with  
the people of N.C. than another,  
it is, that the burdens of taxation  
should be equally distributed,  
and that no species of property



Land that devoted to religious  
 and Educational institutions  
 shall knowingly escape taxation.  
 However, I further except State  
 property, such as the Capital,  
 the Penitentiary, the Asylum,  
 & the State's Stock in this, and other  
 corporations. I say, taking your  
 own view of the case, and you will  
 find that you are not distributing  
the tax equally. For the Road goes through  
 only 12 counties in the State, that would  
 be the beneficiaries of the tax: whereas  
 the dividends on the State's Stock comes  
 to the benefit of every one of the  
 96 counties in the State. And your  
 plan might work a further injustice  
 to the 84 counties, that get none of  
 the benefit of the tax, but that build  
 it with their credit, and own it,  
 as much as the 12 through which it  
 passes — they may be called upon



6

to pay their respective shares  
of a special levy, to provide for  
any deficit in the Treasury, that may  
occur by placing 223 miles of  
road on the tax list as a valuation  
of \$10,000<sup>00</sup> (which is the amount fixed  
by R.R. Commission on connecting  
lines) which was not contemplated  
when the lease contract was ~~fixed~~  
~~upon~~ made by the State, and figured  
upon <sup>upon</sup> the basis of a 6% dividend.  
For, unless the State Treasurer gets \$180,000  
in dividends, under the terms of  
the Graysey suit, he must issue this  
levy, unless the State has other funds  
at his command, or else the  
Suit can be reopened, & the  
road put ~~back~~ in the hands  
of a Receiver. These are the  
alternatives we are confronted  
with under your plan, to say  
nothing of broken faith with



the State's partners in the Road,  
before her own contracts expire.

These views cannot be contro-  
verted when you consider that, when  
taxes are paid, three fourths  
go into the Treasuries of the  
Counties and Towns along the  
line of the Road, and one fourth  
only reaches the Treasury of  
the State. And this in connection  
with the fact that the State  
owns three fourths of the Road  
and the private stockholders  
one fourth, you will see that  
for every dollar that the private  
stockholder pays the ~~the~~ State  
(which is 96 Counties) he must pay  
to 12 Counties, & the Towns in them,  
three dollars. And for every  
dollar that the private stock  
holder pays, the State (96 Counties)  
must pay three. So that it is



Not simply taking one dollar  
 out of the States Treasury  
 (96 Counties) and putting it back  
 again. But it is taking out  
 nine dollars (which these 96  
 Counties would get in the form  
 of a dividend instead of in the  
 form of tax) and putting only  
 one dollar back in the form  
 of tax, while the remaining  
 eight dollars go to 12 Counties,  
 and their towns, in the form  
 of tax. And it is not simply town,  
 County & State tax; but levies for  
 new Court houses, water works,  
 Electric plants, sewerage, street  
 improvements, and here in  
 my County three different  
 railroads of about \$100,000 each  
 in direct competition with  
 the State road. So what can  
 be the justification of this? and



what has become of your cardinal-  
mal idea, as applied to this case  
in its workings, that "the burthens  
of taxation shall be equally  
distributed." I can't imagine  
a more unequal distribution.

Besides this, a person of  
blessed memory to me, ~~was~~ used  
to say, "When chartered  
rights are ignored in North  
Carolina, he did not wish to  
remain in it". He was spared  
this humiliation; as also the  
disgrace to the State by the Fred Douglas  
Legislature. In honor of his memory,  
I shall appeal to the Supreme  
Court of the U.S. to deliver the  
State, as well as the private  
Stock holders, from the wrong  
that this stigma would be.

In common with many  
of your friends, I trust you



10  
will put us to no further  
trouble and expense; but let  
the matter drop. And before our  
Legislature meets, I hope you  
will have made a new lease  
to the Southern Railroad Co, on  
favorable terms to the State & to  
the private stock holders, &  
which will be a lasting credit  
to your administration.

Very Sincerely

B. Cameron



Return to

Box 87

STAGVILLE, Durham Co., N. C.,  
If not delivered within 10 days.



Gov Chas Conn

Raleigh N.C.



1770. 6