

GA

THE REPUBLICAN SCRAP BOOK;

CONTAINING

THE PLATFORMS, AND A CHOICE SELECTION OF EXTRACTS, SETTING FORTH
THE REAL QUESTIONS IN ISSUE, THE OPINIONS OF THE CANDIDATES, THE
NATURE AND DESIGNS OF THE SLAVE OLIGARCHY, AS SHOWN BY THEIR
OWN WRITERS, AND THE OPINIONS OF CLAY, WEBSTER, JOSIAH
QUINCY, AND OTHER PATRIOTS, ON SLAVERY AND ITS
EXTENSION.

“ But fool is he the yoke that flings
O'er the unshackled soul of man.
'Tis like a cobweb on his breast,
That binds the giant while asleep;
Or curtain hung upon the East,
The daylight from the world to keep.”— HOGG.

BOSTON:
JOHN P. JEWETT & CO.
1856.

THE
REPUBLICAN SCRAP-BOOK.

INDEX.

THE PLATFORMS, AND A CHOICE SELECTION OF EXTRACTS RELATING TO THE
THREE PARTIES, 3—16

EXTRACTS SHOWING WHAT ARE THE REAL QUESTIONS IN ISSUE, 16—45

EXTRACTS FROM MR. QUINCY, 45—51

EXTRACTS FROM SOUTHERN STATESMEN AND WRITERS, EXHIBITING THE PRIN-
CIPLES OF THE SLAVE OLIGARCHY, 51—58

EXTRACTS FROM HENRY CLAY, SHOWING HIS HOSTILITY TO SLAVERY EXTENSION, 59—60

EXTRACTS FROM DANIEL WEBSTER, SHOWING THE SAME, 60—67

THE KANSAS LAWS ANALYZED, 67—74

DOCUMENTS RELATIVE TO THE BROOKS OUTRAGE, INCLUDING BROOKS'S RECENT
SPEECH AT COLUMBIA, S. C., 74—80

This pamphlet may be obtained by the quantity, for distribution, at the rate of 12½ cents apiece
Orders to be sent to the publishers.

REPUBLICAN SCRAP-BOOK.

This pamphlet has been prepared with a view to preserving in a convenient form and *keeping before the people* certain facts and views that are of the utmost importance in the present canvass. The Platforms of the three parties are given, the nature and designs of the slave oligarchy in their endeavor to elect Buchanan and to divide the North, are shown forth by extracts from their own writers. In opposition to the nefarious doctrines of the plotters for slavery extension, that now control the Democratic party, the views are here presented of our greatest statesmen, Washington, Jefferson, Webster, Clay, Quincy, and others. Nothing can be more instructive than the contrast thus exhibited. The reader's attention is particularly called to those extracts which show the anti-republican and oligarchic character of the slaveholding class, and the debasing effect on the laborer of that slave system which the Democratic party would extend into all our Territories.

Editors of Fremont papers are especially desired to examine the extracts here presented. Many of them, it is believed, will bear republication, and a more general diffusion than they have yet had.

From the N. Y. Evening Post for Sept. 5.

The Use to be made of Mr. Fillmore.

The friends of Mr. Fillmore now rest what little hope is left them upon the House of Representatives. There is no well-informed man among them who does not fully understand that there is no chance of his election by the people. The policy now agreed upon by the more knowing ones among them seems to be simply this: to use his nomination as part of the machinery for preventing Colonel Fremont from obtaining a majority of the electoral votes. If they should succeed in this, they

count very confidently upon preventing his election by the House of Representatives.

In a long article which appears in the *Washington Daily American Organ* of yesterday, the plan is stated very broadly, and in such a manner as to commend it to the favor of those who support the Cincinnati platform and its candidates. In substance it amounts to this — that the Buchaniers and the Know-Nothings are to act together in such a manner as to prevent the choice of Fremont by the electoral colleges, and having brought the election by this means into the House of Representatives, are to unite upon Mr. Breckinridge as Vice-President, leaving the Presidency vacant. The executive chair would then be filled by the Vice President, who would be expected, as a matter of course, to be suitably grateful to auxiliaries from the Know Nothing party by whose aid he was made the acting Chief Magistrate. The plan is thus stated by the *American Organ*. We preserve the italics of the original:

"It is, we think, perfectly evident, that if there be no election by the people, through the electoral colleges, Mr. Breckinridge would be chosen Vice-President by the Senate, and in the event of a failure by the House of Representatives to elect a President, he would become the *President* — a lesser calamity, in our judgment, than the election of Buchanan. The *Richmond Enquirer* may 'make the most' of this opinion.

"We suppose we may safely assume, that with all classes in the South, the election of Breckinridge as Vice President, and his accession to the Presidency, would be greatly preferred to the election of Buchanan as President. It being certain that the Democratic Senate would elect Breckinridge as Vice Pres-

ident, and that, if no election were made by the House, *he* would become the President, by virtue of his election as Vice President, it follows that *no Southern or conservative man can reasonably object to having the election thrown into Congress.* The failure of an election by the people, under this state of the case, brings no increased danger to the South, or to any portion of the country; *for*, the House would either elect Fillmore as President, *or*, there being no election by the House, Breckinridge would become the President.

* * * * *

“Mr. Breckinridge is an honorable opponent—a high-minded and patriotic gentleman—a man of mind, of talents, and of integrity—he is young, too, with a *future* before him—he is without trainers and dependants—he could form his *own* associations—in *all* this there is *hope*.”

* * * * *

“We are not afraid of the House of Representatives—we believe that Mr. Fillmore would be *certainly* elected by that body—but if not, we should have some consolation under our temporary defeat, in the considerations we have mentioned.

“The advocates of Buchanan in the South have sought to infuse a horror into the public mind at the bare idea of the election being thrown into the House, assuming that the election of Fremont *might* result from it. We have heretofore shown that Fremont’s election by the House is *impossible*. Every man who understands the condition of parties in the House, and who knows that each State has but *one vote* in the election of President by the House, *knows* that the idea of Fremont’s election by that body is simply ridiculous. The advocates of Buchanan, however, dread the House of Representatives—they *know* that *he* cannot be elected there—they *know* that the Fillmore States hold the balance of power, and that they could give the Republicans their *choice*, to *permit Breckinridge to become the President, or to elect Fillmore to that position!* The argument, then, which has been used at the South, in favor of a union upon Buchanan, to keep the election out of the House, is deceptions and Jesuitical.”

“It is *more*,—it is dangerous in the extreme; for if by such arguments the South should be induced to unite upon Buchanan, the country would be at once arrayed in a sectional contest,—*purely so*; and were such a contest to be tendered by the South to the North, and accepted by them, the result would be the triumph of a Northern sectional party. But the

pretended danger, if the election were thrown into the House, is a transparent bugbear—a phantom which would not frighten half-grown children. We *hope* that Fillmore may be elected by the electoral colleges, but if not, we shall not ‘despair of the republic’ if the election devolves upon the House. *Far from it!*”

It is well said, that none of us know

“To what base uses we may come at last.”

Mr. Fillmore, good, easy man, in the innocence of his heart, supposes that he is nominated to be elected. No such thing; he is only nominated to divide the North, to draw off votes from Fremont, to help make John C. Breckinridge Vice President. The declarations with which the development of this plan is sweetened, that Mr. Fillmore will “*certainly*” be elected by the House, if by proper manoeuvres a choice by the people can be prevented, amount to nothing. The American party is feeble in the House of Representatives and the Buchanan party strong, and the compact and well-drilled body who support the administration will not come over to the few and somewhat vacillating and irresolute members calling themselves Americans, and give them all they ask by making Mr. Fillmore President. It is absurd to suppose them willing to make a losing bargain like this, when the *American Organ* assures them in the same breath that it is willing to give them an infinitely better one in conferring the Chief Magistracy on one of their candidates—Breckinridge. The election of Fillmore by the House is, therefore, an impossibility.

Mr. Fillmore must be exceedingly flattered when he discovers the object for which he is set up. The *American Organ*, it will be seen, acknowledges that, if he were to retire from the field, the triumph of the Republican candidate would be certain. “If,” says the *Organ*, “the South should be induced to unite upon Buchanan, the country would be at once arrayed in a sectional contest,—*purely so*; and in such a contest, tendered by the South to the North, and accepted by them, the result will be the triumph of a Northern sectional party.” This is to say, Buchanan would be beaten in any fair computation upon the ground which he and his followers have taken, the extension of slavery. Make that the point in dispute—as it really is—withdraw all topics got up for the purpose of distracting the attention of the people,—extinguish all false lights, and the *Organ* acknowledges that the people would give their voice for Fremont.

We do not know what Buchanan may say

to this scheme of setting him aside, but one thing, at least, is clear, that if his friends do not enter into some understanding with the Fillmore members of the House, Breckinridge cannot be elected. They will have only to promise that the words of the *Organ* shall be duly fulfilled, that Breckinridge shall "form his own associations," this is to say, reward in some manner those who vote for him. Perhaps, while the negotiation is in progress, means may be found to persuade these pliant members to go a step further and vote for Mr. Buchanan as President. We do not think that Mr. Buchanan would be particularly impracticable in an arrangement like this. He is not at all nice in his associations, as he has fully proved, and would as readily lie in the same truckle-bed with a Know Nothing as with a Democrat, provided there were any personal advantage to be derived from it. It would be quite as easy, we fancy, to make the arrangement, to which the *Organ* alludes, with him as with his Kentucky associate on the ticket.

Mr. Fillmore may now see, if he will open his eyes, the fate which is reserved for him.— He is put up to be beaten, to amuse the North while the South is accomplishing its ends, and then to be laid aside with the old lumber of parties—with John Tyler and Franklin Pierce, for neither of whom is there any further occasion. His pretended friends no longer think of him as the probable President; the eyes of those who manage the American party at Washington are turned to the prospect of a coalition with the administration party, by which Breckinridge, under the name of Vice President, can be placed in the Executive chair.

It is becoming more evident every day that *Fillmore has no chance*. See what the old Whigs think of it.

From the N. Y. Evening Post, Aug. 1st.

One of the most extraordinary phenomena of the present political contest is *the alacrity with which a certain class of Whigs, including some of the most bigoted of their party, enrol themselves in the ranks of Buchanan's supporters*. The *Savannah Georgian*, in an exulting article, thus enumerates one of the most remarkable of these instances:

"In Maine, we point to Evans, unquestionably the ablest statesman that commonwealth has ever sent to the councils of the Republic. In Massachusetts, who is there that can be compared as an orator and advocate with Rufus Choate? In all New England he stands

without a peer—without a rival. Several months since, he proclaimed that he marched with no party that did not 'carry the flag and keep step to the music of the Union.' Always a Whig—at one time a Whig Senator in Congress—he is now advocating the election of Buchanan.

"Coming further South, the eye rests on such men as Randall and Reed, of Pennsylvania; Clayton, of Delaware; Pearce, Pratt and Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland; Burwell, of Virginia; Clingman, of North Carolina; Preston, ex-Senator Dixon and James Clay, of Kentucky; Senator Geyer, Caruthers, and Oliver, of Missouri; Senator Jones and Watkins, of Tennessee; Jenkins, of Georgia; Percy Walker and Judge Ormond, of Alabama; and Senator Benjamin, of Louisiana. How puny seem the arguments of our opponents against Democracy, when opposed to the acts of such men as these. We venture to say that never in the history of parties in America before, was seen the spectacle of so many men (those mentioned are but specimens) going by common impulse to the support of the candidate of a party, to which, for a life-time, they had stood opposed."

What Mr. Choate says.

"While I entertain a high appreciation of the character and ability of Mr. Fillmore, I do not sympathize in any degree with the objects and creed of the particular party that nominated him, and do not approve of their organization and their tactics. Practically, too, the contest in my judgment is between Mr. Buchanan and Col. Fremont. In these circumstances I shall vote for Mr. Buchanan."

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

Platform of the National Democratic Convention, 1856.

Resolved, That we regard the American Democracy place their trust in the intelligence, the patriotism and the discriminating justice of the American people.

Resolved, That we regard this as a distinctive feature of our political creed, which we are proud to maintain before the world as the great moral element in a form of government springing from and upheld by the popular will; and we contrast it with the creed and practice of federalism, under whatever name or form, which seeks to palsy the will of the constituent, and which conceives no imposture too monstrous for the popular credulity.

Resolved, therefore, That entertaining these views, the Democratic party of this Union, through their delegates assembled in a general convention, coming together in a spirit of concord, of devotion to the doctrines and faith of a free represented government, and appealing to their fellow citizens for the rectitude of their intentions, renew and re-assert before the American people, the declarations of principles avowed by them when, on former occasions, in general convention, they have presented their candidates for the popular suffrages.

1. That the federal government is one of limited power, derived solely from the Constitution; and the grants of powers made therein ought to be strictly construed by all the departments and agents of the government; and that it is inexpedient and dangerous to exercise doubtful constitutional powers.

2. That the Constitution does not confer upon the general government the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvements.

3. That the Constitution does not confer authority upon the federal government, directly or indirectly, to assume the debts of the several States, contracted for local and internal improvements, or any other State purposes; nor would such assumption be just or expedient.

4. That justice and sound policy forbid the federal government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of any other, or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country; that every citizen and every section of the country have a right to demand and insist upon an equality of rights and privileges, and to complete and ample protection of persons and property from domestic violence or foreign aggression.

5. That it is the duty of every branch of the government to enforce and practise the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the government, and for the gradual but certain extinction of the public debt.

6. That the proceeds of the public lands ought to be sacredly applied to the national objects specified in the Constitution; and that we are opposed to any law for the distribution of such proceeds among the States, as alike inexpedient in policy and repugnant to the Constitution.

7. That Congress has no power to charter a national bank; that we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the best in-

terests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated moneyed power, and above the laws and the will of the people; and that the results of Democratic legislation in this and all other financial measures upon which issues have been made between the two political parties of the country, have demonstrated to candid and practical men of all parties, their soundness, safety and utility, in all business pursuits.

8. That the separation of the moneys of the government from banking institutions is indispensable for the safety of the funds of the government and the rights of the people.

9. That we are decidedly opposed to taking from the President the qualified veto power, by which he is enabled, under restrictions and responsibilities amply sufficient to guard the public interests, to suspend the passage of a bill whose merits cannot secure the approval of two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, until the judgment of the people can be obtained thereon, and which has saved the American people from the corrupt and tyrannical domination of the Bank of the United States, and from a corrupting system of general internal improvements.

10. That the liberal principles embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, and sanctioned in the Constitution, which makes ours the land of liberty, and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the Democratic faith, and every attempt to abridge the privilege of becoming citizens and the owners of soil among us, ought to be resisted with the same spirit which swept the alien and sedition laws from our statute books.

¶ And *whereas*, Since the foregoing declaration was uniformly adopted by our predecessors in national conventions, an adverse political and religious test has been secretly organized by a party claiming to be exclusively American, it is proper that the American Democracy should clearly define its relations thereto, and declare its determined opposition to all secret political societies, by whatever name they may be called.

Resolved, That the foundation of this union of States having been laid in, and its prosperity expansion and pre-eminent example in free government, built upon entire freedom in matters of religious concernment, and no respect of person in regard to rank or place of birth; no party can justly be deemed national, constitutional, or in accordance with American

principles, which bases its exclusive organization upon religious opinions, and accidental birthplace. And hence a political crusade in the nineteenth century, and in the United States of America, against Catholics and foreign-born, is neither justified by the past history or the future prospects of the country, nor in unison with the spirit of toleration and enlarged freedom which peculiarly distinguishes the American system of popular government.

Resolved, That we reiterate with renewed energy of purpose the well considered declarations of former conventions upon the sectional issue of domestic slavery, and concerning the reserved rights of the States—

1. That Congress has no power, under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the abolitionists or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people, and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.

2. That the foregoing proposition covers, and was intended to embrace the whole subject of slavery agitation in Congress; and, therefore, the Democratic party of the Union, standing on this national platform, will abide by and adhere to a faithful execution of the acts known as the compromise measures, settled by the Congress of 1850; "the act of reclaiming fugitives from service or labor," included; which act being designed to carry out an express provision of the Constitution, cannot with fidelity thereto, be repealed, or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency.

3. That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made.

4. That the Democratic party will faithfully abide by and uphold the principles laid down in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798, and in the report of Mr. Madison to the Virginia Legislature in 1799; that it adopts those principles as constituting one of the main foundations of its political creed, and is resolved to carry them out in their obvious meaning and import.

And that we may more distinctly meet the issue on which a sectional party, subsisting exclusively on slavery agitation, now relies to test the fidelity of the people, North and South, to the Constitution and the Union—

Resolved, That claiming fellowship with, and desiring the co-operation of all who regard the preservation of the Union under the Constitution as the paramount issue—and repudiating all sectional parties and platforms concerning domestic slavery which seek to embroil the States and incite to treason and armed resistance to law in the Territories; and whose avowed purposes, if consummated, must end in civil war and disunion—the American Democracy recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the "slavery question," upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose in its determined conservatism of the Union—
NON-INTERFERENCE BY CONGRESS WITH SLAVERY IN STATE AND TERRITORY, OR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

2. That this was the basis of the compromises of 1850—confirmed by both the Democratic and Whig parties in national conventions—ratified by the people in the election of 1852—and rightly applied to the organization of Territories in 1854.

3. That by the uniform application of this Democratic principle to the organization of Territories, and the admission of new States, with or without domestic slavery, as they may elect—the equal rights of all the States will be preserved intact—the original compacts of the Constitution maintained inviolate—and the perpetuity and expansion of this Union insured to its utmost capacity of embracing in peace and harmony every future American State that may be constituted or annexed, with a republican form of government.

Resolved, That we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution with or without domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States.

Resolved, finally, That in view of the condition of popular institutions in the Old World, (and the dangerous tendencies of sectional agitation, combined with the attempt to enforce civil and religious disabilities against the rights of acquiring and enjoying citizenship, in our

own land) a high and sacred duty is devolved, with increased responsibility, upon the Democratic party of this country, as the party of the Union, to uphold and maintain the rights of every State, and thereby the Union of the States; and to sustain and advance among us constitutional liberty, by continuing to resist all monopolies and exclusive legislation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and by a vigilant and constant adherence to those principles and compromises of the Constitution, which are broad enough and strong enough to embrace and uphold the Union as it was, the Union as it is, and the Union as it shall be, in the full expansion of the energies and capacity of this great and progressive people.

[All of the above was adopted unanimously by the Convention.]

1. *Resolved*, That there are questions connected with the foreign policy of this country, which are inferior to no domestic question whatever. The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world, and by solemn manifestations to place their moral influence at the side of their successful example.

[Adopted, 234 to 26. Georgia, Maryland, Delaware and North Carolina voted no.]

2. *Resolved*, That our geographical and political position with reference to the other States of this continent, no less than the interests of our commerce and the development of our growing power, requires that we should hold as sacred the principles involved in the *Monroe doctrine*; their bearing and import admit of no misconstruction; they should be applied with unbending rigidity.

[Adopted, 239 to 23.]

3. *Resolved*, That the great highway which nature, as well as the assent of the States most immediately interested in its maintenance, has marked out for a free communication between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, constitutes one of the most important achievements realized by the spirit of modern times and the unconquerable energy of our people. That result should be secured by a timely and efficient exertion of the control which we have the right to claim over it, and no power on earth should be suffered to impede or clog its progress by any interference with the relations it may suit our policy to establish between our government and the governments of the States within whose dominions it lies. We can, under no circumstances, surrender our preponderance in the adjustment of all questions arising out of it.

[Adopted, 199 to 56. Maine 1, Connecticut 2, Virginia, Maryland and Rhode Island formed the principal nays.]

4. That in view of so commanding an interest, the people of the United States cannot but sympathize with the efforts which are being made by the people of Central America to regenerate that portion of the continent which covers the passage across the inter-oceanic isthmus.

[Adopted, 221 to 38. Rhode Island, Delaware, Maryland, South Carolina and Kentucky voted nay.]

5. *Resolved*, That the Democratic party will expect of the next administration that every proper effort be made to insure our ascendancy in the Gulf of Mexico, and to maintain a permanent protection to the great outlets through which are emptied into its waters the products raised out of the soil, and the commodities created by the industry of the people of our Western valleys and of the Union at large.

[Adopted, 229 to 30—last nearly as on previous one.]

THE PACIFIC RAILROAD.

The following resolution was reported by the committee, as an appendage to, but not a part of the platform:

Resolved, That the Democratic party recognizes the great importance, in a political and commercial point of view, of a safe and speedy communication, by military and postal roads, through our own territory between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of this Union, and that it is the duty of the federal government to exercise promptly all its constitutional power for the attainment of that object.

A motion was made to lay this resolution on the table, and this was carried, yeas 138, nays 120. So the resolution in favor of a railroad to the Pacific was rejected.

Subsequently a resolution was introduced and passed, declaring it to be the duty of the general government, so far as the Constitution will permit, to aid in the construction of a safe overland route between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

Let the reader observe how cunningly the slavery resolutions are drawn up in the above platform so as to take away from Congress all power to forbid slavery in the Territories, or even in a new State, and also to deny to the people themselves of a Territory the right to forbid slavery there. Here every thing is conceded to the South. Observe how the infamous Kansas code is endorsed; how that pre-

posterous and novel view of the Monroe doctrine, held by the Democratic party, is asserted; how the filibuster Walker is taken by the hand; and how the Ostend manifesto is adopted into the party creed. *Are the American people ready for all this?*

PLATFORM WHICH, ACCORDING TO THE NEW YORK HERALD, OUGHT TO HAVE BEEN ADOPTED BY THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION.—1. *Resolved*, That niggers, pistols, bowie knives and bludgeons are the fundamental principles of the Democracy, as re-constructed under the administration of our warlike FRANKLIN PIERCE, by our dear friends, the Southern nigger-drivers.

2. *Resolved*, That the freedom of speech is liable to abuses even in the United States Senate, abuses which can only be corrected by the application of gutta percha to the naked head of the offending party as he sits in his chair; and that in thus beating an Abolition Senator we are righteously vindicating the true policy of the "unterrified Democracy."

3. *Resolved*, That the killing of a contemptible Irish waiter holding the position of a nigger, for neglect of duty or impudence to a Democratic guest coming down to a late breakfast, is a proper warning to the whole Irish race, that they cannot longer expect to ride rough shod over the Democracy of the Union.

4. *Resolved*, As the Constitution, as interpreted by our Southern teachers, the nigger-drivers, has already established African Slavery in all the Territories of the United States, that "Squatter Sovereignty" is a humbug, that General Cass is a humbug considerably behind the age, and that all Abolition or Free State Squatters should be expelled from Kansas, if necessary, by fire and sword, &c., &c.,

Extracts from Mr. Buchanan's Letter of Acceptance.

Wheatland, near Lancaster, }
June 16, 1856. }

Gentlemen,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 13th instant, informing me officially of my nomination by the Democratic National Convention recently held at Cincinnati, as the Democratic candidate for the office of President of the United States.

* * * * *

In accepting the nomination, I need scarcely say that I accept in the same spirit the res-

olutions constituting the platform of principles erected by the convention. To this platform I intend to confine myself throughout the canvass, believing that I have no right, as the candidate of the Democratic party, by answering interrogatories, to present new and different issues before the people.

* * * * *

The agitation on the question of domestic slavery has too long distracted and divided the people of this Union and alienated their affections from each other. This agitation has assumed many forms since its commencement, but it now seems to be directed chiefly to the Territories; and judging from its present character I think we may safely anticipate that it is rapidly approaching a "finality." The recent legislation of Congress respecting domestic slavery, derived, as it has been, from the original and pure fountain of legitimate political power, the will of the majority, promises ere long to allay the dangerous excitement. This legislation is founded upon principles as ancient as free government itself, and in accordance with them, has simply declared that the people of a Territory, like those of a State, shall decide for themselves, whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits.

The Nebraska-Kansas act does no more than give the force of law to this elementary principle of self-government; declaring it to be "the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." This principle will surely not be controverted by any individual of any party professing devotion to popular government. Besides, how vain and illusory would any other principle prove in practice in regard to the Territories! This is apparent from the fact admitted by all, that after a Territory shall have entered the Union and become a State, no constitutional power would then exist which could prevent it from either abolishing or establishing slavery, as the case may be, according to its sovereign will and pleasure.

Most happy would it be for the country if this long agitation were at an end. During its whole progress it has produced no practical good to any human being, whilst it has been the source of great and dangerous evils. It has alienated and estranged one portion of the Union from the other, and has even seriously threatened its very existence. To my own personal knowledge, it has produced the im-

pression among foreign nations that our great and glorious confederacy is in constant danger of dissolution. This does us serious injury, because acknowledged power and stability always command respect among nations, and are among the best securities against unjust aggression and in favor of the maintenance of honorable peace. * * * * *

From the N. Y. Evening Post.

Buchanan's very latest opinion on Kansas and Cuba.

The Buchanier presses at the North are in the habit of insinuating that Mr. Buchanan is conservative in his notions; that he does not really approve of the policy of the administration in Kansas; that he did not mean what he said in the Ostend circular, and that in his foreign policy, if elected, he would be entirely pacific.

The *Journal of Commerce* is in the habit of playing this tune among its commercial readers, and there are some who are charmed by it. We have always maintained that this was a delusion; that Buchanan is now what he always was; that he is led by the same desperate class of men as formerly, and that no more faith can be placed in his principles or his professions now, than when he told General Jackson of the bargain between Henry Clay and President Adams, in the existence of which he afterwards admitted he had no faith.

That he is the same man he always was; that he has pledged himself to the nationalization of slavery; that he still sticks to the high-wayman's plea set up at Ostend; and if elected, would esteem it among the contingent duties of his position to take Cuba by force, happily does not rest now upon presumption nor inference merely. He has stated his opinions upon both these points most explicitly, and evidently with the intent that they should be made public, to Senator Brown, of Mississippi, who has given an account of the interview to one of his constituents. Here is the letter. Will the *Journal of Commerce* please give its commercial readers an opportunity of reading it, and of becoming as enlightened about Mr. Buchanan's opinions as the Mississippian constituents of Mr. Senator Brown.

LETTER FROM HON. A. G. BROWN.

WASHINGTON CITY, June 18.

My dear Sir, — I congratulate you on the nomination of your favorite candidate for the Presidency.

If the nomination of Mr. Buchanan was

acceptable to me at first, it is still more so now, since I have seen him and heard him speak. The Committee, of which I was one, waited on him at his residence to give him formal and official notice of his nomination, and, in the name of the National Democracy, to request his acceptance of it. We found him open, frank, and wholly undisguised in the expression of his sentiments.

Mr. Buchanan said, in the presence of all who had assembled, — and they were from the North and the South, the East and the West, — that he stood upon the *Cincinnati platform*, and endorsed every part of it. He was explicit in his remarks on its slavery features, saying that the slavery issue was the absorbing element in the canvass. He recognized to its fullest extent the overshadowing importance of that issue; and, if elected, he would make it the great aim of his administration to settle the question upon such terms as should give peace and safety to the Union, and security to the South.

He spoke in terms of decided commendation of the Kansas bill, and as pointedly deprecated the unworthy efforts of sectional agitation to get up a national conflagration on that question. After the passage of the compromise measures of 1850, the Kansas bill was, he said, necessary to harmonize our legislation in reference to the Territories; and he expressed his surprise that there should appear anywhere an organized opposition to the Kansas bill, after the general acquiescence which the whole country had expressed in the measures of 1850.

After thus speaking of Kansas and the slavery issues, Mr. Buchanan passed to our foreign policy. He approved in general terms of the *Cincinnati resolutions* on this subject; but said, that, while enforcing our own policy, we must at all times scrupulously regard the just rights and proper policy of other nations. He was not opposed to territorial extension. All our acquisitions had been fairly and honorably made. Our necessities might require us to make other acquisitions. He regarded the acquisition of Cuba as very desirable now, and it was likely to become a national necessity. Whenever we could obtain the island on fair, honorable terms, he was for taking it. But he added, it would be a terrible necessity that would induce me to sanction any movement that would bring reproach upon us, or tarnish the honor and glory of our beloved country.

After the formal interview was over, Mr. Buchanan said playfully, but in the presence of the whole audience, "IF I CAN BE INSTRUMENTAL IN SETTLING THE

SLAVERY QUESTION UPON THE TERMS I HAVE NAMED, AND THEN ADD CUBA TO THE UNION, I SHALL IF PRESIDENT, BE WILLING TO GIVE UP THE GHOST, AND LET BRECKINRIDGE TAKE THE GOVERNMENT."

Could there be a more *noble ambition*? You may well be proud of your early choice of a candidate, and congratulate yourself that no adverse influences ever moved you an inch from your stern purpose of giving the great Pennsylvanian a steady, earnest, and cordial support. In my judgment HE IS AS WORTHY OF SOUTHERN CONFIDENCE AND SOUTHERN VOTES AS MR. CALHOUN EVER WAS; and in saying this I do not mean to intimate that Mr. Buchanan has any sectional prejudices in our favor. I only mean to say that he has none against us, and that we may rely with absolute certainty on receiving full justice, according to the Constitution, at his hands.

Knowing your long, laborious and faithful adherence to the fortunes of Mr. Buchanan, I have thought it proper to address you this letter, to give you assurance that you had not mistaken your man, nor failed in the performance of a sacred and filial duty to the South. In doing so I violate no confidence.

Very truly, your friend,

A. G. BROWN.

To Hon. S. R. ADAMS.

This statement of the views and purposes of Mr. Buchanan, gives new importance to the celebrated Ostend Manifesto, from which the following is an extract:

"After we shall have offered Spain a price for Cuba far beyond its present value, and this shall have been refused, it will then be time to consider the question, Does Cuba, in the possession of Spain, seriously endanger our internal peace and the existence of our cherished Union? Should this question be answered in the affirmative, then by every law, human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain if we possess the power."

Mr. Buchanan's Record.

The Richmond *Enquirer* thus endorses Buchanan:—

"In private as well as in public, Mr. Buchanan has always stood on the side of the South. The citizen and the statesman are one and the same individual. He supported the rights of the South when in office; he vindicated and maintained those rights when out of office. He not only voted for all measures of justice

to the South, but he endeavored to carry them into effect. His is not a dead record of votes, but a living record of acts, which vindicate the honesty of the votes. Thus, Mr. Buchanan exhorted the North to a faithful and cheerful fulfilment of the obligations of the fugitive slave law. He protested against the prohibition of the jails in Pennsylvania to federal officers for the confinement of captured slaves. He denounced the Wilmot Proviso. He approved the Clayton Compromise of 1847. And, to sum up in a single sentence, *he has at all times and in all places exerted the authority of his high character and great talents to uphold the Union, defend the Constitution, and protect the South.*

To recapitulate:—

1. In 1836, Mr. Buchanan supported a bill to prohibit the circulation of abolition papers through the mails.
 2. In the same year he proposed and voted for the admission of Arkansas.
 3. In 1836-7, he denounced, and voted to reject petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.
 4. In 1837, he voted for Mr. Calhoun's famous resolutions, defining the rights of the States and the limits of federal authority, and affirming it to be the duty of the government to protect and uphold the institutions of the South.
 5. In 1838-9 and '40, he invariably voted with Southern Senators against the consideration of anti-slavery petitions.
 6. In 1844-5 he advocated and voted for the annexation of Texas.
 7. In 1847 he sustained the Clayton Compromise.
 8. In 1850, he proposed and urged the extension of the Missouri Compromise to the Pacific Ocean.
 9. But he promptly acquiesced in the Compromise of 1850, and employed all his influence in favor of the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave Law.
 10. In 1851, he remonstrated against an enactment of the Pennsylvania Legislature for obstructing the arrest and return of fugitive slaves.
 11. In 1854, he negotiated for the acquisition of Cuba.
 12. In 1856, he approves the repeal of the Missouri restriction, and supports the principles of the Kansas-Nebraska Act.
 13. He never gave a vote against the interests of Slavery, and never uttered a word which could pain the most sensitive Southern heart.
- The prominent facts of Mr. Buchanan's record touching slavery are thus grouped into a

single view; so that a person of the least patience in research, may ascertain at a glance how the Democratic candidate stands in respect to the great issue of the canvass. In this succinct statement, we give not detached passages and isolated acts; but we bring the whole history of a long life to bear upon the popular mind with the irresistible force of truth. This rapid retrospect discloses a *consistency and efficiency of service to the South*, which flattery can claim for no other living man. Mr. Buchanan is not only vindicated from calumny; he is not simply shown to be exempt from just reproach and worthy of confidence; he is promoted to his proper position, *in advance of any and every statesman of the North, in the confidence and affection of the people of the South*. He demands not a mere recognition of his attachment to the Constitution, but *unbounded applause for such service in the interest of the South as no other man can boast*. Against the captious criticism of a desperate adversary, refining upon technical distinctions and skulking among quibbles, the Democracy oppose this incontestable attestation of their candidate's fidelity." And again.

"We challenge the *Whig* to cite a single instance of a clear and unequivocal struggle between North and South, in which Mr. Buchanan did not espouse the interests of the South."

But after all his subserviency, Buchanan is not likely to be elected, if we may believe that rank pro-slavery sheet, the *St. Louis Intelligencer*, which says:

"Buchanan has scarcely the shadow of a prospect of beating Fremont. *He cannot do it*. Buchanan is a doomed and defeated man. As surely as Cass was borne down and defeated in 1848, so will Buchanan be defeated now. He will never sit in the Presidential chair. Buchanan will not get a single New England State. He will lose New York and Ohio by nearly 100,000 minority. His stronghold of Pennsylvania is torn from him, and nothing is more certain than his inglorious defeat in his own State. In all the Northwest Buchanan is as dead as an Egyptian mummy, buried a thousand years ago. He will not get a single State north of the Ohio river or west of the Lakes. He will be overwhelmingly defeated in the Northwest. His own partisans there feel it and know it. The Southern States are Buchanan's only hope; but the South, unaided, cannot elect him, and, what is more, they *do not care to elect him*. The South does not re-

spect or trust Buchanan. They have no confidence in him."

Gen. Sam Houston on the Presidency.

WASHINGTON CITY, July 21, 1856.

My dear Sir, — Your letter of the 27th of June ult., addressed to me at Huntsville, did not reach me until my arrival here. I thank you for your kind sentiments, and I assure you I reciprocate all that you have expressed. Any apology was unnecessary for addressing me on political subjects, as they are now so interesting to the public, as well as to individuals. I thank you for your views and suggestions, and will render mine with perfect freedom and fidelity. You say, in speaking of yourself, that, "having been reared almost beneath the shades of the Hermitage, and in every sense a Democrat, I feel all the reverence and confidence in the principles and integrity of the motives that actuated Gen. Jackson in his political course that I should do. The issues formerly dividing the old Whig and Democratic parties may no longer be said to exist; yet there is a difference in principle, arising out of the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, that must continue to exist as long as our present form of government continues."

Now, let us reflect for a moment, and observe that I too, if not reared "beneath the shades of the Hermitage," was taught under the pure, vigorous, and national Democratic teachings of the revered and brave old chief, whose wisdom brought honesty, purity, and vigor into the public service, with strength, love of union, honor, and renown to the whole country. I marched with that old chief, and kept step with his Democracy, throughout his public life; and, since he departed, I have never deviated for a moment from his principles; — and, I tell you, you can say most truly that not only the issues formerly dividing the old Whig and Democratic parties can no longer be said to have any practical existence, but that those parties themselves have no distinctive character. They have faded, become extinct, and expired.

One, the Whig party, lives only in the memory of its great name, its great abilities, and its great failures to accomplish practical results; the other, although it retains the name of Democracy, has no memories to which the present organization can refer without a blush of shame. The Democracy of to-day is a "compound" of heterogeneous materials; it has dwindled down to mere sectionalism, and is now but a faction.

It has lost the principle of cohesion, and boasts no longer a uniform policy. When it followed with us the flag of the "old chief," it had a consistency of principle and firmness of purpose which always accompany a clear conviction of right. It had clear heads, patriotic hearts, and clean hands, ever ready in its support. It spoke wisdom and quiet at home, and every section rejoiced in our general prosperity; it announced its foreign policy, and negotiations abroad were no farther necessary than to communicate that announcement.

Where is that Democracy to-day? *Swallowed up in unmitigated squatter sovereignty—in sectional bickerings and disputes—in disregarding compacts between the different sections of the Union, the repeal of which has led to insurrection in Kansas*—in getting up Indian wars wherever Indians could be found, as a pretext for increasing the regular army, the estimated expenses of which, at this time, are \$12,000,000 per annum, when \$300,000, judiciously expended, would secure peace with every Indian Tribe on the continent, and induce them to embrace the arts of civilization.

The foreign policy of the present Democratic President has been far from creditable to our government. It, too, has shown a disposition to court an alien influence to sustain it, while it has declared and practised relentless proscription against native-born American citizens. I will pursue this point no further. To ruminate upon it is painful enough for a man who loves his country, but when called upon by friends, I feel it due to them to express my sentiments plainly. You and I, and tens of thousands of old Democrats who were the true covenanters under Jackson, wash our hands of these absurdities, follies and evidences of culpable mismanagement.

From the New York Evening Post.

How Buchanan hopes to get in.

At present it is pretty manifest that Mr. Buchanan and his friends are thinking to throw, or rather thrust, the election of President into the House of Representatives. If they can succeed in preventing an election by the people, it is as much as the shrewder ones among them, we are persuaded, allow themselves to hope.

The House of Representatives is singularly constituted. The majority represent a constituency strongly hostile to the extension of slavery, but the representatives, as is often the case in public bodies, are not all in agreement with their constituents. There are men in Congress representing districts where the

hostility to the propagation of slavery is intense, and who yet vote with the South. There are other Representatives of similar districts who often vote perversely, as if they sought to favor the plans of the slaveholders by getting up little factions of their own among the friends of freedom in the Territories. There is consequently but a bare majority for the right side in the House, a majority which lies at the mercy of accident, or of a subtler and still more potent cause than accident—corruption. In a body of men where the majority to overcome is so very small, and so many members of which have already proved faithless to their constituents, the chances of succeeding by corruption would seem to a politician who makes no scruple of resorting to such methods, well worth trying.

Suppose, then, Mr. Buchanan accomplishes the object of getting the election into the House of Representatives, what steps will be taken to secure its vote? What terms will he propose, what offers does he stand ready to make, to shift the majority over to his side? The reply is to be found in Mr. Buchanan's past history. We will not judge him by any suspicions of our own, but by his past conduct, and Andrew Jackson shall be our witness. The following letter of General Jackson, which we have already laid before our readers, but which is important enough to bear republication, and the original of which is in the hands of the editor of the *Nashville Banner*, informs us by what means Mr. Buchanan will seek to operate upon the House of Representatives.

"HERMITAGE, February 28, 1845.

"Your observations with regard to Mr. Buchanan are correct. He showed a want of moral courage in the affair of the intrigue of Adams and Clay—did not do me justice in the *expose* he then made, and I am sure about that time did believe there was a perfect understanding between Adams and Clay about the Presidency and the Secretary of State. This I am sure of. But whether he viewed that there was any corruption or not, I know not, but one thing I do know, that he wished me to combat them with their own weapons—that was, to let my friends say if I was elected I would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State. This, to me appeared gross corruption, and I repelled it with that honest indignation as (which) I thought it deserved."

We do not republish this letter for the sake of recalling the memory of feuds which are now forgotten. The recollection of what General Jackson in this letter calls "the intrigue of Adams and Clay" may well be allowed to sleep. Adams was a virtuous man, capable of confronting any danger, and making any

sacrifice in what he esteemed a good cause. Clay was a man of noble and generous nature, and it may well be that General Jackson's suspicions of an improper understanding between them arose from his first hearing from Mr. Buchanan the proposal that he should purchase Mr. Clay's support and influence by a promise to make him Secretary of State, and finding Mr. Clay afterwards appointed to that office by Mr. Adams. The bare suspicion of that "bargain," as it was called, greatly prejudiced both those eminent men in the opinion of the public, and affected their popularity for years. Against Mr. Buchanan, unfortunately for him, there is something more than suspicion—he gave directly and distinctly the advice that General Jackson should make the very arrangement with Mr. Clay, which both Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay always indignantly denied that they ever made with each other. If General Jackson, instead of repelling this base suggestion with that honest warmth which was natural to his character, had listened to it, Buchanan was ready to convey the offer to Mr. Clay. He saw nothing in it to shock his moral delicacy, whatever Gen. Jackson or Mr. Clay might.

No politician once corrupted, is ever weaned from his bad courses by time. The cheek that has once learned not to blush never blushes again. Years of association with such creatures as Mr. Buchanan's political agents—among them it is known are some of the most profligate of men—have not given him a more sensitive conscience. If he was ready to enter into a corrupt bargain in 1824, he will, of course, have no scruple now; and if instruments are wanted to work upon the House of Representatives, he has them already in his service. If place and emolument can buy votes in that body, they will be bought. One man will be offered a foreign mission, another a place in the Cabinet, another a collectorship, and half a dozen bribes of that kind, if members can be found to take them, who will do the business.

The course of Mr. Buchanan, if, by any skill of his partisans, the election should be devolved upon the House of Representatives, is clearly foreshadowed in the suggestion which he made to General Jackson, and which gave that great and honest man a bad opinion of him for life. We know from it what Buchanan will do if he is one of the candidates before the House; and if he should succeed in obtaining a majority of the votes, we shall know to what means the success is owing.

From Correspondence of the Washington Organ, Aug. 11.
Gen. Jackson and Mr. Buchanan.

THE BARGAIN AND INTRIGUE SLANDER ON
MR. CLAY.

NASHVILLE, August 5, 1856.

In the *Republican Banner*, of this city, of the 22d of June last, there appeared an able editorial fixing upon Mr. Buchanan the authorship of the bargain and intrigue slander which wrought so much injury upon Henry Clay. In the article the following extracts of a letter from Gen. Jackson to Major William B. Lewis, an old and revered friend of the departed chieftain, were quoted to show in what light Mr. Buchanan's conduct was regarded by Gen. Jackson :

GEN. JACKSON TO MAJOR W. B. LEWIS.

"HERMITAGE, February 28, 1845.

"Your observations with regard to Mr. Buchanan are correct. *He showed a want of moral courage in the affair of the intrigue of Adams and Clay, did not do me justice in the expose he there made, and I am sure about that time did believe there was a perfect understanding between Adams and Clay about the Presidency and the Secretary of State. THIS I AM SURE OF.* But whether he viewed that there was any corruption in the case or not, I know not; but one thing I do know, *that he wished me to combat them with their own weapons; that was, to let my friends say, if I was elected I would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State. This to me appeared deep corruption, and I repelled it with that honest indignation as I thought it deserved.*

"ANDREW JACKSON."

This letter fell with crushing effect upon the Buchanan Democracy here, and notwithstanding all their efforts to break its force, it is still doing mischief to them and the cause of Mr. Buchanan. In their extremity they called in the aid of Andrew Jackson, Jr., who intimated that the letter did not express the real sentiments of Gen. Jackson—that he wrote it under "irritation," &c. The question then arose, what was it that could have so "irritated" the General that he deliberately put on record what his adopted son declares is not his real opinion of Mr. Buchanan? What was it that made the old chief belie, in the opinion of his adopted son, the honest sentiments of his heart? The American party had no means of knowing—they had no copy of Major Lewis's letter to Gen. Jackson; but the *Patriot*, one of the American papers here, succeeded, after inflicting a terrible lashing on the adopted son, in drawing the desired information from him!

In the *Nashville Union and American* of the 9th of July, Andrew Jackson, Jr., appeared in a long letter, and introduces the following:

LETTER FROM MAJOR W. B. LEWIS TO GEN. JACKSON.

“WASHINGTON, February 17, 1845.

“My dear General: Your two confidential and very interesting letters of the 4th and 5th instant have been received and disposed of as requested. I am happy to say that I am entirely satisfied, and so is Mr. Blair, with the gentlemen who it is supposed will constitute the new Cabinet. Mr. Blair and myself both think it doubtful, however, *whether Mr. Buchanan will accept upon the terms proposed, (he should not be appointed unless he does,)* as he is full of the idea as stated to you in my previous letters, of being a candidate for the succession. *If he should not accept, I suppose the State Department will then be offered to Mr. Stephenson. With or without Mr. Buchanan, however, I think the Cabinet will be an able one, and fully entitled to, and doubtless will receive, the confidence of the nation.*

“The truth is, General, I have never had any very great respect for Mr. Buchanan, and of late I have even had less than formerly. He did not come out upon the subject of that ‘bargain, intrigue and corruption’ charge upon Messrs. Clay and Adams in 1825, as he ought to have done, and as was expected of him. *Besides, I have heard him say, not more than a month ago, that he did not, and never had, believed there was any truth in the charge.* This occurred at Mr. —’s dinner table, and the remarks were addressed to Judge Mangum, the President of the Senate. But having taken place at the time and place *when it did,* I have said nothing about it to any one. * * *

“W. B. LEWIS.”

With this letter before the public, Gen. Jackson’s “irritation” is very easily accounted for. No doubt he was indignant, excessively indignant, when he learned that Mr. Buchanan, upon whose authority he had made the charge of bargain and intrigue against Mr. Clay, had declared he “*did not* and NEVER HAD BELIEVED *there was ANY TRUTH IN THE CHARGE!*” But indignant as he might have been, who will believe that he, in his letter above to Major Lewis, wrote what were not his honest sentiments?

Unable to meet and confute the damning evidences of Mr. Buchanan’s guilt, furnished by Gen. Jackson, attempts have been made to discredit the authenticity of the letter to Major

Lewis. This has not been openly done here, for the reason that *the letter is in this city, open to the inspection of any one who wishes to see it.* But it has been done abroad. One of these attempts was made by the *Washington Union* in the following article:

From the *Washington Union* of July 19, 1856.

GENERAL JACKSON AND MR. BUCHANAN.

“The most disreputable attempt that has been made to injure Mr. Buchanan, is that which seeks to make the impression that General Jackson lacked confidence in him on account of his conduct in the unfortunate difficulty as to the charge of ‘bargain and corruption’ which grew out of the election of Mr. Adams in 1825. We have already published two letters from General Jackson’s son, Andrew Jackson, in which he triumphantly vindicates the memory of his father, and entirely refutes the allegation that Mr. Buchanan did not enjoy his entire confidence. It will be remembered that Andrew Jackson was induced to appeal to the public in consequence of the disgraceful violation of all decency and propriety of the publication of certain confidential letters of his father. One of these private letters, an extract of which was so published, purported to bear date, late in February, 1845, and in this extract General Jackson alludes in terms of dissatisfaction to the conduct of Mr. Buchanan in the affair before referred to.

“We now have information from Nashville, Tennessee, that the person who has thus violated General Jackson’s confidence, and furnished for political effect what purports to be an extract from one of his private letters, is Major W. B. Lewis. The gentleman who gives us this information was one of the most intimate of General Jackson’s friends, and a member of Mr. Polk’s Cabinet. In regard to the alleged extract he says: ‘I shall not believe that he (Gen. Jackson) ever so expressed himself until I see the letter in his own handwriting. Such tricksters could easily add to or erase a word which would entirely change the whole meaning of a sentence.’ As we understand the matter, the whole credit to be given to the extract rests upon the assertion of Major Lewis, that he has furnished the copy of it for publication. By the very fact of thus abusing the confidence reposed in him by General Jackson, he forfeits all claim to credibility.

“The fact that he has suppressed the residue of the letter furnishes strong evidence that the extract is either not genuine, or that it is garbled and altered so as to pervert its

true meaning. Every honorable mind is justified in pronouncing it a probable forgery, unless Major Lewis produces the whole letter, in General Jackson's own handwriting, and, together with it, the letter of his own to which it was an answer. The gentleman before alluded to, not only asserts, as a fact susceptible of proof, that Gen. Jackson approved the selection of Mr. Buchanan by Mr. Polk, as a member of his Cabinet before the appointment was made, but that, after it was made, and after the date of the pretended letter to Major Lewis, Gen. Jackson wrote to Mr. Polk expressing his cordial satisfaction at the appointment of Mr. Buchanan. This letter is in existence, and its contents are so directly contradictory of the pretended extract, that it strongly corroborates the conclusion that the *extract is a forgery.*"

Now the chief object of this communication is to expose this base attempt at imposture on the part of the *Union*. It is true that Andrew Jackson, Jr., has written two letters, in which he speaks of the letter to Major Lewis, but *in neither does he dare to question the authenticity of the extract.* On the contrary he admits its genuineness, but suspects if the whole letter were published it might not be so hard on Mr. Buchanan. He copies the extract in one of his letters, preceding it with the remark:—"The following extract from one of my father's private and confidential letters." Again, he says: "I say furthermore, that the above paragraph (the extract from the letter to Major Lewis, given above) *was called forth by irritation, produced,*" &c. In no instance does he dare to throw a doubt upon the extract as a veritable production of Gen. Jackson. The "paragraph" contains all that is said in the letter upon the subject of the slander on Mr. Clay; and, of course, the publication of the whole letter could not alter its sense in any way.

[If the letter contained a word or an idea which would benefit Mr. Buchanan, we suppose of course his *friend*, Andrew Jackson, Jr., would publish it.—*Ed. Am. Organ.*]

The Cabinet officer alluded to in the *Union* is Hon. Cave Johnson. He intimates that the letter is not in General Jackson's handwriting—that words or sentences may have been erased, &c. These are grave imputations upon the honesty of gentlemen in every respect the peers of Hon. Cave Johnson. It would have been more honorable had he, instead of making them, examined the letter and satisfied his doubts, if he really had any doubts. *The letter is at the Banner office*, within a stone's throw

of the Bank of Tennessee, where he (Johnson) spends his days, and he, together with all other Democrats, have a standing invitation to call and read it.

In response to his intimation, I will say that *the letter is in the handwriting of Gen. Jackson*, that there is neither an erasure or an interlineation in it, and that it has been examined by honorable Democrats, who admit its genuineness, while they lament its existence. Under these circumstances, the attempt of Cave Johnson and A. O. P. Nicholson to create the impression that the letter has been "garbled" or is a "forgery," is in the highest degree discreditable to them as honorable men. By lending themselves to such an unworthy artifice to impose upon the people, they descend to the level of the ballot-box stuffers, and render themselves objects of contempt and derision.

In conclusion, your correspondent would admonish all who expect to relieve Mr. Buchanan from the odium of his position as an accomplice in the conspiracy to destroy Mr. Clay, by throwing doubts upon the authenticity of Gen. Jackson's letter, that the thing is impossible. The "Old Buck" has been brought to bay, and in November his antlers will be hung up as an evidence of his guilt, and of the justice of the great masses of Mr. Clay's countrymen.

MACON.

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

The Republican Platform.

This convention of delegates, assembled in pursuance of a call addressed to the people of the United States, without regard to past political differences or divisions, who are opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; to the policy of the present administration; to the extension of slavery into free territory; in favor of the admission of Kansas as a Free State; of restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson; and for the purpose of presenting candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, do

1. *Resolve*, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence, and embodied in the Federal Constitution, is essential to the preservation of our Republican institutions, and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the union of the States, shall be preserved.

2. *Resolved*, That, with our Republican fathers, we hold it to be a self-evident truth that

all men are endowed with the unalienable right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that the primary object and ulterior design of our federal government were to secure those rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction; that as our Republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing slavery in the United States by positive legislation, prohibiting its existence or extension therein; that *we deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial legislature, of any individual or association of individuals, to give legal assistance to slavery in any Territory of the United States*, while the present Constitution shall be maintained.

3. *Resolved*, That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery.

4. *Resolved*, That while the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established by the people in order to "form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, and secure the blessings of liberty," and contains ample provisions for the protection of the life, liberty and property of every citizen, the dearest constitutional rights of the people of Kansas have been fraudulently and violently taken from them.

Their territory has been invaded by an armed force:

Spurious and pretended legislative, judicial, and executive officers, have been set over them, by whose usurped authority, sustained by the military power of the government, tyrannical and unconstitutional laws have been enacted and enforced:

The rights of the people to keep and to bear arms have been infringed:

Test oaths of an extraordinary and entangling nature have been imposed as a condition of exercising the rights of suffrage and holding office:

The right of an accused person to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury has been denied:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, has been violated:

They have been deprived of life, liberty, and property, without due process of law:

That the freedom of speech and of the press has been abridged:

The right to choose their Representatives has been made of no effect:

Murders, robberies, and arsons, have been instigated and encouraged, and the offenders have been allowed to go unpunished.

That all these things have been done with the knowledge, sanction, and procurement of the present administration, and that for this high crime against the Constitution, the Union, and humanity, we arraign that administration, the President, his advisers, agents, supporters, apologists, and accessories, either before or after the facts—before the country and before the world; and that it is our fixed purpose to bring the actual perpetrators of these atrocious outrages, and their accomplices, to a sure and condign punishment hereafter.

5. *Resolved*, That Kansas should be immediately admitted as a State of the Union, with her present free constitution, as at once the most effectual way of securing to her citizens the enjoyment of the rights and privileges to which they are entitled, and of ending the civil strife now raging in her Territory.

6. *Resolved*, That the highwayman's plea that might makes right, embodied in the *Ostend Circular*, was in every respect unworthy of American diplomacy, and would bring shame and dishonor upon any government or people that gave it their sanction.

7. *Resolved*, That a Railroad to the Pacific Ocean by the most central and practical route, is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country, and that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction, and, as an auxiliary thereto, the immediate construction of an emigrant route on the line of the railroad.

8. *Resolved*, That appropriations by Congress for the improvement of rivers and harbors, of a national character, required for the accommodation and security of our existing commerce, are authorized by the Constitution, and justified by the obligation of government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

9. *Resolved*, That we invite the affiliation and co-operation of the men of all parties, however differing from us in other respects, in support of the principles herein declared; and believing that the spirit of our institutions as well as the Constitution of our country guarantees liberty of conscience and equality of rights, among citizens, we oppose all legislation impairing their security.

LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE—COL. FREMONT
TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE PEOPLE'S
CONVENTION.

NEW YORK, *July 8, 1856.*

GENTLEMEN: You call me to a high responsibility by placing me in the van of a great movement of the people of the United States, who, without regard to past differences, are uniting in a common effort to bring back the action of the Federal Government to the principles of WASHINGTON and JEFFERSON. Comprehending the magnitude of the trust which they have declared themselves willing to place in my hands, and deeply sensible to the honor which their unreserved confidence in this threatening position of the public affairs implies, I feel that I cannot better respond than by a sincere declaration that, in the event of my election to the Presidency, I should enter upon the execution of its duties with a single-hearted determination to promote the good of the whole country, and to direct solely to this end all the power of the Government, irrespective of party issues, and regardless of sectional strifes. The declaration of principles embodied in the resolves of your Convention expresses the sentiments in which I have been educated, and which have been ripened into convictions by personal observation and experience. With this declaration and avowal, I think it necessary to revert to only two of the subjects embraced in the resolutions, and to those only because events have surrounded them with grave and critical circumstances, and given to them special importance.

I concur in the views of that Convention deprecating the foreign policy to which it adverts. The assumption that we have the right to take from another nation its domains because we want them, is an abandonment of the honest character which our country has acquired. To provoke hostilities by unjust assumptions would be to sacrifice the peace and character of the country, when all its interests might be more certainly secured, and its objects attained by just and healing counsels, involving no loss of reputation.

International embarrassments are mainly the results of a secret diplomacy, which aims to keep from the knowledge of the people the operations of the Government. This system is inconsistent with the character of our institutions, and is itself yielding gradually to a more enlightened public opinion, and to the power of a free Press, which, by its broad dissemination of political intelligence, secures in advance to the side of justice the judgment of

the civilized world. An honest, firm, and open policy in our foreign relations would command the united support of the nation, whose deliberate opinions it would necessarily reflect.

Nothing is clearer in the history of our institutions than the design of the nation in asserting its own independence and freedom, to avoid giving countenance to the extension of Slavery. The influence of the small but compact and powerful class of men interested in Slavery, who command one section of the country, and wield a vast political control as a consequence in the other, is now directed to turn this impulse of the Revolution and reverse its principles. The extension of Slavery across the continent is the object of the power which now rules the Government; and from this spirit have sprung those kindred wrongs in Kansas so truly portrayed in one of your resolutions, which prove that the elements of the most arbitrary governments have not been vanquished by the just theory of our own. It would be out of place here to pledge myself to any particular policy that has been suggested to terminate the sectional controversy engendered by political animosities, operating on a powerful class banded together by a common interest. A practical remedy is the admission of Kansas into the Union as a Free State. The South should, in my judgment, earnestly desire such a consummation. It would vindicate the good faith—it would correct the mistake of the repeal; and the North, having practically the benefit of the agreement between the two sections, would be satisfied, and good feeling be restored. The measure is perfectly consistent with the honor of the South, and vital to its interests. That fatal act which gave birth to this purely sectional strife, originating in the scheme to take from free labor the country secured to it by a solemn covenant, cannot be too soon disarmed of its pernicious force. The only genial region of the middle latitudes left to the emigrants of the Northern States for homes cannot be conquered from the free laborers, who have long considered it as set apart for them in our inheritance, without provoking a desperate struggle. Whatever may be the persistence of the particular class which seems ready to hazard everything for the success of the unjust scheme it has partially effected, I firmly believe that the great heart of the nation, which throbs with the patriotism of the free-men of both sections, will have power to overcome it. They will look to the rights secured to them by the Constitution of the Union, as their best safeguard from the oppression of the class which—by a monopoly of the soil

and of slave labor to till it—might in time reduce them to the extremity of laboring upon the same terms with the slaves. The great body of non-slaveholding freemen, including those of the South, upon whose welfare Slavery is an oppression, will discover that the power of the General Government over the public lands may be beneficially exerted to advance their interests and secure their independence. Knowing this, their suffrages will not be wanting to maintain that authority in the Union which is absolutely essential to the maintenance of their own liberties, and which has more than once indicated the purpose of disposing of the public lands in such a way as would make every settler upon them a freeholder.

If the people intrust to me the administration of the Government, the laws of Congress in relation to the Territories will be faithfully executed. All its authority will be exerted in aid of the national will to re-establish the peace of the country on the just principles which have heretofore received the sanction of the Federal Government, of the States, and of the people of both sections. Such a policy would leave no aliment to that sectional party which seeks its aggrandizement by appropriating the new Territories to capital in the form of Slavery, but would inevitably result in the triumph of Free Labor—the natural capital which constitutes the real wealth of this great country, and creates that intelligent power in the masses alone to be relied on as the bulwark of free institutions.

Trusting that I have a heart capable of comprehending our whole country, with its varied interests, and confident that patriotism exists in all parts of the Union, I accept the nomination of the Convention, in the hope that I may be enabled to serve usefully its cause, which I consider the cause of constitutional Freedom.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
J. C. FREMONT.

SWORD FROM SOUTH CAROLINA.

The citizens of Charleston, S. C., at a public meeting, in 1846, after passing resolutions highly eulogistic of Col. Fremont's services in Oregon and California, voted him a sword, limiting the subscription for the same at one dollar to a person. The sword is costly and elegantly wrought, of gold, silver mounted, in a scabbard of gold, and bears the following inscription:

Presented

BY THE CITIZENS OF CHARLESTON
TO LIEUTENANT-COLONEL
JOHN CHARLES FREMONT.
A MEMORIAL OF THEIR HIGH APPRECIATION
OF THE GALLANTRY AND SCIENCE
HE HAS DISPLAYED IN HIS
SERVICES IN OREGON AND CALIFORNIA.
SWORD BELT FROM THE CHARLESTON WOMEN.

From the Charleston, S. C., Mercury, Sept. 27, 1847.

We regret to learn that Col. Fremont, whose departure for Aiken we noticed a few days since, did not reach that place to see his mother alive. She died but a few hours before his arrival. He accompanied her remains the next day to this city, and after witnessing the last sad rites, left here the evening following for Washington. In this affliction, rendered doubly poignant by his deep disappointment in not receiving her parting look of recognition after his long and eventful absence, he has the sympathy of our entire community.

“The marked and brilliant career of Col. Fremont has arrested general attention and admiration, and has been watched with lively interest by his fellow-citizens of South Carolina. Charleston particularly is proud of him, and the reputation which he has at so early an age achieved for himself, she claims as something in which she too has a share. But for the melancholy circumstance attending his visit, our city would have manifested by suitable demonstrations their respect for him, and their continued confidence in his honor and integrity. It will require something more than mere accusation to sully them in the minds of the people of Charleston. Some months since a sword was voted to him by our citizens, the individual subscriptions to which were limited to \$1; it now awaits his acceptance at a suitable opportunity. We are happy to learn that the ladies of Charleston propose, by a similar subscription, to furnish an appropriate belt to accompany the sword, an evidence that they too can appreciate the gallantry and heroism which have so signally marked his career, and have thrown an air of romance over the usually dry detail of scientific pursuits.”

LETTER FROM BARON HUMBOLDT.

To COL. FREMONT, *Senator*.—It is very agreeable to me, sir, to address you these lines by my excellent friend, our Minister to the United States, N. de Gerold. After having given you, in the new edition of my “Aspects

of Nature," the public testimony of the admiration which is due to your gigantic labors between St. Louis, of Missouri, and the coasts of the South Sea, I feel happy to offer you, in this little token of my existence (*dans ce petit signe de vie*), the homage of my warm acknowledgment. You have displayed a noble courage in distant expeditions, braved all the dangers of cold and famine, enriched all the branches of the natural sciences, illustrated a vast country which was almost entirely unknown to us.

A merit so rare has been acknowledged by a sovereign warmly interested in the progress of physical geography; the king orders me to offer you the grand golden medal destined to those who have labored at scientific progress. I hope that this mark of the Royal good will will be agreeable to you at a time when, upon the proposition of the illustrious geographer, Chas. Ritter, the Geographical Society at Berlin has named you an honorary member. For myself, I must thank you particularly also for the honor which you have done in attaching my name and that of my fellow-laborer and intimate friend, Mr. Bonpland, to countries neighboring to those which have been the object of our labors. *California, which has so nobly resisted the introduction of Slavery, will be worthily represented by a friend of liberty and of the progress of intelligence.*

Accept, I pray you, sir, the expression of my high and affectionate consideration.

Your most humble and most obedient servant,
A. VON HUMBOLDT.

Sans Souci, October 7, 1850.

On the envelope thus addressed:

To Colonel Fremont, Senator,

With the Great Golden Medal

For Progress in the Sciences.

BARON HUMBOLDT.

Testimony of Fremont's Teacher, given in 1850,--Six Years before he was Nominated.

Young Fremont, after attending school for some time in Norfolk and Charleston, at about the age of thirteen entered the law office of John W. Mitchell, Esq., in Charleston. Mr. Mitchell was a man of exemplary character and of high standing in the community. He took a fancy to Fremont, and invited him to enter his office and prepare himself, ultimately, for the practice of the law. Here Fremont continued about a year, when Mr. Mitchell sent him to the school of Dr. Robertson, a Scotchman of good classical acquirements, and particularly skilled in the ancient languages.

Dr. Robertson is still living, and is now engaged in teaching in the city of Philadelphia. In the preface to one of his school-books, published in 1850, he exhorts his pupils to attention to their studies, and thus sets before them the example of Fremont:

"For your further encouragement, I will here relate a very remarkable instance of patient diligence and indomitable perseverance:

"In the year 1827, after I had returned to Charleston from Scotland, and my classes were going on, a very respectable lawyer came to my school, I think some time in the month of October, with a youth apparently about sixteen, or perhaps not so much (fourteen), of middle size, graceful in manners, rather slender, but well formed, and upon the whole, what I should call handsome; of a keen, piercing eye, and a noble forehead, seemingly the very seat of genius. The gentleman stated that he found him given to study, that he had been about three weeks learning the Latin Rudiments, and (hoping, I suppose, to turn the youth's attention from the law to the ministry) had resolved to place him under my care, for the purpose of learning Greek, Latin, and Mathematics, sufficient to enter Charleston College. I very gladly received him, for I immediately perceived he was no common youth, as intelligence beamed in his dark eye, and shone brightly on his countenance, indicating great ability, and an assurance of his future progress. I at once put him in the highest class, just beginning to read Cæsar's Commentaries, and although at first inferior, his prodigious memory and enthusiastic application soon enabled him to surpass the best. He began Greek at the same time, and read with some who had been long at it, in which he also soon excelled. And whatever he read, he retained. It seemed to me, in fact, as if he learned by mere intuition. I was myself utterly astonished, and at the same time delighted with his progress. I have hinted that he was designed for the Church, but when I contemplated his bold, fearless disposition, his powerful inventive genius, his admiration of warlike exploits, and his love of heroic and adventurous deeds, I did not think it likely he would be a minister of the Gospel. He had not, however, the least appearance of any vice whatever. On the contrary, he was always the very pattern of virtue and modesty. I could not help loving him, so much did he captivate me by his gentlemanly conduct and extraordinary progress. It was easy to see that he would one day raise himself to eminence. * * * * *

At the end of one year, he entered the Junior Class in Charleston College triumphantly, while others who had been studying four years and more, were obliged to take the Sophomore Class. His career afterwards has been one of heroic adventure, of hair-breadth escapes by flood and field, and of scientific explorations, which have made him world-wide renowned. * * * *

Such, my young friends, is but an imperfect sketch of my once beloved and favorite pupil, now a Senator, and who may yet rise to be at the head of this great and growing republic."

From the New York Evening Post.

Fremont's Opinions on Slavery in 1837. His Early Religious Views.

The following interesting correspondence has recently taken place :

LETTER FROM JOHN M. WELCH, ESQ.

HUDSON, August 30, 1856.

R. F. Livingston, Esq. :

Dear Sir: Knowing that you, some years since, had a personal acquaintance with John C. Fremont, and that you were a companion of his in several Exploring or Engineering expeditions, I write you a few lines for the purpose of obtaining your understanding of Mr. Fremont's views with reference to slavery extension: and also to ascertain from you whether he was, at the time you were with him, a pro-slavery man and a Roman Catholic. If you will have the kindness to give me the information I ask for, you will confer a great favor.

Respectfully yours, JOHN M. WELCH.

LETTER FROM ROBERT F. LIVINGSTON, ESQ.

LIVINGSTON, Columbia county, }
September 2, 1856. }

Mr. John M. Welch :

Dear Sir: Your note of the 30th of August, addressed to me, soliciting my understanding of Col. John C. Fremont's religious tenets and views of human slavery, I am pleased to comply with. I have been personally acquainted with him for nearly twenty years. In the year 1837 we were for several months associated in the same corps of engineers, serving in North Carolina. We camped together, ate and slept together in the deep ravines of the Blue Ridge, far removed from any habitation. From our daily intercourse and intimacy it might very naturally be inferred, "as the fact is," that we became pretty conversant with each other's opinions and characters. I have no hesitation in declaring, from the knowledge I then obtained of him, and have since obtained

from my associations with him, that his religious opinions were and still are those of the Protestant Episcopalians.

Independent of this, I will state that the only Prayer Book in our tent at the Blue Ridge was owned by John C. Fremont, with his name inscribed on the cover, which was the Common Prayer Book used by all Episcopalians, and the same kind that I had from boyhood been accustomed to use. This circumstance is strongly impressed upon my mind from the fact that there was among our number a son of the Episcopal Bishop of Baltimore, a strict disciplinarian, who, in the hurry of preparation for camp, neglected to bring his Book of Prayers, which produced in our company no slight degree of amusement at his expense. If Mr. Fremont is now a Roman Catholic he must certainly have become so since his nomination.

In reply to your question of slavery, I will introduce a short extract from the journal kept by me at the time spoken of, in 1837 :

"I am mystified with regard to the character of my companion, Fremont. The most taciturn, modest man I ever met, reminding me of William C., and, like him, is not readily drawn into conversation, looking at times as if he were resolving some difficult problem in Euclid."

* * * * * "One week has passed. I am greatly fatigued by the last few days' laborious duties. Buncombe is truly a rough country. That young man, Fremont, is a genius—a diamond of the first water—a person of no ordinary capacity. Such application, coupled with such indomitable perseverance—such a determination to surmount every obstacle—a patient investigation unsurpassed."

* * * * * "A month has elapsed. We are camping in the most primitive of forests. Our caterer brings in a deer; our taciturn man is more communicative lately. He is loved, respected and admired by us all. First impressions of persons are generally the best. It is mine that Fremont will, at some future day, be distinguished; such energy, such perseverance, such application and talent, cannot escape notice, and will not go unrewarded. I am, in a measure, his confidant, conversing with him freely on all subjects, including that of slavery. He does not conceal his opinions of the institution. He condemns it much, even in the presence of our companions. I am more cautious."

This is from my journal nearly twenty years ago. I believe from what I have heard Mr Fremont say of the demoralizing effects of

slavery, that he hates it, but would not advise interference with it in the States where it is established. He is opposed to its extension. I have been in Col. Fremont's company in Kentucky, Cuba and California, and on the Isthmus of Panama. His views on this question of human slavery, are what all good men desire. Of his Protestantism there can be no doubt. Believing that this will satisfy you upon the several points alluded to, and trusting that you will, "as I certainly shall," cast your vote for Fremont and Freedom,

I remains yours, &c.,

ROBT. F. LIVINGSTON.

His Views in 1856.

LETTER FROM COL. FREMONT.

NEW YORK, April 29, 1856.

Gentlemen:—I have to thank you for the honor of an invitation to a meeting this evening, at the Broadway Tabernacle, and regret that other engagements have interfered to prevent my being present. I heartily concur in all movements which have for their object to "repair the mischiefs arising from the violation of good faith, in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise." I am opposed to slavery in the abstract, and upon principle sustained and made habitual by long settled convictions. *While I feel inflexible in the belief that it ought not to be interfered with where it exists under the shield of State sovereignty, I AM AS INFLEXIBLY OPPOSED TO ITS EXTENSION ON THIS CONTINENT BEYOND ITS PRESENT LIMITS.*

With the assurance of regard for yourselves,
I am, very respectfully, yours,

J. C. FREMONT.

To Messrs. E. D. Morgan and others,
Committee, &c.

What the Democrats thought of Fremont.

We find the following curious statement in the New York *Herald*, and publish it with a remark that we have before heard a similar intimation from a Democratic source:

"This idea of running Fremont for the Presidency originated, with the Democratic party, or with some of its managers, which is the same thing. Less than a year ago, had Fremont consented to ride the Nebraska bill, he would in all probability have been adopted as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, upon the superior claims of a higher and more extended personal popularity than any other living man in the United States.

"We know what we say; and the whole

mystery in due season will be fully explained. We only repeat, for the present, with a knowledge of the circumstances, that had Fremont, when applied to by a Democratic committee, consented to swallow the Kansas-Nebraska bill, he would have put the nose of Mr. Buchanan out of joint as the Democratic nominee."

What a Patriotic American Politician thinks.

Chauncey Schaffer, Esq., formerly district attorney of New York, has been a much respected and prominent member of the American party, but has recently given his support to Fremont. A paragraph recently appeared in the *Ithaca Citizen*, stating that he had returned to the support of Fillmore and Donelson, because he was convinced that Fremont was a Catholic. Mr. Schaffer has written a spicy letter in reply to this "roorback." He says that, as an American, he is not bound by the action of the Philadelphia convention, any more than his brethren of Massachusetts, of Connecticut, and of every New England State. That convention, he says, was not an "American convention." As far as the North was concerned, it was a Silver Gray Whig convention; as far as the South was concerned, it was a convention for the propagation of human slavery; and the result was the nomination of two men, one of whom glories in being the owner of a hundred slaves, and the other (Mr. Fillmore) in being a most subservient instrument of the slave power. He says:

"I have not 'returned to the hearty support of Fillmore and Donelson,' nor will I do any act or thing tending to sanction the outrages of pro-slavery, nullification, border-ruffians, who in addition to their outrages in Missouri and Kansas, of themselves sufficient to turn the cheek of darkness pale have, from 1852 until now, wrested the high powers of the nation from their legitimate purpose, to the strengthening of the slave oligarchy.

"There are other objections to my supporting Mr. Fillmore, founded upon the fact stated by the *Citizen*, that I belong to the Methodist Church.

"The church owes slavery no particular good will, for slavery has rent that church in twain; has imprisoned women for teaching the slave to read the Bible, and has sought in every way to destroy that church, as being the opponent of slavery most to be feared. Let facts speak. Last winter, a minister of the Methodist Church, in Missouri, was arrested while in the pulpit, by a gang of men (who,

if they live, will probably vote for Mr. Fillmore), who wantonly and falsely charged him with horse stealing; and without allowing him time to put on his overcoat, mounted him on a horse, drove him some seventeen miles (the weather being intensely cold), threw him into a cheerless room, without fire, there left him to die, *and there he died!*

"My informant is a Bishop of the Methodist Church, and spoke of his own knowledge.

"Another instance: The Rev. Mr. Wiley, and about thirty other ministers of the Methodist Church, have been assaulted in their churches, and driven from place to place, like beasts of prey, their lives being every day in imminent peril.

"Another instance: In Kansas, a Methodist minister was whipped, tarred and feathered, tied to a log and set afloat on the Missouri river.

"Another instance: Very recently, a Methodist minister in Missouri, while preaching, was dragged from his pulpit and tarred and feathered; while an old Methodist layman, for the crime of expostulation against such conduct, was shot; and it is a notorious fact, and one which will not admit of controversy, that a minister of my church cannot preach the Gospel in the State of Missouri, or the Territory of Kansas, but at the peril of his life! and yet I find no reproof of these outrages either in the Philadelphia platform or in any of the speeches of Mr. Fillmore."

He further says that he has examined all the evidence in relation to Col. Fremont's religious creed, and exhausted the means of information within his reach, and has arrived at the following conclusions:

1st. That Mr. Fremont's father was a French Huguenot, and his mother an American Protestant lady.

2d. That Col. Fremont was born a Protestant, baptized a Protestant, married a Protestant lady, has had his children baptized by a Protestant clergyman, educates them in the Protestant faith, while he is a Protestant in practice in all the relations of life.

3d. I conclude that Alderman Fulmer's statement is altogether untrue. Col. Fremont was not in Washington at the time Fulmer says he conversed with him, nor within several months of that time.

Mr. Schaffer says that if he should refuse to vote for Mr. Fremont because of his being a Roman Catholic, he could not vote for Mr. Fillmore; and for the reason, that the Convention which nominated Mr. Fillmore was controlled by Roman Catholics as well as by

slavery propagandists. As proof of this he cites the fact that two sets of delegates appeared from the State of Louisiana, one Protestant and the other Roman Catholic, both demanding admission. The Roman Catholic delegation was received, and the Protestant delegation was rejected. He concludes his letter as follows:

"I believe upon the election or defeat of Col. Fremont will depend the questions whether or not the black column of slavery will be pushed to the Pacific Ocean; whether or not the African slave trade, the sum of all wickedness, will be revived; and whether or not practical slavery shall be forced upon the Free States under the decisions of Federal Judges, appointed as Mr. Fillmore sought to appoint and did appoint some of his Judges; and in short, whether this country shall have a constitutional government for the slave oligarchy; whether or not we shall recover our lost national honor, and go on in peaceful progress to the climax of human greatness; or whether we shall be destroyed by the aggressive system of the slave power."

**Further Expression of English Opinion on
Colonel Fremont.**

From the London Times, July 29.

Among a large portion of the English public there has been too strong a tendency to regard competing politicians in the United States as men ready to profess any opinion, echo any cry, flatter any prejudice, or pander to any dominant passion, for the sake of obtaining or retaining office; and some instances might be cited to justify such an impression as this. But, true as it doubtless is in certain cases, it is not true that all who are candidates for the highest offices of American government and for the approbation of the majority of the people by whom they are bestowed, are liable to such criticism.

We lately extracted from the American papers a political address *which is worthy of any people and any statesman*. It is the reply in which Colonel Fremont conveys to those partisans who have nominated him for the Presidential chair his willingness to accept it. Colonel Fremont is a man of action in a country where action inspires greater admiration than cultivated taste or philosophical reflection; and the events in which he has taken a conspicuous part cannot fail to exercise a great influence over the fortunes, not only of the American States, but the whole civilized world. Too little is known in Europe of the geography and recent history of the New World for

Colonel Fremont's real merits to be appreciated through the haze of exaggeration. But as the leader of the pioneers whose courage first forced a path for western adventure over the fastnesses of the Rocky Mountains to the treasures of California, he is fairly entitled to take his rank among those benefactors of mankind who have brought moral and physical hardihood to the performance of works suggested by science and accomplished by perseverance. Such a man must have many admirers among his own countrymen, yet few Englishmen, judging by the tone of the American papers, and the speeches of American legislators, were prepared to find that a man distinguished rather by his past career than his present partisanship, was popular enough to command a nomination to the Presidential chair; and fewer still to find that, when solicited to compete for the honor, he could address to his fellow-citizens a reply so little vulgarized by the passions of the day, so little tainted by the epidemic fever of jealousy and violence.

* * * * *

But if, as a Republican addressing Republicans, he is freespoken on the subject of American aggressiveness, he is no less freespoken, when, as a Southerner, he remonstrates with the Southern States against the extension of State slavery. In this point his words will find divided sympathy there, but universal sympathy here; and we suspect that even in the United States his sentiments will ere long command the adhesion of the majority. He does not express himself to his followers in the language of cant or exaggerated humanity. He seizes on that which, to a practical man, is the blot of the system which would allow the admission of more Slave States into the Union. He denounces its glaring inconsistency with the principles on which the Constitution of the republic is based, and with the material of prosperity of that large class of free citizens whose subsistence depends upon the correspondence between soil and employment.

* * * * *

To create new Slave States is to increase the numbers of a population which conscious power may some day arm for the vindication of outraged feelings and violated rights. But it is something more; *it is to deprive the free citizen of that employment for his labor which is his only property*; it is to create that monopoly of territorial possession which is so obnoxious to republican equality and simplicity. With every new Slave State there is a fresh accession of strength to a party which, however patriotic it may be in its support of the national honor

abroad, cannot give a hearty assent to the spirit of national institutions at home. Whatever policy, therefore, tends to multiply the slaveholders or those interested in slavery, tends also to foster a race who can only be half-republicans at heart. Colonel Fremont's language on this point is as sound as it is honest:

"It would be out of place here to pledge myself to any particular policy that has been suggested to terminate the sectional controversy engendered by political animosities operating on a powerful class banded together by common interests. A practical remedy is the admission of Kansas into the Union as a Free State. . . . That fatal act which gave birth to this purely sectional strife, originating in the scheme to take from free labor the country secured to it by a solemn covenant, cannot be too soon disarmed of its pernicious force. The only genial region of the middle latitudes left to the emigrants of the Northern States for homes cannot be conquered from the free laborers who have so long considered it as set apart for them as an inheritance, without provoking a desperate struggle."

We have seen other addresses lately which certainly did not meet this awkward question in so bold a strain, but which coquetted with it, played with it, and rang the changes on the "federal union," the "preservation of our institutions," and the "merging of particular theories in the safety of the Republic." *We trust that the citizens of the States will know how to appreciate a courage which will neither palter with a momentous question nor seek to base the safety of the Republic upon a timid compromise*; and if, by his courage and his ability, Colonel Fremont secures the object of his patriotic ambition, we certainly shall congratulate the States and this kingdom on the elevation of a man who seems to reconcile patriotism with regard for the rights of others, and the resolution to do great things with the graceful abstinence from bragging of them.

From the N. Y. Evening Post.
Fremont in the South.
STATE OF OPINION IN VIRGINIA.

It is truly said that there is a much larger number of persons in the Slave States who do not favor the extension of slavery, and who would be very glad to see an end of the institution among themselves, than is revealed by any external indications. In many cases they make no secret of their opinions in conversation, but they do not express them by any mode of publication through the press, or in

public meetings, or in any political organization. We have lately had the means of informing ourselves concerning the feeling of the population of those counties of Virginia which lie among the Alleghanies in regard to the great question of the day. In conversation with an intelligent native Virginia from that quarter, he remarked that he was in favor of the election of Fremont, and that if his vote would make him President, he would give it in a moment. "Your doctrine," he said, "that slavery in the States must be left to the action of the States, but that its introduction into the Territories should be resisted, ought to satisfy any reasonable man at the South, and does satisfy me and the greater number of my neighbors. The policy of excluding slavery from the Territories is older than the Constitution, and it is a policy which we do not wish to see superseded."

So far as we can learn, there are parts of Virginia, along the Alleghanies, near the Southern frontiers of the State, in which two thirds of the inhabitants entertain the same sentiments with those expressed by the gentleman to whom we refer. As you go Northward they become still more general. The only reason why those who think thus do not form a political organization, is the wish to live in peace. The slaveholding influence is so powerful, so intolerant, and so despotic, that a Fremont electoral ticket nominated in Virginia would be the signal of angry feuds, which would not stop short of violence.

In the meantime, however, this influence of the slaveholders rests on a somewhat insecure foundation. The greater part of the white population is composed of persons who do not own slaves. "What would you do," said a gentleman to a crowd of people, principally of this class, assembled during the sittings of the court in one of the Virginia interior counties, "what would you do if it became necessary to fight the North in defence of the right of the slaveholders to the persons of the work-people?" "We should let those who own the niggers fight for their right to keep them," was the instant answer. It is one of the dangers of slavery, that the slaveholders are in a minority, and that public opinion, in no country, and least of all in ours, is constant in one purpose, and that it may easily happen that the prejudices on the one side, and the fears on the other, by which the oligarchy in the Slave States is now supported, may, in some peculiar conjuncture, lose their force, and the slaveholders find themselves at the mercy of those whom they now hold in awe.

Our readers may judge for themselves, from the political silence and inaction in which the more liberal-minded part of the people of Virginia are held by the slaveholders, how incompatible is the slavery of the black race with the perfect freedom of the white race.

Although the press and professional politicians represent the people of Western Virginia to be loyal to the institution of slavery, yet *I do know that if the question should be fairly laid before the voters of this city, a very large and respectable majority would be found opposed to the extension of slavery.* And more than this; when Toombs and his followers attempt to carry out their threat, the South will secede in case of Fremont's election; they will find that Western Virginia, at least, will not be with them. Here will be found an undivided people, true to the Union. And should that day ever come, it will be found that the Republican party, North and South, is the true union party. T. J.

VIRGINIA TYRANNY.—An interesting letter is published in the Buffalo Republic from Mr. J. C. Underwood, the Virginia refugee. He says that Charles Stetson, the noble-hearted landlord, would take nothing from him while he was at the Astor House. This case of Mr. Underwood's expulsion from Virginia, for quoting Jefferson, is the most astonishing fact of the kind in American history.— He says:—

"My expulsion from home was most unexpected. I knew there was intense feeling in favor of extending slavery, and the hope of a large increase in the price of slaves resulting from the extension of the slave market. Gov. Wise had just inflamed this avarice by saying, substantially, in his ratification speech at Richmond, 'elect Buchanan and spread slavery over the Western Territories, and you will increase the price of slaves from \$1000 to from \$3000 to \$5000.' But I had no idea of the madness which the Governor's extravagant declaration had produced. Besides, we had, not long ago, a transaction which I had supposed had produced some calmness, reflection, and even moderation on the part of our pro-slavery men.

"The case I refer to was this. One of the most worthy men of which any country can boast, Samuel M. Janney, a Quaker minister, residing near me in Loudon County, Virginia, had been indicted for what was deemed a seditious publication in one of our newspapers. But it was found, on examination, that the words complained of were almost literal quo-

tations of Jefferson and John Wesley, and the Commonwealth's attorney became very willing and anxious to enter a *nolle prosequi* and let the Quaker go. Having this case before me, I confined myself, in my Philadelphia Convention remarks, to quotations from Jefferson, and I studiously avoided even his harsher expressions. You know he says, 'if the slaves should rise in arms against us, the Almighty has no attribute which could take sides with us in the contest.' I certainly said nothing that could compare with this.

"I have just received a letter from a poor neighbor, asking when I will return, and promising an armed and mounted escort of at least fifty of my neighbors, from the railroad depot to my farm, a distance of ten miles. I can hardly resist the strong inclination I feel to go home. But I have thus far yielded to the advice of friends, and the unqualified remonstrance of my wife, who believes it would be rushing upon certain destruction. She points to our little children, and claims her right to my aid in their care and education, and that appeal is irresistible.

"I have written a great many letters home to try and allay the excitement, and my wife has, through Gen. Spinner, appealed to Gov. Smith, an old friend of her family, and the representative in Congress of the district where the most violent proceedings against me have been held. The General informs that he presented the letter to Gov. Smith, who, in returning it, the General says, seemed, in common with other Virginians, to be possessed with the idea that I had forfeited my right of residence in Virginia, and that where there was no statute law to meet the case, they had a right to rely on common law.—What common law is meant, I don't know; perhaps it is the 'higher law,' though I am rather inclined to believe it must be a lower law." * * * * *

VIRGINIA FREEDOM.—We recently announced the formation of a Republican Association at Wheeling, Va. From the Wheeling papers we learn that a meeting of the Association was held on the evening of the 15th inst., which ended in a fight. An address was delivered by Dr. G. P. Smith. No particular disturbance appears to have taken place during the meeting, but afterwards Smith was attacked by a crowd in the street, and he was taken to jail in order to prevent being lynched. Although Smith's friends did not participate in the fight, yet he defended himself bravely, and severely wounded two of his as-

sailants. The Wheeling press comment in severe terms upon the organization, composed, as they assert, of Northerners, and threaten its members with dire punishment if they attempt to hold another meeting. It remains to be seen whether free speech can thus summarily be suppressed in the Old Dominion.

From the Boston Journal.

WHY FREMONT HAS NOT A SOUTHERN PARTY.

Fremont has no party at the South, and, therefore, he is sectional, say the Northern supporters of Buchanan. Those who read the account of the Fremont meeting in Wheeling, Va., the lynching of the principal speaker, and the approving comments of the press of that city, designed to prevent a similar gathering, will readily understand why Fremont has no party at the South. It is not because he has not plenty of friends in that section, but that system of intimidation which the slave power is now trying upon the freemen of the North, effectually represses freedom of speech and of action. The Fremont electoral tickets which have been put up in Kentucky, Maryland, and other Southern States, would get twenty votes where they now will one, if every man were free to express his own opinions. The New York *Mirror* well says:

"We sincerely and honestly believe, that if Mr. Fremont's principles and platform were thoroughly understood and the embargo on public demonstrations in his favor removed, a large and gallant Southern party would rally to his support. As the matter now stands, the ultraists require as much submission from the moderate thinkers among them as they have previously extorted from the North. In fact, they have grown more exacting. Formerly, a man who manifested no disposition to interfere with slavery in the States was considered 'sound'; now the test of orthodoxy is, that no Southern man shall oppose its extension; and the 347,000 slaveholders require of the 500,000 non-slaveholding voters, not merely a pledge to make no attempt to replace slave labor by free labor, but a concurrence in the ignominious, unjust and fraudulent Territorial policy of the Pierce administration."

The Wheeling *Times*, in its comments upon this riotous demonstration, acknowledges that "there are many men in our midst who think slavery an evil, more on account of the white man than the negro, and favor a system of wise, peaceable and gradual emancipation.—Such men are to be found in abundance in the South."

Translated from the *Staats-Demokrat*, August 12.

LOOK AT MISSOURI.—Germans in the Free States who lend themselves to aiding the slavery extensionists must blush when they see their brothers in the Slave States battling against the enemy of freedom. St. Louis, the metropolis of Missouri, has spoken, and her German population have joined in the cry which makes the party of the reaction tremble.

The Freesoiler Blair, who openly condemned the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and declared for free speech, free labor, and free Kansas, is elected to Congress from the St. Louis district. The votes of German citizens aided to achieve this victory.

All honor to the German population of St. Louis. Though residing in a Slave State, they nevertheless remain true to freedom.

MISSOURI.—A St. Louis correspondent of the *Chicago Tribune* asserts that the Benton vote of Missouri would have been much larger had it not been for the silent but effectual intimidation of the slaveholders. *There are 125,000 votes in Missouri, but only 90,000 were cast. He thinks the inference not unfair, that the thirty thousand silent voters would vote for free Kansas.* The writer says:

“A gentleman who witnessed the voting in an up-the-river district, described the following scene and made these statements:—Whenever a German came forward to deposit his vote, the rabble around the polls, who were armed with side arms, would shout—‘Stand back—make way for this wolly-head.’ Whenever a known Benton man of peaceable character appeared, the same language was made use of.

This intimidated hundreds in that country. It is a serious matter to be “spotted” by the ruffians, especially when one lives among them. Quiet men, who wished to live at peace among their neighbors, but who are opposed to ruffian sovereignty, remained at home.

The Atchison Democrats had tickets of a peculiar kind—I mean up the river. They were issued on fine note paper, with a fly leaf; a blue ribbon was attached to the sheet, and pro-slavery mottoes—as, for example, “*This ticket is sound on the goose*”—were printed around the names of the candidates.

Unorganized decency had no chance against organized ruffianism.

From the *Boston Chronicle*.

The following statement of facts, which we take from the *Boston Chronicle*, will serve to

prove that the Republican cause has its sympathizers, and even active supporters, at the South:

“Some seven years ago, William S. Bailey, a hard-working, ingenious mechanic of Newport, Ky., a machinist by trade, with a large family, and a hatred of slavery such as only an experience of its unspeakable oppressions on the white mechanic as well as the negro can engender, resolved to speak out, with such education as he has been able to pick up, through types of his own. In a Slave State, where such men as Birney and Cassius M. Clay had been frustrated in their efforts to establish an anti-slavery press, the attempt of a mere mechanic was looked upon as hopeless. But he procured press and types, taught his own family to print, and went ahead. His paper met with favor among men of his own class. The slaveholders set on ruffians to mob him, but with his own workmen and friends he defended his printing apparatus successfully. They got up opposition papers and lost their money. Bailey having a machine shop, with a good many hands in his employ, put his press and types in the upper story, and when the ruffians came to attack his paper, the sturdy workers in the metals were ready to pitch into them. Finding no other way to subdue him, about four years ago, they set fire to his shop and burnt down the whole. There was no insurance, and his loss, about \$6000, made him a poor man.

“By straining every nerve and stretching his credit, he procured printing materials and revived his paper. It is now printed weekly and daily—bears the flag of Fremont and Dayton—having all its types set by the *proprietor's own family of ten children*—and is the only daily paper in Kentucky out of Louisville. It is a fixed, living fact. It has a constituency. It is a political power in Kentucky. It has opened the eyes of tens of thousands—they are poor whites to be sure, but many of them will vote the Freedom ticket at the risk of becoming poorer. Mr. Bailey is now in this city, and assures us that he verily believes if Kentucky could be stumped for Freedom, and the mode of voting were such that the non-slaveholders could vote their true wishes without jeopardizing their livelihood, the State would give a decided majority for Fremont and Dayton.

“With such a power in his hands, and such a prospect before him, this brave mechanic finds himself burdened with a debt of some \$500, and without means to renew his worn type. We have seen a letter from Cassius M. Clay,

fully admitting, that if he would abandon his paper, he might, by his mechanical skill, at once surround himself with comfort. But he is determined to make Kentucky a Free State, and deliver the white non-slaveholders from their cruel bondage."

From the Mobile Advertiser.

"There are men here in Alabama, and in this county, who are not ashamed to own a preference for Fremont, or any other abolitionist, to Buchanan. How can the South ever expect to maintain her self-respect, or obtain her just rights, if she even endures such persons on her soil, much less permits them to occupy influential positions within her borders?"

From the New York Post.

More Shutting of the Eyes to See in the South.

The telegraph announces the expulsion from Mobile of Wm. Strickland and E. Upson, composing the firm of Strickland & Co., booksellers and stationers, in that city, for selling books of what are termed an "incendiary character."

A committee of five was appointed by somebody to wait upon them, and tell them to leave within five days. They left without delay. They were large dealers in books, and Mobile will miss them seriously.

The Terrorism of the Press in New Orleans.

The following communication appears in a German paper published in New Orleans, which is slightly tinged with Free-soilism:

"To the Editors of the *Deutsche Zeitung*:"

"Gentlemen: The course which your journal has pursued within the last few months is undoubtedly calculated to bring disgrace and dishonor upon all citizens of German extraction, who, because supporting such a sheet, are denounced as abolitionists. This state of things must have an end. I have, therefore, prepared some extracts from your journal, which will prove it to be a stumbling block that cannot be tolerated in this section; and these extracts I shall send to an Anglo-American paper for publication. You will readily perceive that the further existence of your journal, after such exposure, will be out of the question. Before having recourse to this extreme measure, however, I will give you timely warning. I now tender the following propositions:

"1. Hoist the Democratic flag immediately, and publish the entire Democratic ticket until after the election.

"2. Advocate publicly and purely the Democratic principles.

"The result of such a course will be to unite the German voters at the coming election.

"I must, however, beg you to forward to me a formal written guaranty to accept and abide by my stipulations before 12 o'clock M., this day. If, up to that hour, such a guaranty is not received, I shall act, and you must then bear the consequences.

"Respectfully y^rs, C. F. HEUNISCH.

"Notary's Office, 97 Exchange place."

From the Chicago Tribune.

PENSACOLA, Leake Co., }

Miss., July 2, 1856. }

Editors Chicago Tribune:

* * * I, in common with many Southern men, feel a deep interest in your success in the Kansas struggle, as well as in the ensuing Presidential election; but we dare do nothing, as we should thereby expatriate ourselves, or suffer intolerable persecution from the slaveholders and those under their influence. I long, however, to mount the stump and tell my Northern friends what many Southern men really do think of public affairs in the present crisis. *But we are tongue-tied—speechless, and dare not open our mouths in defence of equal rights and free labor, without falling under the merciless displeasure of the "Oligarchy,"* as you Northerners correctly call them. Yet many of us would brave their anger and malevolence, but for our families and relations that would suffer on our account the ruthless vengeance of the public oppressors of our fair land.

* * * * *

Many a silent but earnest prayer will be uttered for your complete success in November, by true-hearted patriots south of Mason and Dixon's line, who will work and vote for Fillmore as the least of two evils, trusting that their thralldom may be overthrown by the success of Fremont. He is our hope and morning star. If he sets in darkness, our last hope expires, and leaves us in gloom. May God in his mercy avert such a calamity from our land. His success will revive the smouldering fires of freedom in the breasts of tens of thousands of non-slaveholders by compulsion. *Before his four years end there will be a powerful gradual-emanipation party organized in all the Northern Slave States on Clay's plan, while we farther South in the cotton and sugar region, will conjure the right of Free Speech, and of subscribing to, and receiving such newspapers as we please.* Work and pray for Fremont; but be sure and work whether you pray or not.

Yours truly, **

Free Speech and Fremont in Texas.

If any one wishes to know why delegates from the Southern States were not more generally in attendance upon the convention that nominated Col. Fremont, and why electoral tickets in his favor will not be generally run in the South, they may have their innocent eyes opened by reading the following report of the proceedings of a public meeting held the other day at Galveston, Texas.

From the Galveston News.

Proceedings of a Public Meeting in Galveston, Texas.

At a meeting of the citizens of Galveston, convened to take into consideration the propriety of permitting Lorenzo Sherwood to address the people in defence of his course in the last legislature, Col. M. Williams was called to the chair, and Alfred F. James appointed secretary, when, after explaining the object of the meeting, it was

Resolved, That the following letter, prepared and read by Mr. Ballinger, be addressed to Mr. Sherwood as embracing the views and sentiments of this meeting, in relation to the contemplated address:

"GALVESTON, Monday, July 7, 1856.

"Lorenzo Sherwood, Esq.,—Sir: At a public meeting of the citizens of Galveston, convened this morning at the court-house, in consequence of your public notice that you would make an address this evening in defence of your course in the last Legislature, it was unanimously resolved to notify you of the well-considered sentiments and resolute determination of the people of Galveston, as follows:

"That your right, in common with every other citizen, to free opinion, free discussion, and the largest liberty of self-defence, is fully recognized, and will be respected. (?)

"But there is one subject connected with your course in the Legislature—that of slavery—on which neither you, nor any one entertaining your views, will be permitted to appear before the community in a public manner. That your views on that subject are unsound and dangerous, is the fixed belief of this community, caused by your own speeches, writings and acts.

"We are aware that either actually or seemingly, you wholly misapprehend the real views of the people of Texas, and suppose that, by explanation and argument, you can make your anti-slavery theories and plans inoffensive and acceptable. How far this should be attributed, on your part, to delusion, and how far to design, is not material. *The slavery subject is not one which is open to you before us.*

"You are, therefore, explicitly and peremptorily notified, that, in your speech, you will not be permitted to touch, in any manner, on the subject of slavery, or your opinions thereon, either directly or indirectly, or by way of explanation or otherwise. Under the pretext of the personal right of self-defence, you will not be tolerated in any attempt to defend your course in the Legislature on this subject, which was an aggression on the rights, and an outrage on the feelings of the State of Texas, and much more on those of the people of Galveston, whom you misrepresented, than on any other.

"The entire subject of slavery, in all its connections, is forbidden ground, which you shall not invade.

"Your introduction of it in any manner will be the prompt signal for consequences to which we need not allude.

"It has been asserted that you have some supporters in this community on that subject. We trust not. But if so, and if they have sufficient presumption to undertake to sustain you in any further discussion on this subject, before the people, they will make this evening the occasion for the definite and final settlement of that issue, both as to you and to them.

"We trust, however, that you will confine yourself to matters of legitimate public interest and discussion, and will not hereafter, *either in public or private*, further abuse the patience of a people with whom, on that question, you have no congeniality, and whom you wholly misunderstand.

"This communication will be read to the assembled public before you proceed with your speech; and you will clearly understand, is not to be the subject of any animadversion by you."

The meeting was addressed by Messrs. W. P. Ballinger, P. R. Edwards, H. Stuart, T. M. Joseph, B. C. Franklin, S. M. Williams, F. M. Merriman, O. Farish, M. B. Menard, N. John, and J. J. Hendly.

Col. S. M. Williams, Judge B. C. Franklin, Wm. P. Ballinger, Esq., and Col. E. McLean were appointed a committee to deliver to Mr. Sherwood a copy of the letter addressed to him by this meeting.

On motion of Mr. Hamilton Stuart, Esq., all those opposed to the action taken by this meeting were requested to withdraw, whereupon Messrs. Joseph J. Hendly and Stephen Van Sickle retired.

The meeting then adjourned to meet again this evening at the place appointed by Mr. Sherwood to deliver his address.

SAMUEL M. WILLIAMS, Chairman.

A. F. JAMES, Secretary.

In addition to the foregoing, the reader will remember the recent indictment of a man in Arkansas for circulating Sumner's speech. Also the violent breaking up of a meeting convened at Baltimore, September 11th, for nominating a Fremont electoral ticket for Maryland. The Republican party a geographical party! *Whose fault is it that the South does not go for him?*

What the South thinks of Fremont's Chance.

The editor of the *Georgia Telegraph*, a Buchanan paper, has recently visited New York, and writes from that city, July 10, as follows, with regard to the political prospects:

"The current of floating opinion here is most decided that Fremont will carry, without difficulty, every non-slaveholding State, even Pennsylvania. I have just seen a friend who returned yesterday from the rural districts in Pennsylvania, and he says the drift is all for Fremont, so far as he could see. So westward, I hear, all the indices of the popular feeling are for Fremont. I saw yesterday a Southern friend who has been locomoting around Vermont and the strongest abolition regions of New England — a talking and observing friend, and a "dyed-in-the-wool" Democrat. He said he found only three Buchanan and one Fillmore man in those parts. In the city here, which is naturally rather liberal and cosmopolitan in opinion, the Free Soil ticket rules the roost. The most moderate of the old Whig party are going for Fillmore, but the bulk of that party is going for Fremont. The first classification named comprehends all of the more modern political development of Know Nothingism, which Mr. Fillmore seems likely to get. Buchanan's vote, so far as can be judged, is confined to the regular Democracy, shorn of the more Free Soilish and fishy portion of the same."

The *New Orleans Bulletin* cautions its friends not to be deceived or misled, for

"No honest journal will gainsay the fact that the cause of Free-soilism is gaining ground, and the election of Fremont is not an improbable contingency."

From the *N. O. Courier*, August 22.

As to the chances of the several candidates, we expect we know just as much as any one else, fully as competent to judge, and just as much entitled to credit and confidence. We can arrive at no conclusion satisfactory to our-

selves, or which would be to others. Our belief is, or, speaking more candidly, our fear is, that if there should be any election by the people, Fremont will be elected.

WHO ARE THE DISUNIONISTS?

The following extracts are selected from authentic records of opinions expressed by men, all of whom are now prominent supporters of Buchanan or Fillmore:

BY SENATOR YULEE, OF FLORIDA.

"For my part, I am ready to proceed to extreme measures, even to the dissolution of the Union."

BY SENATOR BROWN, OF MISSISSIPPI.

"If the Wilmot Proviso is adopted, it will raise a storm that will sweep away this Union, and I pray God devoutly it will do so."

BY MR. MORSE, OF LOUISIANA.

"The Southern man who will stand up and say that he is for the Union, 'now and forever,' is more dangerous to the people he represents than those who are in open hostility. If California be trammelled with a preamble declaring the Territory now free, I am willing to dissolve the Union."

BY MR. STANTON, OF TENNESSEE.

"When the Wilmot Proviso is adopted, I and the South are ready to walk out of the Union."

BY SENATOR BUTLER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

"I do not make the salvation of the Union the paramount question."

BY SENATOR MASON, OF VIRGINIA.

"It is time the yoke was thrown off and the question settled."

BY MR. COLCOCK, OF GEORGIA.

"If the Wilmot Proviso should pass in any form, I will introduce a bill for the dissolution of the Union."

BY MR. MEAD, OF VIRGINIA.

"If you exclude us, I am not willing to submit. * * We intend to have the land peaceably if we can, *forcibly* if we must."

BY MR. MCWILLE, OF MISSISSIPPI.

"The people of the South know their rights, and will maintain them at all hazards, even should disunion result. * * * The South must defend their rights at the expense of blood."

The following resolution was adopted at a Congressional caucus of Southern Democrats held in Washington, January, 1849:

"Resolved, That the dissolution of the Union is preferable to the submission of the South to the Wilmot Proviso."

The following toasts were drank at a Democratic 4th of July celebration at Atchison City, in Kansas:

"*Disunion*: — By secession or otherwise — a beacon of hope to an oppressed people, and the surest remedy for Southern wrongs. [Enthusiastic cheers.]"

"*The City of Atchison*: — May she, before the close of the year '57, be the capital of a Southern republic. [Cheers.]"

LISTEN TO THE FATHER OF MODERN DEMOCRACY.

In 1835, Mr. Calhoun introduced into the Senate a bill, "to prohibit the circulation in the Slave States of any publication or picture touching the subject of slavery," through the U. S. mails. In support of this bill, which was opposed by Mr. Webster and Mr. Clay and never passed, Mr. Calhoun uttered the following audacious doctrine:

"Should such be your decision by refusing to pass this bill, I shall say to the people of the South, Look to yourselves — you have nothing to hope from others. But I must tell the Senate, be your decision what it may, the South will never abandon the principles of this bill. If you refuse co-operation with our laws, and conflict should ensue between your and our law, the Southern States will never yield to the superiority of yours. * * * Let it be fixed, let it be riveted in every Southern mind, that the laws of the Slaveholding States for the protection of their domestic institutions are paramount to the laws of the general government in regulation of commerce and the mail, and that the latter must yield to the former in the event of conflict; and that, if the government should refuse to yield, the States have a right to interpose, and we are safe."

From the "Boston Journal."

WHO ARE THE DISUNIONISTS? — Gov. Wells, of Maine, in a late speech at Rockland, enunciates the following entirely characteristic sentiment: —

"If Fremont should be elected, the South will secede, and the Democratic party of the North will sustain the South. Shall the Democrats of the North be ruled by the Republicans? No, never."

This is but another way of saying that the Northern Democrats, who are now so loud-mouthed in their professions of devotion to the Union, will help to break up this glorious confederacy, if they find themselves, as they are likely to, in a minority at the approaching election.

From the "South Side (Va.) Democrat," Aug. 29.

A STRANGE POSITION. — We regret that there is a newspaper in Virginia which holds such language as the following: —

"The election of Fremont, whatever it may lead to, certainly will not in itself be a violation of the Constitution; nor are we to take it conclusively for granted that the Constitution must needs suffer violence under his administration. It will be time enough for the most ultra secessionists and disunionists at the South to call out for extreme measures when the exigency shall arise."

The Norfolk *Herald* is responsible for this sentiment. We think it will not increase its circulation, or render itself more popular in the estimation of its readers, by making such an avowal. The *Herald* must know and believe that THE SOUTH WILL NEVER SUBMIT TO BE GOVERNED BY THE BLACK REPUBLICAN PARTY. This paper has already been quoted by the New York *Evening Post* as talking "sensibly" in relation to the election of Fremont; and we hope, for the sake of Virginia and the whole South, that it may be more guarded about this matter. We have no idea that the venerable editor of the Norfolk *Herald* desires or expects the election of such a fellow as Fremont; but we submit that such language as the above is not calculated to lessen his chances.

MR. FILLMORE PATTING THE SOUTHERN DISUNIONISTS ON THE BACK! EXTRACT FROM HIS ALBANY SPEECH.

"Sir, you have been pleased to say that I have the union of these States at heart. [You have, you have, sir.] This, sir, is most true; for, if there be one object dearer to me than any other, it is the unity, prosperity, and glory of this great republic [great cheering]; and I confess frankly, sir, that I fear it is in danger. I say nothing, of any particular section, much less of the several candidates before the people. I presume they are all honorable men. But, sir, what do we see? An exasperated state of feeling between the North and the South on the most exciting of all topics, resulting in bloodshed and organized military array. But this is not all, sir.

"We see a political party presenting candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, selected for the first time from the Free States alone, with the avowed purpose of electing these candidates by suffrages of one part of the Union only to rule over the whole United States. [Cries of 'Shame! Shame!'] Can it be possible that those who are engaged in

such a measure can have seriously reflected upon the consequences which must inevitably follow, in case of success? CAN THEY HAVE THE MADNESS OR THE FOLLY TO BELIEVE THAT OUR SOUTHERN BRETHREN WOULD SUBMIT TO BE GOVERNED BY SUCH A CHIEF MAGISTRATE? . . .

"These are serious, but practical questions; and, in order to appreciate them fully, it is only necessary to turn the tables upon ourselves, and suppose that the South, having a majority of the electoral votes, should declare that they would only have slaveholders for President or Vice-President, and should elect such by their exclusive suffrages to rule over us at the North, — do you think we would submit to it? [Cries of 'No.'] No, not for one moment. And do you believe your Southern brethren less sensitive on this subject than you are, or less jealous of their rights? ['No, no.'] If you do, let me tell you, you are certainly mistaken. And therefore you must see, that, if this sectional party succeeds, it leads inevitably to the destruction of this beautiful fabric, reared by our forefathers, cemented by their blood, and bequeathed to us as a priceless inheritance!"

From the "Boston Journal."

A SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY. — The Washington correspondent of the New Orleans *Delta* indirectly lets out some of the secrets of the Nicaragua and Cuba movements. We ask attention to the closing paragraph in the following extract, in which the purpose of forming a Southern confederacy, embracing Cuba, Nicaragua, and Mexico, is frankly avowed: —

"Fremont is gaining ground daily. There is no doubt of it. There is the greatest anxiety here. The wildest alarm is manifested by the political managers. The long slumbering sentiment of the Northern people, so long suppressed and hidden from the South by political party-hacks, and diverted from its course by the compromise of the Constitution, is out at last in the open day. There is no disguise now. The irresponsible and radically unconstitutional masses of this Northern Free Society are upon us. The wolf is in our path. The crisis which Mr. Calhoun predicted is at hand. There is only one single hope on which to hang a faith in our success. It is that the larger majority of the Northern people are *not* actually and conscientiously opposed to slavery. There are people here from the North who stoutly assert it. There are plenty of Southern

men who eagerly believe it, and retail their convictions to a too credulous public. The North not anti-slavery!

"We have one consolation at least, and that is that we can and will outlive the degradation of Fremont's election. It will unite us. It will hasten that event (a Southern confederacy embracing Cuba, Nicaragua, and Mexico) which many regard as inevitable, by presenting an issue in which the South will unite to a man. The insult of such an election of such a man, on such a platform, will not be borne by the Southern people. It will be a blow in the face!"

Whether the *attempted* organization of a Southern republic will be advanced or retarded by the election of Fremont is a matter of opinion. We differ from the writer, and will state the grounds for our belief that the triumph of Fremont would save the Union. The establishment of a Southern confederacy is a scheme which has long been entertained by the Southern secessionists; and the policy of the Democratic administrations, which they control, has unmistakably tended to ripen it. The annexation of Texas was the first step towards the accomplishment of this notable scheme. Then followed the Mexican war, with its territorial acquisitions, extending still further our Southern frontier. The Taylor and Fillmore administrations were not controlled by the secessionists, who returned to power with Pierce, and re-commenced their work. One of their first measures to promote the carrying out of their scheme, under the existing administration, was to obtain by purchase another large slice of territory from Mexico, including a route for a Southern railroad to the Pacific. They have already established a foothold in Nicaragua, and expected to acquire Cuba during this administration, but have failed to find a plausible pretext for a war with Spain. The acquisition of Cuba is therefore deferred until the anticipated election of Buchanan, who is pledged to make this a leading object of his administration.

The election of Fremont will defeat for a time, and perhaps for ever, this notable scheme of the Southern secessionists. It is no part of their purpose to secede until their plans are fully ripe; and we predict that *there will be no open movement to establish a Southern confederacy until Cuba is acquired, and a Southern railroad is built with the federal money.* Then not all the labors and self-sacrifices, the moving appeals and patriotic genuflections, of the Union-savers of the North, will prevent the Southern conspirators from *making an attempt*

to dissolve the Union. We may defer the evil day by check-mating the schemes of the secessionists; but we are only hastening it by helping them to build up an overshadowing power South of Mason and Dixon's line.

From the "Boston Journal."

The Richmond *Enquirer*, one of the ablest and most influential of the Southern journals that support Buchanan, does not hesitate to avow that it seeks disunion, and that it advocates Mr. Buchanan's election *because it strengthens the disunion party*. The following extracts from an article in the *Enquirer* show the ulterior objects of the Southern slaveholders:—

"The election of Mr. Buchanan may, and probably will, originate a reaction in public opinion that will encourage the extension of the conservative institution of slavery, and the extension of the British and Southern European races, for the purpose of stemming and turning back the torrent of infidelity, materialism, sensuality, agrarianism, and anarchy, that threatens to overwhelm us from the prolific hive of Northern Europe.

"The election of Mr. Buchanan would be a reactionary movement in favor of slavery and conservatism.

"Forewarned, forearmed.' We see, the numbers, the character, the designs of our enemies. *Let us prepare to resist them, and drive them back.*

"Let the South present a compact and undivided front. Let her show to the barbarians that her sparse population offers little hopes of plunder; her military and self-reliant habits, and her mountain retreats, little prospects of victory; and her firm union and devoted resolution, no chances of conquest. LET HER, IF POSSIBLE, DETACH PENNSYLVANIA AND SOUTHERN OHIO, SOUTHERN INDIANA AND SOUTHERN ILLINOIS, FROM THE NORTH, AND MAKE THE HIGHLANDS BETWEEN THE OHIO AND THE LAKES THE DIVIDING LINE. LET THE SOUTH TREAT WITH CALIFORNIA, AND, IF NECESSARY, ALLY HERSELF WITH RUSSIA, WITH CUBA AND BRAZIL.

"A common danger from without, and a common necessity (slavery) within, will be sure to make the South a great, a united, a vigilant, and a warlike people."

The Charleston (S. C.) *Mercury*, another Buchanan paper, bluntly avows the same object:—

"There is not a single public man in her limits (South Carolina), not one of her present Representatives or Senators in Congress, who

is not pledged to the lips in favor of disunion. We have had enough of the 'Glorious Union.' The association, on our part, has long been dishonorable; now, what with genteel scoundrelism, exhibited in fashionable bankruptcies, foreign and free negro riots, open and professed infidelity, &c., &c., the connection has become actually disreputable. A thoroughly organized *disunion party* is the desideratum; and, until such be formed at the South, all time devoted to political discussion will be time wasted."

Still another Buchanan paper, the New Orleans *Delta*, incautiously avowed, some two or three weeks ago, that there was a design to form a Southern confederacy, embracing Cuba, Nicaragua, and Mexico.

Would it not be well for the intense Union-loving (?) orators and journals of the Buchanan party of the North to denounce the Richmond *Enquirer*, the Charleston *Mercury*, the New Orleans *Delta*, and those members of Congress who are "pledged to the lips in favor of disunion," before they attempt to arraign as traitors public men and presses who have never given utterance to an unpatriotic sentiment, and whose motto is, "*Liberty for the sake of the Union*"?

SOUTH CAROLINA SCRIPTURE.—We have heard a good deal of late from the Rufus Choates, and such other wandering political stars of the geographical party who propose to go for Col. Fremont, and who lay it down as the cardinal principle of their platform, that they do not league together against the Union. The leading journal of Charleston, S. C., has the following most extraordinary and revolutionary sentiments:—

"THERE IS NOT A SINGLE PUBLIC MAN IN HER LIMITS, NOT ONE OF HER PRESENT REPRESENTATIVES OR SENATORS IN CONGRESS, WHO IS NOT PLEDGED TO THE LIPS IN FAVOR OF DISUNION. Indeed, we well remember that one of the most prominent leaders of the cooperation party, when taunted with submission, rebuked the thought by saying, that, in opposing secession, he only took a step backward to strike a blow more deadly against the Union."

If this sentiment was made at the North by a Fremont journal, it would be paraded at the head of all the Democratic papers, as a reason to go for Buchanan. But when it is made in a Democratic organ in another State, that happens to be (it could be no worse) a Slave State, it attracts no attention from them. It seems the South Carolina members of Congress

are pledged, absolutely pledged, to disunion, — that the Keitts and Brooks, if they can, will strike deadly blows at the Union. So their leading organ declares.

The sacredness of South Carolina we cannot see; still less because it happens to be a Slave State. Does that make South Carolina a sainted community? Does treason there grow to be as sacred as the Scriptures? Do the Choates and Curtises go for South Carolina, because its chief men in Congress are striking deadly blows at the Union? They go for South Carolina, — why, it is more than is in our power to discover. — *New Bedford Mercury*.

Let it be observed that the *ultra Abolitionists*, who avowedly seek the dissolution of the Union, go for Buchanan, as the surest way of accomplishing their end.

THE ABOLITIONISTS AND BUCHANAN. — We have already published Garrison's avowed preference for the election of Buchanan over that of Fremont, and now we find his followers taking the same ground.

Parker Pillsbury, a prominent Garrisonian, in a speech at Framingham on the 4th of July, declared his preference for the election of Buchanan, "because it would tend to promote and influence the anti-slavery agitation, while that of Fremont would tend to a cessation of it."

So also H. N. Smith, an earnest disciple of Garrison, writes from the West, that, if Fremont is elected, "the Union will be strengthened, and he fears made permanent;" but that Buchanan's election will produce such fierce and continued agitation in Kansas and all over the country, that the Union can hardly last through his term of office. "For these reasons," says Mr. Smith, "I, AS A CONSISTENT OPPONENT OF ANY UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS, EARNESTLY DESIRE THE ELECTION OF MR. BUCHANAN; FOR THAT, I THINK, WILL BRING THE UNION TO A SPEEDY CLOSE." — *Portland Advertiser*.

From the "New York Post."

The Way to quiet Slavery Agitation.

The *Anti-Slavery Standard* is opposed to the Republican movement, because it will stop slavery agitation, and "will, in its benumbing and satisfying influence, retard the movements of the slaves' redemption."

No doubt the election of Fremont will have both these tendencies. It will stop slavery agitation, because it will put an end to the fraud

and injustice which have roused the indignation of all the Free States during the past few years; it will also paralyze the efforts of the few who are disposed to interfere unlawfully with the tenure of slave property within the States. On the other hand, the election of Buchanan will be construed into a popular approval of the pro-slavery policy of the late administration, and will invite further aggressions, which will, of course, be followed by a still more violent agitation. We were informed only this morning, by a Democrat of many years' standing, that he meant to vote for Buchanan as the quickest way of bringing the question of freedom or slavery, civilization or barbarism, in this country to a crisis. He said, that, if Buchanan was elected, he would not carry on his administration four years without abolitionizing the country.

We incline to think that he was correct in his logic, though we do not see so clearly the wisdom of the course of action to which it guides him. Fremont is the conservative candidate in this campaign; and his election, we confidently believe, would promptly put an end to the sectional agitation which has left the country, for years past, a prey to demagogues and noodles.

From the *New Bedford Mercury*.

What are the Real Questions in Issue?

The present political contest differs from all previous ones IN ITS DIRECT BEARING UPON THE INTERESTS OF THE LABORING CLASS. Other important issues which have from time to time been presented, have borne more directly upon capitalists and corporations. Though a wise political economy teaches us that no one link in the great chain of industrial pursuits can be broken without seriously affecting the rest more or less remotely, it has required a close train of reasoning, and large field of illustration, to prove the ultimate effect upon the great mass of the people.

In the present campaign, however, the issue is forced upon us with the most unmistakable distinctness. It is the great question of the supremacy of free over slave labor. It is a question which appeals to the self-interest no less than the self-pride of the laborer. Every man who is in favor of the present remunerative rate of wages at the North, who wishes to preserve for himself an honorable independence, to whom the dignity of labor is dear, should ask himself the question whether he is ready to stultify himself by voting for that party candidate whose avowed policy it is, to bring slave labor into direct competition with

that of the freeman. The triumph of FREMONT and DAYTON will be the victory of freedom over slavery—of the sacred rights which have descended to us from the Revolution, over the vile squatter sovereignty of Douglas and the Democratic party who uphold him, and who believe the Declaration of Independence to be only enthusiastic declamation.

The Democratic party is so only in name. Its Democracy is a lie, a cheat, and a delusion. It is the party which has been the obedient slave of the aristocratic oligarchy of the South, which would have the twenty millions of freemen surrender their dearest privileges at the ipse dixit of 347,000 slaveholders, which has sought to enforce, by the bayonets of the United States soldiers, the iniquitous laws of Kansas, and which turned a deaf ear to the eloquent appeals of her unhappy children for protection from the pro-slavery ruffians.

No laboring man who has not either a very weak head or a very bad heart, will vote for James Buchanan, the representative of the Democratic Platform. To attempt to shirk that responsibility by voting for Fillmore, is unworthy of a high-minded freeman, since it is only an idle farce so far as any chance of his election is concerned. Let the laboring men of the North remember, that Fremont can only be elected by the united efforts of the North. Already, the small corporal's guard of Fillmore men in North Carolina, have voted to throw their votes for Buchanan, feeling certain that the contest must be between the Democratic and the Republican parties. Let them consider that divided counsels and a wavering policy is the most suicidal course that they can adopt. Never before were such vital interests at stake. Let them see to it that they are not false to their trusts, false to their honor and every interest which is near and dear to them.

From the Wellsborough (Pa.) Agitator.

Letter from Hon. Philip Dorshiemer.

We take great pleasure in publishing the following letter from the Hon. Philip Dorshiemer, of Buffalo, N. Y., so pertinent is it to the question at issue, and soon to be pronounced upon at the ballot-box. Mr. Dorshiemer, as will be seen, is an adopted citizen, a German, and one of many of his distinguished countrymen who have declared for Fremont and Dayton. With him Democracy is something more than a name—it is a great *principle*; and that principle being found in the Republican, and not in the so-called Democratic platform, ex-

plains his repudiation of Mr. Buchanan. Read it, citizens, adopted and native; it will do you good. It is a noble and manly letter. It has been furnished us by J. F. Donaldson, Esq., of this place, to whom it is addressed:

BUFFALO, July 15, 1856.

Dear Sir: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter asking me to visit the counties of Tioga and Lycoming. I have delayed answering this invitation, because I hoped to be able to accept it; but I am sorry to say that my present engagements are such that I cannot fix upon any time for visiting Pennsylvania. Sometime in the autumn I may be able to, and if so I will inform you.

IT IS THE SPECIAL DUTY OF FOREIGN BORN CITIZENS TO VOTE THE REPUBLICAN TICKET. Most foreigners come here, as I did, with no other wealth than the strength of their hands. They have to depend upon their labor for all their hopes of future comfort, usefulness and dignity. Of all the blessings which American liberty promises them, the most valuable is the assurance it gives of freedom to work, and security for their earnings. They can part with all other privileges—the elective franchise—eligibility to office—rather than this one.

SLAVERY DEGRADES THE WORKING MAN. IT REDUCES HIM TO THE LEVEL OF THE SLAVE. No Know-Nothing proscription can be so effective as that which excludes free labor from slave soil. From all that soil, comprising more than one half the territory of the States, foreigners are to-day banished by laws more positive than any legislative enactment, and it is now the purpose of a large and powerful party to banish them from the prairies of the West. Those regions belong to all of us, to the Southerner and Notherner, the foreigner and native; and it is that each man may have his share, and enjoy his rights, that the Republican party enters the fight this campaign.

You say, sir, that most of the Germans in your neighborhood have hitherto been Democrats. This is the very reason why they should be Republicans now. For more than thirty years I have been a Democrat, never voting any other ticket, and that is what makes me a Republican. The Republican policy is the Democratic policy, a policy which was carried out by the administrations of Jefferson, Monroe, Jackson and Polk; which received the approval of Democratic statesmen like Van Buren, Silas Wright and Cass; and the constitutionality of which was never, until within a

few years, called into question by any Democrat, not even by such doubtful and unsteady Democrats as John C. Calhoun and James Buchanan. This new policy of the extension of slavery is not Democratic at all. It was not thought so by its author until after he had left the Democratic party and entered the Cabinet of a Whig President. Its chief supporters from the South are renegade Whigs. Every foreigner ought to be a Republican, but if he is a Democrat as well as a foreigner, I cannot see how he can refuse to become one.

Besides, sir, we adopted citizens ought to do all in our power to put down this sectional agitation, and to preserve the Union of these States, upon which our prosperity and the prosperity of all citizens depend. For this, what course is left open to us? On the one side we see a party which has reopened sectional agitation; revived the slavery dispute; and which proposes to aggrandize one portion of the country at the expense of all others. This party is now represented by an administration, the most influential members of which, and whose chief supporters in Congress are, Southern secessionists, open and avowed disunionists. These men do not seek to preserve the Union; while in it they use the power of the government, so that Southern territory will be larger when they go out of it. On the other hand, we see a party, fortunately neither large nor powerful, which besides being fully committed to these sectional schemes of disunion, seeks to destroy the harmony of our society by drawing distinctions between men of different races and creeds.

I have no choice left except to go with the only truly national party, the great Republican party, by which the whole country, both North South, and all citizens, Catholic and Protestant, native and foreigner, will be protected in every right, privilege and liberty; and in whose hands the federal government will be safe against all enemies at home or abroad.

We are singularly fortunate in our candidate. I know Colonel Fremont to be an honest man, with ability more than sufficient for any duty which may be required of him. His whole career, all his associations, show him to be a truly national man. He is the son of a foreigner, he is a Southerner by birth and education, his life has been spent in the service of the whole country, he has done more for her than any living American, and he is conscientiously in favor of that time-honored policy which protects slavery where it exists under State laws, and prohibits its extension into territory now free.

Hoping to see you in the course of a month or two, I remain, most truly, your servant,

PHILIP DORSHEIMER.

To J. F. DONALDSON, Esq.

A SIMPLE TRUTH FOR LABORING MEN. If you vote for Millard Fillmore or James Buchanan, you vote to deprive yourself and your children of a just and equitable return for your labor, of the advantages to be derived from the exhaustless wealth of our Western Territories, and the inestimable privileges of general education. And why? Because Millard Fillmore and James Buchanan are the representatives of 346,524 slave owners; because they are pledged to their interests; and because those interests are dependent upon the degradation of all labor. Mechanics of the North! working men of the North! are you ready to make these sacrifices for the aggrandizement of a miserable minority? Are you ready to bow your necks that these Southern task-masters may place their ruthless feet upon them? If not, record your names upon the roll for Fremont.—*Newark Mercury.*

From the N. Y. Post.

A Few Plain Statements.

Newspapers, like preachers, are sometimes censured for being too much afraid of reiterating plain and elementary statements of facts which the people need to comprehend. They are apt to take too much for granted, and suppose that what had once been made plain to their readers, every one has read and thoroughly digested. Whereas in truth, it is only at certain favored moments that ideas obtain a productive lodgment in men's minds, so as to become available as motives to action. We take it for granted that a multitude of our readers are now awakened, in an unusual degree, to political questions, and are in a state of mind sure to welcome the repetition of a few plain statements, which they either have not heretofore distinctly appreciated, or have allowed to slip away in some measure from their recollection.

Let it be observed, then, that *the leading issue in this campaign, is that of freedom in Kansas.* The administration is seeking to establish slavery in Kansas, and to do it by the most unjust and oppressive measures, and in opposition to the known wishes of a very large majority of the resident citizens there. The principle on which we have started is that of a union of all who are in favor of freedom in Kansas. And we have nominated such men

as by their character and history are worthy to be relied on to secure this end, and such as we judge will get us the largest vote, because we need all the votes of all who agree with us on this question. We do not ask men what are their opinions on other matters; many of the most zealous in our cause voted for President Pierce, and have been disappointed by him. Several of our leading men voted for the Nebraska bill, or advocated it among the people, and are disgusted with the manner in which it has been carried out. We do not call them to account, nor expect to be called to account by them. Those who themselves would be willing to meet the slaveholders on a much broader and more comprehensive issue, are so sensible of the importance of preserving Kansas at this time, that they cheerfully forego all other demands, and trust to the future and to the will of the people to settle other questions some other time. It is a union of honest men for patriotic purposes, to establish justice towards Kansas, and to save the country from a great calamity. Every man who approves of our object can act with us and we with them, without any violation of principle or sacrifice of honor on either side.

On the Kansas question, let it be remembered that when the proposal first came up, four years ago, of organizing a territory west of the Missouri river, it was opposed by Atchison and other slaveholders in Congress, because the Missouri Compromise prohibited slavery there. Two years ago, Douglas proposed to repeal the prohibition, but said it was only to conciliate the South by humoring their wishes, while it would make no difference in the practical result, because it was impossible that Kansas should ever become a Slave State. He also said it was more Democratic to have all these questions settled by the inhabitants, and the favorite doctrine of popular sovereignty was appealed to and dwelt upon in every form of speech that could be thought of. Multitudes of people at the North believed this pretension, and so acquiesced in the measure, and it was passed as a concession to popular sovereignty. And those in the Free States who opposed the repeal of the prohibition, resolved to make the best of it after it was passed, in the expectation that the new act would at least secure the rights which were expressly guaranteed by it, of deciding the question of slavery by the votes of the settlers in Kansas; and they expected to abide by the decision of the settlers in good faith. It is no fault of theirs that they have been disappointed, but through the treachery of those who

have allowed and encouraged the rights of the settlers to be overborne by violence.

The people of the Free States considered that they had still as good a right as ever to go and settle in Kansas. They went there to gratify an enterprising disposition, to secure a home and some land, to avail themselves of the advantages of pre-emption, with a chance of time for making payment for their land. And they settled here and there, as each man thought for his own interest, and as he had a right to do. They expected to take their chance as to making Kansas a Free State, according to the will of the majority of settlers when they should come to vote. They wished it to be free, because they knew that was but for their own interest, and but for the prosperity of the State where they intended to make their homes. They were pursuing a lawful end only by lawful means, all open and above-board, taking the Nebraska bill as it appeared on the face of it, and according to the pledges of its friends. But it soon appeared that the administration, the authors of the Nebraska bill, and the slaveholders, had a very different idea of the intention and effect of that bill. The slaveholders have assumed that by the bill Kansas was given to them, it was theirs, that they had an absolute right to make it a Slave State and nothing else, and that those who went there hoping to make it a Free State were intruders and trespassers, whom it was right to resist in any and every way; to overpower by force, to expel and to kill, just as many white people treat Indians who stand in their way. And the administration too, have sustained the slaveholders to the fullest extent, in all their demands, and in all their outrages, showing that it was their original intention that Kansas should be made a Slave State at all hazards, and that the pretence that the Free States had an equal right in Kansas was a deception, made for political purposes. Thus, the free settlers were deceived; going there under the expectation that the government would protect them, and give them just an even chance, they have found the administration using its whole power to defeat or to crush them, and to give the control into the hands of a minority, and to keep up a civil war if slavery requires it.

Such being the state of the case, it is evident that there can be no hope of justice for Kansas, without a change of administration. This administration is fully resolved to push it through, and make Kansas a Slave State. The Cincinnati Convention pledged itself to carry out the design, and its candidates were nominated and are solemnly bound to the same

policy. Mr. Buchanan's administration will be but a prolongation of Mr. Pierce's. He himself so declared, and there is not a word to the contrary to be heard. There is no peace nor security for the Free State men of Kansas under either. They will continue to be held as enemies and outlaws who may be robbed or killed, as they are now, and no judge, attorney, jury or marshal appointed by the administration, thinks it worth while to inquire who did it. They are treated as of less account than Indians or slaves, for no wrong inflicted upon Free State men has been investigated or brought under legal notice in a single case.

The affair has been so complicated by the mismanagement of the administration, and such an exasperation of feeling has been cherished and authorized among the Missourians in the interest of slavery, that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, even for a just and energetic administration to quiet the controversy, and preserve peace and order, so long as a possibility is left open to the ruffians of effecting anything by their invasions. It is now impossible to secure an equitable ballot in the choice of a new territorial legislature, or of a constitutional convention, or on the adoption of a constitution protecting the rights of the people of Kansas, free from the interference of citizens of Missouri. There is no way to get out of the difficulty but by admitting Kansas as a State under the Topeka constitution. That is a good constitution; its provisions are wisely arranged, its principles are republican, and there is ample proof that it is acceptable to the great majority of actual settlers. There have been no irregularities in its formation greater than have been often overlooked in other cases; and the legislature and people have conducted throughout with singular wisdom and moderation, the more to be commended, from the trying and unusual circumstances in which they have been placed. There can be no doubt of their capacity for self-government, and to do honor to the Union as a sovereign State. No other State has commenced its history with a more worthy class of settlers. Her admission as a State will at once cure all defects and establish perfect peace, not only in that territory, but throughout the country, and nothing short of this will do it. The people of Kansas are not to be taken in by the specious schemes of Mr. Douglas; they know him and his plans too well. Neither are they of the sort to acquiesce in the violation of their rights. Kansas is their home; they have made it a Free State, and they will never

cease to agitate, in all lawful ways, till they have their rights.

It is plain, then, that there are only two sides to this question. He that wishes to vote for freedom in Kansas, for justice to Kansas, for peace and against civil war, let him vote for Fremont and Dayton. If we elect them, we have secured all. If we fail, we have done our duty to our country, let what will follow. *He that votes against Fremont, votes for slavery and oppression in Kansas, and for civil war in the country, whether he votes for Fillmore or Buchanan.* There is very little to choose between them on any account, and not a particle of difference as far as Kansas is concerned.

From the N. Y. Post.

What makes a Sectional Candidate?

General Houston has changed his mind since his late visit to Texas, and has concluded not to run for the Presidency this time. He means to support Fillmore instead. The party with which he acted, he says, "although it retains the name of Democracy, has no memories to which the present organization can refer without a blush of shame. It has dwindled down to mere sectionalism, and is now but a faction." The Republican party, on the other hand, is sectional in its character, and he "cannot conceive how any man, loving the Union, can support a ticket fraught with such disastrous consequences to the whole country as its success would be." He therefore avows his intention to support Mr. Fillmore, who combines in himself, in a pre-eminent degree, the objections raised to both the others. If the old Whig party has any memories to which its present organization, under Fillmore, can refer without a blush, then it is because its members have not sensibility enough left to feel as they should, in contemplating one of the most hideous phases of intolerance, bigotry and imposture of our age. In regard to sectionalism, which is the specific objection to the Cincinnati and Philadelphia candidates, we do not see in what respect the General betters himself by supporting Fillmore. If either of the three candidates is sectional, Millard Fillmore is that candidate. He was nominated by a Convention, from which the great body of the representatives of every Free State had withdrawn. He was nominated by the delegates from Slave States alone, assisted by a few minorities of their respective delegations from two or three of the Free States, not one of which, however, is likely to give Mr. Fillmore an electoral vote.

But General Houston does not need to be

taught, at this late day, that it is not the nomination, but the popular vote at the election, that determines whether a candidate is sectional or national. A man may run upon his own nomination, as the General did, for a month or two, without being sectional; but if he is supported only by a particular topical interest, by the slavery interest, for example, or the manufacturing interest, and is defeated, then he is a sectional candidate. If he gets a majority of the legal votes, from whatever States, between whatever degrees of latitude or longitude, he is the constitutional choice of the American people, and no more a sectional candidate than every candidate is who gets less than a unanimous vote. Now, it is not probable that either Fillmore or Buchanan can get, both together, five Free States. The best their friends expect for either, is, that they may defeat an election by the people, and have a chance for victory, the one in the House and the other in the Senate. There are some more sanguine as to results, but very few who suppose that either can carry more Free States than there were Southern States represented in the Philadelphia Convention. Will General Houston pretend that there is any probability of the Republican candidate occupying a more sectional position than this?

But in what, we beg to ask, consists the sectionalism of the Republican party in the eyes of the Texan Senator? By the terms of the call of the Philadelphia Convention all who were opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, to the Kansas policy of the administration, and to the nationalization of slavery by Congressional or Executive action, were invited to send delegates to it. No State or Territory, North or South, East or West, was deprived of the privilege of representation. In what, then, consists its sectional character? There was nothing, we believe, in the principles avowed by it, not entirely accordant with the principles entertained by General Houston himself. He has said as bad, if not worse, things of the Douglas legislation in Congress; he has not disguised his opposition to the extension of slavery, and his friends in the North pressed him with great earnestness as a candidate, upon the ground of his well-known sympathies with the Free State party. Did the Republican party sectionalize itself in the eyes of the Texan Senator by avowing doctrines which they might have learned from his lips? If so, then is every party sectional which avows any disputed opinions.

If the Southern States do not happen to

agree with the Northern States upon the candidates or policy which they respectively support, so much the worse for the weaker candidate, whether of the North or South; but we have yet to learn that the vote of a Free State for President is not worth just as much as that of a Slave State, or that a minority of slaveholders ought to have more weight in the choice of a chief magistrate than a majority of non-slaveholders. A *constitutional majority* is all that a candidate requires to make him a national and constitutional President; whether that majority come from the North or the South of the Potomac, or from the East or the West of the Alleghanies.

In what sense of the word, then, can Colonel Fremont be called a sectional candidate? His mother belonged to one of the oldest and most influential families in Virginia; he himself was born in Georgia, he was educated in South Carolina, and resided in Slave States exclusively till he was over thirty years of age. His wife is the daughter of a Virginia lady; her father was born in North Carolina; and she herself always resided in Slave States or Territories, until within a few years. Col. Fremont is, in every reputable sense of the term, a Southern man. He has no prejudices in regard to slavery which he did not acquire at the South, nor has he any, so far as we know, unfriendly to the best interests of the South. He was nominated, on the other hand, by delegates representing every Northern State, and is supported with a greater unanimity at the North, apparently, than either of the other candidates is at the South, whence they expect almost exclusively their support.

It is idle to call a candidate thus descended, educated, associated, nominated and confirmed, a sectional candidate. Of course, we did not expect Senator Houston to support Fremont or any other Republican so long as he has any political aspirations of his own ungratified, for such a course would not be tolerated by his constituency at present; but we must say that, like a distinguished citizen of our own State, recently, he has irrevocably lost a most splendid opportunity of keeping silent.

Extract from a Sermon by Rev. D. A. Tyng, of Philadelphia.

Slavery degrades bodily labor. It makes a man's bodily strength and manual skill less availing for his own profit and elevation. It thus diminishes and takes away his inherent property in himself. It lessens his pecuniary reward, and shuts up the door of promotion. *The question is, therefore, between the right of*

one man to the muscles of his neighbor and the right of thousands to the full benefit of their own muscles. It is whether one man is to leave his slave behind him, or whether a thousand white citizens are to be enslaved if they go. The rights of all our laboring classes, ten thousand to one slaveholder, are invaded in the attempt at the violent subjugation of Kansas. Moreover, there are many methods of remunerative labor of more intellectual character that are available only in a free community. In fact, there is scarcely a department of ingenuity or power, which the history and present state of our country do not show to be circumscribed and depreciated by the presence of slavery. The intellectual, literary, and inventive, as well as the bodily powers of man, become less available for individual and social prosperity. Every man, therefore, who is not himself a slaveholder, is interested for himself, his children, his relatives and friends in the exclusion of slavery.

WHO OUGHT TO RULE IN A NATION OF 27,000,000? THE 20,000,000 FREEMEN OF THE NORTH, OR THE SLAVEHOLDING OLIGARCHY OF 350,000 AT THE SOUTH? LET THE FOLLOWING EXTRACT ANSWER, FROM AN ARTICLE BY "CECIL" IN THE PHILADELPHIA NORTH AMERICAN FOR JULY 31.

The repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the introduction of these new doctrines of constitutional law, are consequences of a struggle for power between the North and the South. The South is afraid to trust the protection of slavery to the Constitution. It thinks that slavery can only be protected by extending it, by gaining new States for it, and thus securing more political power for it. By the regular constitutional action of the government, the South cannot do this without the consent of the Northern States, which it cannot be sure of obtaining. Southern politicians have therefore determined to alter the Constitution or disregard it, by force of votes, and it seems now, also, to seize on new territory by force of arms. Whether they are likely by these means to secure the safety they seek, is worth considering.

THERE IS ONE GREAT FACT OUT OF WHICH THIS CONTROVERSY HAS ARISEN, AND WHICH MUST GOVERN IT TO ITS END, WHATEVER THAT END MAY BE, AND THAT IS THE SUPERIOR POWER OF THE NORTHERN STATES. The difference between the North and South, in all the elements of power, now so vast, is growing greater every day. This is a stern, inexorable fact, remediless, irresistible, but which does not seem to have its

due influence upon the minds of our Southern neighbors. Power has certain qualities and laws, sure and punctual in their action, which cannot with safety be disregarded, and which, therefore, it is wiser to study and obey, than to deny and resist.

This is a government of the people. The Union is a Union, not of the States, but of the people. The great fundamental principle of our institutions is, that the majority of the people shall govern the country by their representatives, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. On what ground then, can the South claim political equality with the North? Political power is the consequence of superior numbers, and the North has the majority of the population by six millions. As a consequence, it has a majority of votes in Congress. It is entitled then, not to equality with the South, but to superiority over it. In all questions about which there is disagreement between the North and the South, *the North is entitled to govern the country.* Slavery is one of those questions. The North cannot interfere with slavery in the States where it exists, because it is there protected by the Constitution. But the Territories belong to the whole people, and Congress represents the whole. The government, the absolute control of the Territories, for this reason is in Congress. If the North has the majority in Congress on any question relating to the Territories, as to that question, the North has rightful power over the Territories. This power, moreover, is trust power; it is coupled with duty and responsibility of the most solemn nature, which concern not the present only, but a wide and mighty future. If, therefore, the people of the North, having rightful power over this question, believe slavery to be an industrial, social and political evil, they are bound to interfere and prevent this evil from being imposed upon any portion of the country under their control. They owe this duty to their own convictions of right, and they owe it to humanity; for the power to do good implies, from its very nature, the obligation to do good, and the greater the power, the stronger the obligation.

Political power results, necessarily, from superiority of numbers in a government where a majority rules. Something more, however, than mere numbers is wanting, to add moral sanction and influence even to legal power. If the North has superiority of population, it has in even greater degree superiority in wealth, in intellectual and moral culture, in diffused knowledge and comfort, in all industrial arts and improvements, in everything that

constitutes civilization. What measure the South really has of these things no American surely should wish to deny. All that it is and all that it has, and it is and has much that is great and worthy, are part and parcel of our country. But in arguing questions like the present, arithmetic and statistics cannot be omitted, and as facts will rule in practice, they must not be disregarded in speculation. The superiority of the North, not merely in numbers but in every other element of national strength, is beyond dispute. It is only necessary to ask, where are the chief seaport cities, the great inland towns; where are the factories and ships, the machinery and merchandise, and money capital; where the thriving villages and cultivated farms; where the colleges and schools of literature and art and science; where the leading journals, the great publishing houses, the writers who influence the mind of the nation, and give it literary reputation abroad? As well compare Spain or Italy with England, as the South with the North. If any one wishes to appreciate Southern weakness, let him read Mr. Olmstead's *Tour through the Seaboard Slave States*. It is an interesting book, written with graphic power and evident truthfulness, in a lively, animated, dramatic style, is full of anecdote and adventure, and contains a series of deeply instructive daguerreotype pictures, painted by the light of a clear intellect, from real life. The view of Southern society given in this work is not a pleasant one for a catholic American to look at. It reveals a state of things very surprising, hitherto unsuspected by most persons in the North, probably by most in the South. It would be well for Southern people who wish to understand their real position, to read this book, if its circulation has not been prohibited by some Kansas law or Lynch law, by General Pierce or Mr. Brooks.

There is another element of moral power in the Northern States, also positive and real, undeniable and unchangeable, which cannot be evaded or resisted, and which must always influence this question, whatever aspect it may assume. That element is the opinion of the civilized world on the subject of slavery. In morals, in religion, as in literature and the arts, there are no national boundary lines. Scientific truth, the productions of genius, political reforms, social ameliorations, nobler and higher views of life and duty, wherever they originate, are a common property. Opinion rules the world, and opinion is modified by advancing culture, so that the maxims and habits of one age become barbarisms in the

next. Thence the progress of civilization, thence the difference between Christian Europe to-day, with its liberty, its social security, its wealth, its literature, its arts, its intellectual culture and activity, its elegance and refinement, and the Europe of former ages. Of that Christian European civilization, we form a part. We are in daily contact with it, are joint heirs of all it has done, copartners of all it is doing. Its opinion is part and parcel of our opinion, and its suffrages, though not put in our ballot boxes, do, and must of necessity, influence our action and our destiny. That opinion has condemned slavery—those suffrages have been given unanimously in sympathy with the anti-slavery party in this country. Whether right or wrong, the superior mind of the most enlightened countries of Europe has declared this institution to be inconsistent with the present state of civilization, and to belong to the barbarism of the past. This opinion, therefore, influencing, as it must, opinion here, giving support, encouragement, intellectual aid and moral weight to Northern sentiment and purposes, is an important element of Northern power.

It is with this power, so founded on numbers, wealth and intelligence, so guaranteed by law, so buttressed and sustained by the opinion of the civilized world, that the South claims equality, and claims it by reason of the very cause which has produced weakness in the South and strength in the North. It claims equality of representation where there is no equality in the thing represented. It claims equality of power where it has a minority of votes. It claims the right to gain this equality by fastening upon vast regions of boundless resources, and the unborn millions to inhabit them, the very institution that has withered its own energies and retarded its own progress. Such a claim is founded neither in the law of the land, nor in justice, nor in the nature of things. It cannot permanently succeed, and its triumphs will not endure. Whatever shape it may assume, of thought or act, of argument or practice, of revolutionary doctrine or revolutionary deed, it is destined to be confronted and defeated by the controlling fact of Northern power, which must in the end prevail, because it is an inherent attribute of power to govern.

There is only one sort of equality that it is wise for the South to desire, or possible for it to attain, and that is, what it has already—equality before the law. This is the great maxim of free society. Equal rights to unequal things. This is the only principle that can

protect wealth from poverty, or poverty from wealth; the mental cultivation of the few from the brute force of the many, or the ignorance of the many from the superior intelligence of the few. All other kinds of equality are impossible, because contrary to the laws of man's nature, and this alone enables all other kinds to live together, side by side, in harmony and order, uniting all talents, labors and powers, for the common good. This principle can and does give security to the South. It is one of the great principles of our Constitution and our Union, and only under its guardianship can Southern weakness find safety in the neighborhood of its *inseparable* companion—Northern strength.

The South has for its protection, for the protection of the institution on which its repose, its prosperity, its existence depend, but against which is banded in formidable array the opinion of civilized nations—the provisions and guarantees of the Constitution. These have proved so far an efficient protection. The sphere of slavery has not been narrowed, but enlarged. The South has greatly influenced, not to say controlled, the legislation of the country, and still does so. But whether sufficient or not, the Constitution is the only protection that slavery has in the world. Take away that, and the whole world is united against it. While the Constitution lasts, this great Northern strength, which is, and *must forever remain*, the close neighbor of the South, is also its brother and friend. Party arrangements, commercial interests, family ties, easy intercourse, above all, love for the Union and a sense of its benefits, combine to make the relations of North and South safe for the South and a blessing to both. But, destroy the Union and the Constitution, then Northern strength becomes at once the enemy of Southern weakness, and, with the North for an enemy, where will the South find a friend?

Is it not madness, then, in this passionate and foolish South thus to kick against the pricks, to resist facts which are like rocks and mountains, steadfast, immovable, and which shatter all opposition into spray and foam? Was it not unwise in Southern politicians to violate the Missouri compact, which, if it was a barrier to them, was also a barrier to their enemies? Is it not imprudent in them, by ingenious quibbles and subtle repinings, and false constructions, and insincere pretexts, to undermine the plain, well-settled principles of the Constitution, when that Constitution is their only protection; to make a breach in their only wall of defence? Is there no danger

that such arts may return to plague their inventors? Are there no constitutional provisions for their safety, whose plain meaning may be tortured and twisted, and explained away by these attorney-like tricks? Above all, is it not infatuated folly in the South to alienate the feelings and rouse the indignation of its powerful neighbor, by Kansas invasions, and burnings, and slaughter, by tampering with weak Presidents, in whose official authority the North has an equal share and interest, by Brooks assaults in the Senate House, by threats, and insults, and violence, by open, avowed violations of law and the rights secured by law? The time may come when it will invoke in vain the defences of the Constitution it is now attempting to cast down; when it will ask in vain for Northern votes to resist Northern majorities; when it will look in vain for Northern help to save it from dangers more terrible than Northern majorities.

There is one plain path out of these present troubles, and that is to go back to the Constitution. If Mr. Clayton's plan had provided for the repeal of the Kansas Bill, had set aside entirely the spurious Kansas legislature, and all its deeds of darkness, re-enacting such of its laws as are necessary for the moment, including those protecting slaves now in the Territory; then, under his bill, the future legislature of Kansas might immediately or hereafter refuse or accept slavery as part of their system, and such action would be subject, as it ought to be, to the revision and control of Congress. Should the result prove that the majority of the people of this country solemnly refuse to sanction the further extension of slavery, it would still have the Constitution for its protection where it now exists, and it would be the duty of the South to submit, because obedience to the law is always a duty, and its policy also, for its only safety would lie in submission. Rebellion would be treason, and Northern strength can put down and punish treason. Even successful rebellion, after civil war, ending in disunion or treason consummated, would not help the South. Would slavery be safe during civil war? Would it be safer after disunion, with this great Northern strength still by its side, but no longer as a brother?

Thus this great fact of superior and rapidly increasing Northern power, governs this question, looming up from the horizon like some towering Chimborazo mountain, meeting the eye from whatever point it looks. That there is danger to slavery in these days it is vain to deny. It is behind the age; it is an isolated institution; it is inconsistent with any high

standard of national civilization and culture. It is doomed to recede, not to advance; and, finally, to be greatly modified or to perish. Whether this fate is to arrive peacefully and gradually, or suddenly and violently, depends wholly on the action of the South. There is security for the South, living as it must always do by the side of Northern strength, only in the Constitution and the friendship of the North. The Constitution is wise, and every departure from it proves its wisdom. It has shown itself hitherto sufficient for the protection of slavery. The Northern people are loyal to the South. The vast majority yield willingly, zealously, all the constitutional rights of the South. They love the Union and the Constitution, and their country, and the South as part of their country. They are slow to wrath and easy to be entreated; they will endure many things, but not all things. Kansas massacres, General Pierce, and Mr. Brooks, are among the things they will not endure.

CECIL.

From the N. Y. Post.

What an old "Union Saver" thinks.

Mr. Van Cott, the first speaker, announced himself as an old "Union Saver," who had followed in the footsteps of Daniel Webster, and worked for Henry Clay through every Clay campaign.

When the Omnibus bill of 1850 passed, he was one of the men who honestly believed in the efficacy of the measures embraced in it, to lay the ghost of agitation; and he endorsed the "finality" platform of 1852 in good faith. But in advocating these measures, Daniel Webster sacrificed himself, and the South had not the gratitude to reward him. The members of Congress who voted for the Missouri Compromise in 1821 sacrificed themselves; and why? It was because the people felt that ours was a free country, and that the extension of human slavery, or a compromise with it, was at war with the genius of our institutions.

And, gentlemen, I, for many years, was an old line Whig. I was once anxious about the Union. Many a long night have I sat up rocking the cradle and watching over the Union, and what came of it all? We have ourselves been utterly betrayed and sacrificed by the South, as was Mr. Webster, the leader of the Union section. The moment he made these concessions, for the sake of ending slavery agitation, the South turned around and repealed a great measure, which had been held as a most solemn and sacred obligation

since its establishment. And where did we then stand? We were laughed at and told that we were treated just as we deserved to be treated.

Now, gentlemen, a pretty smart man, with his eyes well open, may be cheated once, but he is a fool if he is cheated a second time.

[Great laughter and applause.]

* * * * *

But they tell us we are to dissolve the Union. Pray, how is this to be accomplished? Is the North going out of the Union? No; the North is well contented where she is. Did you ever hear a Northern man say he was going out? [A voice—Millard Fillmore.] Millard Fillmore, I grant is an exception. But, aside from him, the North is not going out. Is the South going out? You could not coax them out—you could not kick them out. What! the South leave the treasury—the Post Office Department—the Custom House! Has the South lost its appetite? and is it going out of the Union because it has got tired of being supported at the public crib? No; there is no danger, so long as there is a treasury left with a stiver in it. [Great applause.]

It is time for the North to assert itself—not to injure the South—but within the pale of the Constitution, I say the North is called upon to utter its own honest convictions. The convictions of the North are against the institutions of slavery, and in favor of free territories. We have just as good a right to that opinion as the South has to theirs. *This is a government of majorities, and if a majority of the people are in favor of our sentiments, the South must yield.* If they have the majority, we must yield, but I deny that they have any rights superior to ours, and that we have less a right than they to utter our convictions upon this subject. Perhaps the North will submit—perhaps it is made of putty, and will have its courage knocked out of it with a gutta-percha cane; but I do not believe it.

We have declared our principles, and I believe we shall stand by them if we have to fight to the last ditch. And I assure you, gentlemen, that though I am an old Union-saver, and have spent many sleepless nights watching over it, these are my sentiments to the day of my death. [Great applause.]

From the N. Y. Post.

What an Old Democrat thinks.

At a meeting recently held at Chatham, Columbia County, in this State, to give utterance to the feelings of the citizens on the expulsion of Mr. RAY from Virginia, for having

spoken in favor of Freedom, the following letter was read from C. H. BRAMHALL, Esq., of this city, heretofore a leading member of the Democratic Party:

LETTER FROM C. H. BRAMHALL.

NEW YORK, June 10, 1856.

* * * * *

CALHOUN is the father of sectionalism in this country. He first tried to unite the South against the North on the Tariff; failing in that, he tried it on Slavery, and succeeded. And from the day when CALHOUN was made Secretary of State under President TYLER, the slave power has been the paramount, ruling power of the nation. From that day to this, all the powers of Government, in all its departments, executive, legislative, judicial and administrative, have been executed in abject and cringing subjection to the Slave Oligarchy. From that day to this, every candidate for public honors, of high or low degree, has basely bowed the neck, and bent the knee, in fawning sycophancy to the power behind the throne.

And what, it may be asked, is this Slave Oligarchy, that it should assume to rule this nation of 25,000,000 of men claiming to be freemen? It consists of 347,000 slaveholders, owning 4,000,000 of human beings as property, and constituting a despotism more absolute and more revolting than any known to the world, civilized or uncivilized, in any period of its known history — selling men, women and little children upon the auction block — separating forever husband and wife, parent and child — and degrading the white race, in point of civilization and humanity, to the level of the slave.

To say nothing of the black race, it degrades and demoralizes the white. If we compare the Free States with the Slave States, the disastrous effect of Slavery upon the social, moral and political condition of the white race will be at once fully realized. If we contrast New York with Virginia, Massachusetts with South Carolina, or Michigan with Arkansas, in the number of Schools and Churches, the facilities, the efficiency and results of educational, moral and religious training — in the progress made by each in the elements of material prosperity, in the arts of peace and civilization — and the amount and value of the products of human industry, the results cannot but carry conviction to the minds of all.

I prefer to leave every one to institute the comparison for himself; and fortunately the census taken every decade, places the necessary information within the reach of all.

It has been said that in this country "Cotton is King." That it rules the foreign policy and every department of our domestic administration is, alas! too true. Let us inquire by what right this power is exercised. The census of 1850 shows that the entire market value of the Cotton crop of that year was . . . \$136,000,000
Tobacco 19,000,000
Sugar 35,350,000
Rice 10,000,000

Total \$200,350,000
Indian Corn \$360,300,000
Wheat 247,400,000
Hay and Fodder 160,000,000
Pasturage 143,000,000
Milk, exclusive of that used for Butter and Cheese 100,000,000

From this it will be seen that the crop of Indian corn alone is worth nearly three times the Cotton crop of the South — and \$160,000,000 more than the aggregate of the four principal crops of Cotton, Tobacco, Sugar and Rice. The Wheat crop is nearly double the Cotton, and \$47,000,000 more than the Cotton, Tobacco, Sugar and Rice. The Hay and Fodder, \$20,000,000 more than the Cotton. The Pasturage is \$7,000,000 more than the Cotton — and in short, the entire Cotton crop of the South is worth but little more than the surplus milk of our cows, exclusive of that used for butter and cheese.

Such, in brief, are a few of the characteristics of Slavery and the Slave Power, which in the brief period of our young history, has grown from diminutive stature to gigantic magnitude — from extreme weakness to overpowering strength — until it is now prepared to combat with Freedom for the mastery of Empire. In 1848 Slavery laid her black and brawny hand upon the North, and commanded silence — and the North resolved not to agitate. In 1850, in compliance with the demands of the Slave Power, the Fugitive Slave bill was passed, in plain violation of the Constitution — in open disregard of humanity — and in defiance of the law of God. In 1852 the Slave Oligarchy again commanded silence at the North, and was obeyed. In 1854, in submissive obedience to the same power, the solemn compact of Freedom, entered into thirty-four years before, was repealed, and the door of Western Empire was again opened to Slavery. And yet again the insolent mandate goes forth from the South to the North — be silent! A Northern Democratic President, and his Northern followers, repeat the shameful mandate—be silent! Then goes

forth the decree of Judge KANE, the American Jeffries, pliant tool of power, that the slaveholder may bring his human property into the Free States, in spite of our Constitutions and Laws, and hold them as property, and with all the attributes of property, as long as he pleases, *in transitu*. Then the drunken, brutal, savage hordes of Slavery pour over the western borders of Kansas, with whisky, bowie-knife, and revolver; drive the peaceful settlers from the polls; seize the ballot boxes—elect a Pro-Slavery Legislature, of non-residents—and establish a code of laws for the people of the Territory, disfranchising every man who is less brutal or inhuman than the perpetrators of these outrages. To refuse obedience to these monstrous usurpations is declared by the President, and his Chief Justice, LECOMPTE, and by the assembled wisdom of the Democratic Party at Cincinnati, TREASON. Be silent! While the wail that is borne to our ears on every Western breeze, tells us of brothers murdered, and sisters outraged, on the plains of Kansas. Be silent! While Northern men are driven out from Kansas and from Virginia, and Northern Senators ruthlessly stricken down in the National Capitol, for daring to refuse obedience to the insolent mandate.

Against outrages so monstrous—crimes so infamous—treason against God and man so shameless and unblushing, words of reason and conciliation are out of place. It is no time to pass resolutions. It is the time for *action*—immediate, united, resolute and determined action is imperiously demanded. The issue is forced upon us, and we must meet it manfully. We must make our election between FREEDOM and SLAVERY, and make it NOW. It is not a question of the Abolition of Slavery—but the Abolition of Freedom. Shall Freedom live? Or shall it die?

Very respectfully, yours, &c.

C. H. BRAMHALL.

Extracts from Josiah Quincy.

His letter to the "Young America Fremont Club" of Boston.

GENTLEMEN:—I rejoice in your organization. I thank God the palsy of death is not yet upon the liberties of the Free States. The young blood begins to move. The question depending is—are the slaveholders or the free States henceforth to govern this Union. If the Free States are united, *their success is certain*. Be on your guard. The slaveholders have governed this Union almost uninterrupt-

edly for nearly fifty years, *by two arts*—by buying in the Free States what was corrupt, by dividing in them what was sound. Be on your guard. There is no intermission in their cunning. Pay no regard to names or influences. Whoever is put up in opposition to Fremont and Dayton is put up in conjunction with the slaveholders. The object will be to divide the Free States, to throw the final question from the people into Congress, where the slaveholders are masters. Be firm and united. "Now is the time, now the hour." The events of the time cannot be misunderstood. The slaveholders mean to continue to govern this Union hereafter, as they have done heretofore—by dividing and corrupting. If they succeed, after the demonstration they have given of character and purposes, the free States are slaves, and deserve to be, to the worst of all possible masters. Heaven never fails to punish with severe retribution, a people who are negligent or faithless to the opportunities it puts into their hands. God and your country are with you, my young friends. Both will bless you.

Yours,

JOSIAH QUINCY.

P. S.—I send you thirty dollars, to aid in defraying the expenses of your organization. If that is not my proportion, let me know what is, and I will transmit it.

Extracts from his Address on the "Nature and Power of the Slave States, and the Duties of the Free States."

"DEDICATED TO THE PEOPLE OF THE FREE STATES, WHO ARE ENTREATED TO CONSIDER THE VIEWS AND STATEMENTS IT PRESENTS."

"The question to be decided at the ensuing Presidential election, is, Who shall henceforth rule this nation,—the Slave States, or the Free States? All the aspects of our political atmosphere indicate an approaching hurricane. Whether it shall sweep this Union from its foundations, or whether it shall be prosperously weathered, depends, under Heaven, on the man whom the people shall choose to pilot them through the coming storm. In my judgment, that man is JOHN CHARLES FREMONT. I have not, and never had, any connection with the party that selected him. Personally, I know him not; but I have read the history of his life, and believe him to be a man as much marked out by Providence for the present exigency of our nation as Washington was for that of our American Revolution.

He comes, from whence great men usually do come, from the mass of the people. Nursed in difficulties, practised in surmounting them; wise in council; full of resource; self-possessed

in danger; fearless and foremost in every useful enterprise; unexceptionable in morals; with an intellect elevated by nature, and cultivated in laborious fields of duty, — I trust he is destined to save this Union from dissolution; to restore the Constitution to its original purity; and to relieve that instrument, which Washington designed for the preservation and enlargement of freedom, from being any longer perverted to the multiplication of Slave States and the extension of slavery.

JOSIAH QUINCY.

QUINCY, July, 1856.

In early life, from 1805 to 1813, I served as Representative in the Congress of the United States from the town of Boston. I was an active member of the Federal party formed by Washington, and have never belonged to any other. Though sympathizing in feeling with Free Soilers and Abolitionists, I have never concurred in the measures of either. My heart has always been more affected by the slavery to which the Free States have been subjected, than with that of the negro. Placed successively, since 1820, in the offices of Judge of the Municipal Court, of Mayor of Boston, and of President of Harvard College, I have abstained from all connection with politics for *thirty-four years*, except by voting; and now I come, at your request, to offer views and opinions on the present crisis of public affairs, derived from the light of history, and from the counsels and advice of Washington.

The blow on the head of Sumner was not intended for him alone. It was struck at Liberty herself, in one of her most sacred temples. It was a public notice and declaration to every man in the Free States, that liberty of speech no longer existed in Congress for him or for his Representative; that whoever coming from the Free States dare to utter a word in opposition to the views, or in derogation of the power of slaveholders, will speak at the peril of life. There is nothing new in this system of intimidation. Fifty years ago it was an approved practice of slaveholders. In that day, men from the Free States, who were open opponents to the administration, often carried pistols in self-defence. Others, urged by their friends to do it, declined; being unwilling, under any circumstances, to have the life of a fellow-being on their consciences. The only difference between our times and the past is this; heretofore they brandished the bludgeon; now they have brought it down. Formerly the bowie-knife was only seen in its sheath, or half-drawn by way of terror; now it is seen glistening in their hands, or steeped in the blood of freemen in Kansas.

This state of things naturally leads thoughtful minds to reflect on the actual condition of this Union, — of Slave States politically united with Free States. Those living under the former are in a perpetual consciousness of danger. It cannot be otherwise, however they may attempt to conceal it from others and from themselves. It is impossible that *three hundred thousand whites*, who are the masters, surrounded by *three million of blacks*, who are slaves, can live otherwise than under a never-ceasing sense of danger. The mode of maintaining the subjection of their slaves is, therefore, the constant object of their thoughts.

In the Free States, on the contrary, from twenty to twenty-five millions of whites exist, with proportionate superiority in wealth, activity, and physical power, without any care of or danger from slaves.

This difference of condition in the two species of States produces unavoidably, in slaveholders, a continual sense of danger from within, and of prospective danger from without. The immense superiority of physical power in the Free States, combined with a knowledge of their own inherent weakness, creates in their minds a belief that their own political existence, and that of their slaves, depend upon obtaining and keeping the control of the Free States. Nature, in the human as in every other animal, compensates positive or comparative weakness by some quality which is equivalent for defence. In the case of the Slave States, she supplies the want of strength by *art*. The operation of this, in effecting their great object of obtaining and keeping the control of the Free States, it is my purpose briefly to illustrate from the history of this Union.

The *art* by which, for more than fifty years, the Slave States have subjugated the Free States, and vested in their own hands all the powers of the Union, they call *policy*. Its proper name is *cunning*; that “left-handed wisdom,” as Lord Bacon calls it, which the Devil practised in the garden of Eden, — “divide and conquer.” By this, they established the seat of national government in a slave country, and thus surrounded Congress with an atmosphere of slavery, and subjected the Free States to its influences, in the place where the councils of the nation are held, and where the whole public sentiment is hostile to the principles of the Free States; and where, in case of collisions resulting in actions at law and indictments, slaveholders are judges, jurors, and executioners. This location of the seat of gov-

ernment has been one of the most potent causes of that dominion over the nation which they have acquired.

Again : by *cunning*, they inserted Louisiana into the Union, not only without the concurrence of the Free States, but without so much as asking it, — a measure which has been the Pandora's box of all our evils.

Another of their arts is *arrogance*, or an insolent assumption of superiority. This, though a result of their condition as masters of slaves, is of great power. "Like boldness,* it is the child of ignorance and vanity; yet it fascinates, and binds, hand and foot, those that are shallow in judgment or weak in courage, and prevailleth even with wise men at weak times. It hath done wonders in popular States." In Slave States, slaveholders are sovereigns, and deem themselves entitled to govern everywhere. In them, with few inconsiderable exceptions, they are proprietors of all the lands; which few persons can afford to hold, except owners of slaves. As the rate of wages is regulated by the expense of supporting slaves, it is, of course, the least possible. Of consequence, slaves are the successful rivals of the *white poor*; being more obedient, and the expense of supporting them being less. Thus the *white poor*, in the Slave States, are reduced to a state of extreme degradation; in some respects, lower than the negro. They cannot dig; for field-labor to a white person is there a disgrace. To beg, they are ashamed; and they have no master to whom they can look for support. Having no land, they have no political power: the value of their labor is below that of the slave; and their actual condition comparatively that of extreme wretchedness. One-half of the white population of the Slave States are said to be in that condition. In the vocabulary of slaveholders, liberty means only that planters should be independent, and have no superiors.

Fifty years ago, there were two classes of slaveholders in Congress; the one, generous in spirit, polished in manners, true to the principles of liberty and the Constitution, uniting heart and hand with the Representatives from the Free States in objects and policy; of the same type and character as George Washington, John Marshall, William Pinckney, Henry W. Dession, John Stanley, Nicholas Vandyke, Philip Stuart, Alexander Contee Hanson, and a host of others, too numerous to be recapitulated, in principle and views coincident with the Constitution, desti-

tute of all desire to establish the supremacy of slaveholders. They spoke of slavery, like Patrick Henry, as "a curse," which blighted the prospects and weakened the strength of the Slave States, — with him deplored the necessity of holding men in bondage, declaring their belief that the time would come when "an opportunity will be afforded to *abolish* this lamentable evil;" like Governor Randolph, they regarded themselves "oppressed by slavery, and treated with disdain the idea that the Slave States could stand by themselves;"* with Judge Tucker, of Virginia,† they thought, as he declared, that posterity "*would execrate the memory of those ancestors, who, having the power to avert the evil of slavery, have, like their first parents, entailed a curse on all future generations.*"

These men, far from threatening to go out of the Union, regarded and spoke of it as a main hope of dependence against their own slaves. They encouraged and supported every man from the Free States who met the violence of the insolent class with appropriate spirit. They saw and lamented the character and conduct of the lower and baser slaveholders, who, coarse in language, overbearing in manner, caring nothing for the principles of liberty and the Constitution, came to Congress for the purpose of getting office or place, and, to that end, were as subservient to every nod of the administration as any slave to that of his master.

The nobler class of slaveholders foresaw and foretold that the effect of the language and course of conduct of this violent class would gradually wear away the affections of the Free States, and lead to a dissolution of the Union. These higher spirits could not submit to use the arts and language to obtain power to which the baser sort condescended, and, of consequence, lost their influence in their respective districts; to which these political filibusters succeeded, and came to Washington, some to follow and some to direct the course of the administration, by whom they were rewarded according to their talents, their violence, or their subserviency.

In 1810, John Randolph, in whose mind Virginia included all the South, said to me, "Virginia is no longer what it once was. The spirit of the old planters is departed or gradually wearing away: we are overrun by time-servers, office-hunters, and political black-legs." In a letter to me, dated "Richmond,

* See Debates in the Convention of Virginia.

† See Tucker's Commentaries on Blackstone.

* Lord Bacon's Essay on Boldness.

22d March, 1814," after giving a melancholy description of a visit he had just made to "the seat of his ancestors, in the maternal line, at the confluence of the James and Appomattox Rivers," he adds, "*The curse of slavery, however, an evil daily magnifying, great as it already is, embitters many a moment of the Virginian landholder, who is not duller than the clod under his feet.*"

Slaveholders have been for fifty years, a few only excepted, the political masters of these States. Rampant with long-possessed authority, in the natural spirit of the class, they have now put on the lash, and are getting ready for use their fetters and manacles.

Let the Free States understand that the crisis has come. Their own fate and that of their posterity depend upon the fact, whether, in this crisis, they are true or false to themselves. The extension of slavery has been, from the days of Jefferson, the undeviating pursuit of the slaveholders. Hitherto by cunning, intrigue, and corruption, and now to plant it forever among the South-western States, compromises have been violated, the ballot-boxes broken, the votes of freemen destroyed, and free citizens massacred and their houses plundered by mobs, encouraged by a slaveholder's administration, and supported by the military arm of the United States. If this tissue of events do not rouse the Free States to united and concentrated action, nothing will. Their destinies are fixed. They are doomed slaves. Their liberties are gone. Their Constitution gone. Nothing is left for them but to yoke in with the negro, and take the lash, submissively, at the caprice of their masters.

But everybody asks, "What is to be done to throw off this slaveholders' yoke?" The first step is to have a spirit and will to be free. If there is a will, the spirit of freemen will soon find a way. It is not the slaveholders' strength, but your folly. It is because they wake, and you sleep; because they unite, and you divide; because they hold in their hands the means of corruption, and half of you perhaps are willing to be corrupted. This is bold language, it will be said. Boldness is one of the privileges of old age. When can a man have a right to be bold, if it be not when he is conscious of being prompted by truth and duty alone, and when a long life is behind him, and nothing before him but a daily-expected summons to the highest and most solemn of all tribunals?

I now proceed to trace the political power of these slaveholders from its origin, and show

the present actual condition of the Constitution, *as it is called*, of the United States.

The admission of Louisiana into the Union, without asking or having the consent of the people of the States or of the States themselves, was undeniably a *stupendous usurpation*.

The passage of the Louisiana Admission Bill was effected by the arts which slaveholders well know how to select and apply. Sops were given to the Congressional watch-dogs of the Free States. To some, promises were made, by way of opiates; and those whom they could neither pay nor drug were publicly treated with insolence and scorn. Threats, duels, and violence were at that day, as now, modes approved by them to deter men from awakening the Free States to a sense of their danger. From the moment that act was passed, they saw that the Free States were shorn of their strength; that they had obtained space to multiply Slave States at their will; and Mr. Jefferson had confidentially told them, that, from that moment, the "*Constitution of the United States was blank paper*;" but more correctly, there was "*no longer any Constitution.*"

The slaveholders from that day saw they had the Free States in their power; that they were masters, and the Free States slaves; and have acted accordingly. From the passage of the Louisiana Bill until this day, their policy has been directed to a single object, with almost uninterrupted success. That object was to exclude the Free States from any share of power, except in subservency to their views; and they have undeniably, during all the subsequent period of our history (the administration of John Quincy Adams only excepted,) placed in the chair of state either slaveholders, or men from the Free States, who, for the sake of power, consented to be their tools, — "Northern men with Southern principles;" in other words, men who, for the sake of power or pay, were willing to do any work they would set them upon.

In the times of non-intercourse and embargo, I had frequent intercourse with John Randolph, and for many years a correspondence with him. During the extreme pressure of those measures upon the commerce of the Northern States, I said to him, "Mr. Randolph, these measures are absolutely insupportable. You Southern men will, at this rate, put an end to parties in the Northern States, and we shall come down upon the South in one united phalanx." I shall never forget the half-triumph and half-sneer with which he replied, "*You are mistaken, sir; you*

are mistaken, sir. THE SOUTH ARE AS SURE OF YOUR DEMOCRACY AS THEY ARE OF THEIR OWN NEGROES."

Let any man examine the history of the United States, from the reign of Thomas Jefferson to that of Franklin Pierce, and he will find, that, when the slaveholders have any particularly odious and obnoxious work to do, they never fail to employ the leaders of the Democracy of the Free States. This fact speaks volumes to the Free States. In all estimates of their future duties, it should never be forgotten, that every act by which their interests have been sacrificed, and the power of slaveholders increased, has been effected by the treachery of members of the Free States.

It is manifest to the Free States, that a monstrous usurpation has been effected, and is intended to be enlarged and perpetuated.

The warning voice of Washington, in this state of things, is, "LET THERE BE NO CHANGE BY USURPATION." He adds, "CHANGE BY USURPATION IS THE CUSTOMARY WEAPON BY WHICH FREE GOVERNMENTS ARE DESTROYED." Again: Washington advises, "RESIST WITH CARE THE SPIRIT OF INNOVATION UPON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CONSTITUTION. THE SPIRIT OF ENCROACHMENT TENDS TO CONSOLIDATE THE POWERS OF ALL DEPARTMENTS IN ONE, AND TO THUS CREATE A REAL DESPOTISM."

The Free States are then, undeniably, at this day, in that very state of things in which the warning voice of Washington declared "RESISTANCE TO BE THEIR DUTY." During more than forty years, the spirit of a continued series of encroachments has established over them the worst of all possible despotisms, — that of slaveholders. The manner in which this duty of resistance, so distinctly advised by Washington, is to be performed in the spirit which he advised, and which his life exemplified, is at this time the subject of earnest and solicitous consideration by the people of the Free States. It will be my endeavor to throw some light on their duties, and on the course to be pursued in performing them.

Many years ago, John Quincy Adams related a conversation which he once had with John C. Calhoun on this very subject. Calhoun said to him, that the broad principles of liberty which Mr. Adams had been advocating, were just and noble; but that in the Southern country, whenever they were mentioned, they were always understood as applying only to white men. Domestic labor was confined to the blacks; and such was the prejudice, that if he, who was the most popu-

lar man in his district, were to keep a white servant in his house, his character and reputation would be irretrievably ruined. Mr. Adams said, that this confounding servitude and labor was one of the bad effects of slavery. Mr. Calhoun thought it was attended with many excellent consequences. It did not apply to all sorts of labor, — not, for example, to holding the plough; he and his father had often done that: nor did it apply to manufacturing and mechanical labor; these were not degrading: but to dig, to hoe, to do work either in the field, the house, or the stable, — these were menial labors, the proper work of slaves. No white man could descend to that. Calhoun thought that it was the best guaranty of equality among the whites. It produced among them an unvarying level. It did not admit of inequalities among whites. Mr. Adams replied, that it was all perverted sentiment, mistaking labor for slavery and dominion for freedom. And, in stating it in conversation, Adams remarked, that this discussion with Calhoun had betrayed to him the secret of their souls. In the abstract, they admit slavery to be an evil; but, when probed to the quick, they show, at the bottom of their souls, pride and vainglory in their very condition of masterdom. They fancy themselves more generous and noble-hearted than the plain freemen that labor for subsistence. They look down on the simplicity of New-England manners, because they have no habits of overbearing like theirs, and cannot treat negroes like dogs. It is among the evils of slavery, that it taints the very sources of moral principle. It establishes false estimates of virtue and vice; for what can be more false and heartless than this doctrine, which makes the first and holiest rights of humanity depend on the color of the skin? It perverts human reason, and reduces man, endowed with logical powers, to maintain that slavery is sanctioned by the Christian religion; that slaves are happy and contented in their condition; that there are, between master and slave, mutual ties of attachment and affection; that the virtues of the master are refined and exalted by the degradation of the slave; while, at the same time, they vent execrations on the slave-trade, curse Great Britain for having given them slaves, burn at the stake negroes convicted of crimes, for the terror of the example, and writhe in agonies of fear at the very mention of human rights as applicable to people of color.

After reading and weighing the opinions of this great and good man, and reflecting on the

facts which he states, can any one doubt the incompatibility of the essential character of slaveholders with the government and management of the affairs of freemen? Can they who regard labor as servitude be the fit guardians of the interests of men who regard labor as their honor, and its successful exercise their duty and glory?

Mr. Jefferson, in his "Notes on Virginia," graphically exhibits "the unhappy influence on the manners of slaveholders by the existence of slavery. The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions; the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other. Our children see this, learn to imitate it; for man is an imitative animal. This quality is the germ of all education in him. From his cradle to his grave, he is learning to do what he sees others do. If a parent could find no motive, either in his philanthropy or self-love, for restraining the intemperance of passion towards his slave, it should always be a sufficient one that his child is present; but, in general, it is not sufficient. The parent storms; the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives a loose rein to his worst passions, and, thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped with odious peculiarities. The man, then, must be a prodigy who can retain his morals and manners undeprecated by such circumstances."

After such testimony, given by the greatest and most idolized of all slaveholders, as to the qualities which are the necessary results of their education from childhood of his whole class, will the people of the Free States trust them longer with the care of their Union? Is it wonderful, that in every year, from the days of Thomas Jefferson to the present, such men as Brooks, Keitt, and Butler should, in one uninterrupted succession, have appeared on the floor of Congress?

Without enumerating other qualities inherent in slaveholders, and incompatible with the liberties of the Free States, I proceed to examine the nature of that power which slaveholders have wielded over this Union for half a century.

This power of slaveholders has its origin, — as has been already intimated, — first from a concentration of interests and fears in the body of slaveholders; second, from a total want of concentration of interests among the people of the Free States, combined with an entire want of all apprehensions of danger owing to their unquestionable superiority in physical power.

From the identity of the interests and fears of slaveholders results identity in policy of the members of the whole class. Their studies, thoughts, counsels, are absorbed and directed to two objects, — how to keep their negroes in subjection; and, as subsidiary to this end, how to keep the control of the Free States. By this control, they present to the fears of their slaves the arm of the Union, ever in readiness to keep them in subjection, and also relieve themselves from the apprehension that that arm might be extended for the relief of their slaves.

Extracts from Mr. Quincy's 'Remarks on Mr. Choate's Letter.'

"The whole letter of Mr. Choate is founded on an assumption which has no basis in truth. 'A great crisis,' cried Mr. Choate, 'exists in the political affairs of our country. There is a new geographical party formed, which must be defeated and dissolved.'

"Now in truth the only question at this time in the political field, is between slaveholders and freemen who are not slaveholders. * * * The assertion and doctrine of Mr. Choate is, that inasmuch as slaveholders exist in only one quarter of the Union, the party opposing them and their projects is geographical. How? Do slaveholders include all the inhabitants of the Slave States? Is it not notorious and demonstrable that *there are not, substantially, more than one hundred thousand slaveholders in all of them?* Is it not undeniable that these owners of slaves form an oligarchy, which not only holds in bondage *three millions of negroes*, but also oppresses with an iron sceptre *three or four millions, at least, of white freemen* living within those States? * * * *Slaveholders are a class, and not a geographical section.* If slaveholders constitute a geographical party, because they only exist in one quarter of the Union, the manufacturers at Lowell, for the same reason, also form a geographical party. Like them slaveholders make, hold and sell articles for enjoyment and livelihood. At Lowell they raise the warp, feed the wool and sell cotton cloth, when it is of full length. In Carolina and the other Slave States, they raise, feed and sell black men and women, when they are of full growth and sometimes babies."

"After this, he (Mr. Choate) goes on to describe what a noble ship the Union is, intimates the value of her cargo, declares she is 'within half a cable's length of a lee shore of rock, and that our first duty is to put her out and crowd her off into the deep open sea.' All this is very graphic and very true. But

the first natural inquiry of the people of the Free States will be, how this noble ship got into this perilous state; and the next will probably be, whether the men whose incompetency or iniquity has placed her in such an awful predicament, are the men to be chosen 'to put her about and pilot her into the open sea,' or whether every man of them *shall not be sent into the fore-castle, and never again be permitted to show their heads upon the quarter-deck.*"

Mr. Choate's Letter.

From the Boston Journal.

The Washington *Union* takes exception to the sentence in Choate's Letter in which he says, "It is in part because the duty of protection to the local settler was not performed that the Democratic party has already, by the action of its great representative convention, resolved to put out of office its own administration." The *Union*, with many fulsome praises of Choate's letter, says he "shows himself well qualified to give counsel to his Whig friends, and to teach them by his example a lesson of wisdom," but expresses its regret that he undertook to develop the motives which actuated the Democratic party in the selection of its candidate. It says:

"It will be remembered that the convention, with entire unanimity, and with enthusiastic cordiality, approved and endorsed the course of policy of the present administration; and we have no hesitation in affirming that no part of its policy received a more earnest and hearty approval than that which embraced its Kansas Policy.

The *Post* copies the article from the *Union*, which administers this gentle rebuke to Mr. Choate, and adds to it the following significant monition:

"It seems very convenient for every one who desires to gratify past or present prejudices against the Democratic party, to cast imputations upon one of its ablest, boldest, and truest defenders, the President of the United States. But the history of his public career will redeem his character from the aspersions of either malice or ignorance."

From the New York Post.

The Issue Stated.

A writer in the *Journal of Commerce*, who labors under the logical infirmity common to the champions of submission to slavery aggression, has stumbled upon an avowal of the true state of the case now on trial before the grand tribunal of the people. He says:

"Let the people beware of that political party organized on the principle of hostility to slavery, which must of necessity be a sectional party, constantly tending to alienate one section from the other. Be not deceived by the specious pretext, that it is only to prevent the spread of slavery. *They can only prevent the spread of slavery by such a course of sectional and hostile action as will most likely provoke collision, resulting in the rupture of the Union.*"

This is the backbone of Mr. Choate's elaborate rhapsody to the "Whigs of Maine." If you resist the spread of slavery, you "provoke collision," and the "result" is a "rupture of the Union." *Therefore*, says the *Journal* man—*therefore*, says Mr. Choate—it is your duty 'to desist from all opposition, and let slavery "pour itself, unobstructed, from ocean to ocean." If the North is ready for this logic, it has only to rally to the support of Buchanan, who represents exactly that view of the question at issue. We shall see what freemen have to say to the authors of such abject counsel.

In Mr. Choate's great speech in support of Gen. Taylor, made at Salem in 1848, he said: "In this matter of slavery, we have always differed from our friends of the South; and in regard to it we propose simply, **TO VOTE THEM DOWN.**"

THE OLIGARCHIC AND ANTI-REPUBLICAN CHARACTER OF SLAVERY, AS SHOWN BY THEIR OWN STATESMEN.

Extracts from a pamphlet entitled "A Plain Statement to Honest Democrats."

B. WATKINS LEIGH, VA.

In every civilized country under the sun, some there must be who labor for their daily bread,—men who tend the herds, and dig the soil,—who have no real nor personal capital of their own, and who earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow. I have as sincere feelings of regard for that people as any man who lives among them. But I ask gentlemen to say, whether they believe that those who depend on their daily labor for their daily subsistence, can, or do, ever into political affairs? They never do, never will, never can."—*Speech in Virginia Convention, 1829.*

F. W. PICKENS, S. C.

"All society settles down into a classification of capitalists and laborers. The former

will own the latter, either collectively through the government, or individually in a state of domestic servitude, as exists in the Southern States of this confederacy. *If laborers ever obtain the political power of a country, it is in fact in a state of revolution.*—*Speech in Congress, January 21, 1837.*

CHANCELLOR HARPER, S. C.

“Would you do a benefit to the horse, or the ox, by giving him a cultivated understanding, a fine feeling? So far as the mere laborer has the pride, the knowledge, or the aspiration of a freeman, he is unfitted for his situation. If there are sordid, servile, laborious offices to be performed, is it not better that there should be sordid, servile, laborious beings to perform them? Odium has been cast upon our legislation on account of its forbidding the elements of education being communicated to slaves. But, in truth, what injury is done them by this? *He who works during the day with his hands does not read in the intervals of leisure, for his amusement, or the improvement of his mind; or the exception is so very rare as scarcely to need the being provided for.*—*Southern Literary Messenger.*

GEORGE M'DUFFIE.

“If we look into the elements of which all political communities are composed, it will be found that servitude in some form is one of the essential constituents. In the very nature of things, there must be classes of persons to discharge all the different offices of society, from the highest to the lowest. *Where these offices are performed by members of the political community, a dangerous element is obviously introduced by the body politic.* * * * * *Domestic slavery, therefore, instead of being an evil, IS THE CORNER-STONE OF OUR REPUBLICAN EDIFICE.*”—*Message to the S. C. Legislature, 1835.*

ROBERT WICKLIFFE, KY.

“Gentlemen wanted to drive out the black population, that they may obtain *white* negroes in their places. White negroes have this advantage over black negroes, they can be converted into voters; and the men who live upon the sweat of their brow, and pay them but a dependent and scanty subsistence, can, if able to keep ten thousand of them in employment, come up to the polls, and change the destiny of the country.”

“How improved will be our condition when we have such *white negroes* as perform the servile labors of Europe, of old England, and he would add now, of New-England; when our body servants and our cart drivers, and our

street sweepers, are *white* negroes instead of black. Where will be the independence, the proud spirit, and the chivalry of the Kentuckians then?”—*Speech in Kentucky.*

But little comment is needed upon the atrocious doctrines of these slaveholding gentry, which they have so openly stated and boldly avowed. For these sentiments were not whispered in secret, but “proclaimed from the house-tops.” It will be noticed that not one of these witnesses makes any allusion whatever to *color* or *race*, except the last. But *slaves* and *laborers* are spoken of in the same connection, and as belonging to the same *class*. Both are denied the right of voting, or of taking any part whatever in political affairs.

Those *innocent* Northerners, who have supposed that none but “*black negroes*” ever were, or are ever to be, subjected to the lash of slavery, will find themselves most egregiously mistaken. Mr. Leigh tells us that those who depend on their daily labor for their subsistence “never do, never will, never can” “enter into political affairs.” And Mr. Pickens adds that, if “laborers ever do obtain political power, the country is in a state of revolution.” And Mr. McDuffie declares that, where those who “discharge all the different offices of society, from the *highest to the lowest*,” are allowed to vote, “*a dangerous element is introduced by the body politic.*” And Mr. Pickens further says, in the same speech:

“Hence it is, that they must have a strong federal government to *control the labor* of the nation. But it is precisely the reverse with us. We have already not only a right to the *proceeds* of our laborers, but *we own a class of laborers themselves.* But, let me say to gentlemen who represent the great class of capitalists at the North, beware how you drive us into a separate system, for, if you do, as certain as the decrees of Heaven, you will be compelled to appeal to the sword to maintain yourselves at home. It may not come in your day; but *your children's children will be covered with the blood of domestic factions, and a PLUNDERING MOB contending for power and conquest.*”

The plain English of which is, that if “laborers”—in other words, those who create and diffuse all the wealth of society—are allowed to vote and exercise political power, they they will so direct the affairs of government, as to secure a just share in the products of their own toil; and the only way in which “capitalists” can prevent this, and safely plunder the laborer, so as to get the “lion's share,” is to rob him of both his vote and himself to-

gether: in other words, make a slave of him. And "capitalists at the North" are warned that they can never enjoy anything like repose until they not only "have a right to the proceeds of the laborers," but "*own*" the laborers themselves.

It was doubtless this view of the case, which drew out that remarkable declaration from

JOHN C. CALHOUN.

"We regard slavery as the most safe and stable basis for *free institutions* in the world. It is impossible with us that the conflict should take place between labor and capital. Every plantation is a little community, with the master at its head, who concentrates in himself the united interests of capital and labor, of which he is the common representative."

That such sentiments are not confined to the South, and the class technically called "slaveholders," will be shown by the following brief extract from the

NEW YORK DAY BOOK,

A journal which aspires to the leadership of the Democratic forces of the entire country. In its issue of June 21, 1856, in an article on "Sewardism," occurs the following, among other passages of similar import:

"*Negro 'slavery' is the basis of American DEMOCRACY; or the subordination of an inferior race has secured, and always will secure, the equality of the superior race.*"

In its campaign prospectus, of the same date, occurs the following portentous announcement:

"We have enlisted for the *war against abolitionism* and its impostures, and we do not intend to stop until we '*subdue*' them."

The following article, in relation to the late murder at *Willard's Hotel*, Washington city, bears upon the point just stated, that *slavery knows nothing of race or color; that condition is the only ground on which it bases all its arrogant assumptions of superiority. It is from the*

CHARLESTON (S. C.) STANDARD.

"HERBERT AND KEATING.—Any provocation that may have been given for the assault upon him by the body of waiters, was at the most a provocation of words, and such a provocation as a servant should not have a right to resent; and, if white men accept the offices of menials, it should be expected that they will do so with an apprehension of their relation to society, and the disposition quietly to encour-

ter both the responsibilities and the liabilities which the relation imposes."

Mr. J. C. UNDERWOOD, who was recently prohibited from returning to Virginia, in consequence of a speech which he made at the Philadelphia Convention, addressed a Fremont meeting in New York on Thursday evening, July 17. Referring to the domestic slave trade, which has been created as a result of the law of 1808 declaring the foreign slave trade piracy, Mr. Underwood said that the number of slaves now annually sold in Virginia was between 20,000 and 25,000, and the price they brought was from \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000. The traffic is attended, too, by horrors as great as any that marked the African slave trade. Of the condition of the white laborers of Virginia, Mr. Underwood drew the following sad picture:

"He would ask, what were the influences of slavery upon the white man? and upon this subject he could not help feeling more for his own countrymen than for the poor children of Africa. He had white laborers around him in Virginia—the families of eight poor white men—sober and industrious tenants. He had employed them because he preferred them to slaves. He could have inherited slaves if he had but said the word; but upon his first reflections he had resolved that the sweat of no slave should moisten his fields. [Great applause.]

"What did they think were the wages of laboring men in Virginia? They only received from eight to ten dollars a month, with the exception of a little time in harvest—some fifty cents a day; and the fare allotted to them was far inferior in every respect to that furnished by the farmers of the North to their laboring men. The white laborers in Virginia were not invited to the great house to take their meals, but they must take them under the shade of a tree, sometimes in the same group with the slaves, and sometimes in a little group by themselves. The white laborer at the South did not get from his employer tea, coffee, sugar, butter, wheat bread, or anything of the kind, for his support. He would tell them some of the other disadvantages under which the white laborers of Virginia were placed. They were not permitted to enjoy the advantages of district schools. It was true, there was a small fund for common-school education, but, before any man could be allowed to have a participation in it for the benefit of his children, he must be willing to acknowledge himself a pauper, and ask for his share of the fund upon the ground of his poverty.

They all had heard the maxim that pride and pauperism walked together, and the poor white men of Virginia were too proud to accept of the fund upon such terms, and the result was that there were seventy-five thousand men and women in Virginia unable to read and write. These were some of the consequences resulting to the white laborers at the South from the influences of slavery; and the question for Northern laboring men to decide was, whether such influences should be extended over the territories of the great West—whether the white men who go there shall fare like the slave laborers of the South, or whether like the white laborers of New York, they shall be permitted to enjoy the rights of freemen, the right of education for their children, and a reasonable compensation for their labor.”

From the Richmond Enquirer.

The Slaveholder's View of the North and its Institutions.

“The relations between the North and South are very analogous to those which subsisted between Greece and the Roman Empire after the subjugation of Achaia by the consul Mummius. The dignity and energy of the Roman character, conspicuous in war and in politics, were not easily tamed and adjusted to the arts of industry and literature. The degenerate and pliant Greeks, on the contrary, excelled in the handicraft and polite professions. We learn, from the vigorous invective of Juvenal, that they were the most useful and capable of servants, whether as pimps or professors of rhetoric. Obsequious, dexterous, and ready, the versatile Greeks monopolized the business of teaching, publishing, and manufacturing, in the Roman Empire—allowing their masters ample leisure for the service of the State, in the senate or in the field. The people of the Northern States of this confederacy exhibit the same aptitude for the arts of industry. They excel as clerks, mechanics, and tradesmen, and they have monopolized the business of teaching, publishing, and peddling.”

From the Richmond Examiner, Dec. 28, 1855.

“We have got to hating everything with the prefix *free*—from free negroes down and up, through the whole catalogue of abominations, demagogueries, lusts, philosophies, fanaticism, and follies, free farms, free labor, free niggers, free society, free will, free thinking, free love, free wives, free children, and free schools, all belonging to the same brood of damnable isms whose mother is Sin and whose daddy is the Devil—are all the progeny of

that prolific monster which greeted Satan on his arrival at the gates of hell, which

‘—Seemed woman to the waist, and fair,
But ended foul in many a scaly fold
Voluminous and vast, a serpent armed
With mortal sting: about her middle round
A cry of hell-hounds never ceasing bark’d
With wide Cerberean mouths full loud and many
A hideous peal: yet when they list would creep,
If aught disturbed their noise, into her womb,
And kennel there; yet there still barked and howled
Within unseen.’

“*But the worst of all these abominations—because, when once installed, it becomes the hotbed propagator of all—is the modern system of free schools.* We forget who it is that has charged and proved that the New England system of free schools has been the cause and prolific source of all the legions of horrible infidelities and treasons that have turned her cities into Sodoms and Gomorrahs, and her fair land into the common nestling-place of howling bedlamites. *We abominate the system because the schools are free,* and because they make that which ought to be the reward of toil, and earnest, ardent, and almost superhuman individual efforts, cheap, commonplace, prizeless, and uninviting. As there is no royal road to learning, so there ought to be no mob road to learning.

“A ‘little learning is a dangerous thing’—to the individual, to society, to learning itself, to all conservatism of thought and all stability in general affairs. The sole function of the free school is to supply that ‘little learning;’ and thus it is charged to the brim with incendiarisms, heresies, and all the explosive elements which uproot and rend and desolate society.

From the New York Post.

The Present Southern Doctrine on Slavery and the Slave Trade.

The other day we gave a sample of the manner in which the administration journals in this quarter speak of the slave trade. In their approval of this traffic they are, of course, supported by the administration journals of the South. The *Richmond Enquirer*, of the 9th inst., has an article precisely in the same tone, from which we give an extract. The zeal of Mr. Pierce’s friends in behalf of the “domestic institutions of the South” carries them to lengths from which a few years since they would have shrunk with something like horror. When Mr. Tyler was Chief Magistrate he sent a message to Congress, dwelling upon the enormity of that execrable

traffic, as he called the foreign slave trade. Such views of the subject are now, old-fashioned in Virginia. There is no enormity which the friends of slavery are not prepared to defend, provided it shall seem necessary to the interests of their institution. The friends of Mr. Pierce's administration are in a particular manner resolved to out-do all former zeal of the friends of slavery. Here is the passage from the Richmond Print:—

“The convention between the United States and Great Britain, in virtue of which the slave trade was denounced as piracy, and obstructed by the vigilance of a joint squadron on the coast of Africa, only stimulated the ingenuity of the Yankee merchant to the invention of expedients by which to escape the halter, and to prosecute his traffic with undiminished profits. In both these objects his sagacity has achieved signal success. Instances of the capture and condemnation of Yankee slavers are so rare as not to stop the trade, yet are frequent enough to justify an increase of price to cover risks. So the business of kidnapping and enslaving the poor negroes by Yankee adventurers has flourished, despite the penalties of piracy and the activity of ships of war.

“The convention with Great Britain was a triumph of English abolitionism over the good-natured stupidity of the American government. At the foundation of the treaty lies the principle that negro slavery is an iniquity and an outrage against human and divine law. If slavery be morally right, and a social benefit, then there can be no impropriety, much less guilt, in extending it. If slavery violates the laws of God, outrages the instincts of human nature, and contradicts the ends of political society, then the slave trade is a crime which government should suppress by adequate penalties. The accusation against slavery involved in the convention with Great Britain, was seized upon as an advanced position whence abolitionism might discharge its battery against the guaranties of the institution, and is the remote origin of the violent abolition agitation of the present day.

“We do not propose the revival of the slave trade, for, as the slave trade has never been suppressed, it needs no revival. We only protest against the principle of a treaty, which is based on an assumption that slavery is an evil in politics and a crime in morals. The accidental evils of the slave trade are a legitimate subject of international convention, and may be corrected by regulations which shall afford adequate protection to the personal security of the negro. The convention with

Great Britain, while it has failed to accomplish its object, infinitely aggravates the sufferings of the negro, and prevents the supply of African labor from keeping pace with the growing demands of an agriculture which is essential to the wants of civilization. For these reasons, we say abrogate the convention.

“But the demands of civilization are not evaded with impunity. The world must have a supply of tropical productions, and there can be no tropical productions without compulsory labor. The obstructions thrown in the way of the African slave trade have not arrested the traffic, but they have reduced it until it is altogether inadequate to the wants of mankind.”

The Richmond Enquirer

is confessedly the most able and influential journal south of “Mason and Dixon's line;” it is, also, a powerful supporter of both Slavery and Democracy, and a zealous advocate of the election of Mr. Buchanan to the Presidency. It talks (of the Kansas question) in this strain:

“The South once thought its own institutions wrongful and inexpedient. *It thinks so no longer — and will insist that they SHALL BE PROTECTED AND EXTENDED BY THE ARM OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, EQUALLY WITH THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE NORTH.*”

From the Richmond (Va.) Enquirer, of June 16.

The True Issue.

The Democrats of the South in the present canvass cannot rely on the old grounds of defence and excuse for Slavery; for they seek not merely to retain it where it is, but to extend it into regions where it is unknown. Much less can they rely on the mere constitutional guaranties of Slavery, for such reliance is pregnant with the admission that Slavery is wrong, and but for the constitutional argument for Slavery, standing alone, fully justifies the Abolitionists. They are clearly right, if Slavery be morally wrong, for to get rid of it under the Constitution, or by amending the Constitution, is confessedly impracticable.

In truth, the Constitution cannot help Slavery, if it be a violation of the laws of God and of morality. In that case, the Constitution should be changed, or the Free States should secede, rather than continue to guarantee what they consider immoral and profane. The Constitution cannot help Slavery, for another reason. That institution, extending through fifteen States, and inter-ramified with the interests, the feelings, and the very existence of many millions of men, is much stronger than

the Constitution. It would be far easier to change or violate the Constitution, than to abolish Slavery. Besides, Slavery is older than the Constitution, existed before it, and independently of it. We derive no right to our slaves from it, and weaken our cause by seeming to rely on it.

Nor will it avail us aught to show that the negro is most happy and best situated in the condition of Slavery. If we stop there, we weaken our cause by the very argument intended to advance it; *for we propose to introduce into new territory, human beings whom we assert to be unfit for liberty, self-government, and equal association with other men. We must go a step farther.* We must show that African Slavery is a *moral, religious, natural,* and probably in the general, a *necessary institution of society.* This is the *only line of argument* that will enable Southern Democrats to maintain the doctrines of State equality and Slavery extension.

For if Slavery be not a legitimate, useful, moral, and expedient institution, we cannot, without reproof of conscience and the blush of shame, seek to extend it, or assert our equality with those States having no such institution.

Northern Democrats need not go thus far. They do not seek to extend Slavery, but only agree to its extension, as a matter of right on our part. They may prefer their own social system to ours. It is best that they should. *Our friends are conservatives at home, and conservatives of the Union — conservative of religion, of marriage, of property, of State institutions, and of Federal institutions.* But whilst they may prefer their own social system, they will have to admit in this canvass that ours is also *rightful and legitimate,* and sanctioned alike by the opinions and usages of mankind, and by the authority and express injunctions of Scripture. They cannot consistently maintain that Slavery is immoral, inexpedient, and profane, and yet continue to submit to its extension.

We know that we utter bold truths. But the time has now arrived when their utterance can be no longer postponed. *The true issue should stand out so boldly and clearly that none may mistake it.*

After reading the above article LET THE READER GIVE HIS PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO THE FOLLOWING, from the New York Herald:

A great change appears to have come over the mind of our Virginia cotemporary in the

course of the last few weeks. He no longer denounces and defies the people of the North; but he appeals, apologizes and argues the slavery question with them, like a brother returning to a reasoning frame of mind. He shows what territories the South has sacrificed to the North for the sake of peace and harmony, and earnestly pleads that "the repeal of the Missouri restriction was not intended as a measure of slavery extension, but of atonement to the Constitution for an outrage upon its spirit, and to the South for a violation of its rights and dignity." It is not slavery that the South desires to establish in Kansas, but an abstract constitutional right. Give the South the abstraction, and the North may have the territory — if they can get it. That's all; and we have no objection in the world to this arrangement.

But how are we to account for this change in the tone of our Richmond organ, from blustering defiance to sober reason? We find in the Richmond Enquirer of June 16, an article on "The True Issue," in which the editor declares that "the Democrats of the South, in the pending canvass, cannot rely on the old grounds of apology and excuse for slavery; for they seek, not merely to retain it where it is, but to extend it into regions where it is unknown. Much less can they rely on the mere constitutional guaranties of slavery, for such reliance is pregnant with the admission that slavery is wrong, and but for the Constitution should be abolished." What then? Why, says our Richmond philosopher, "we must go a step farther. We must show that African slavery is a moral, religious, natural, and probably, in the general, a necessary institution of society. This is the only line of argument that will enable Southerners to maintain the doctrines of State equality and Slavery extension."

Here is the plain announcement that the South seeks not merely to retain slavery where it is, "but to extend it into regions where it is unknown;" and if "the repeal of the Missouri compromise was not intended as a measure of slavery extension," where does our Richmond philosopher propose to extend it? The simple fact is, that since the 16th of June our Richmond cotemporary has become alarmed at the tremendous popularity of Fremont, and convinced of the fact that, upon the direct sectional question of slavery or no slavery in Kansas, Mr. Buchanan runs the hazard of a signal defeat. This article, therefore, of the Enquirer, which we copy to-day, denying the soft impeachment of "slavery extension," is intended for Pennsylvania con-

sumption, just as the late letter of Governor Wise to Rochester was intended for the peculiar Democratic climate of Northern and Western New York. Our fierce Richmond champions of Southern rights are backing down. They have discovered that in making this campaign upon Kansas a strictly sectional fight upon slavery or no slavery, they are in danger of being ingloriously beaten, and so they are beating a retreat.

But this Virginia Democratic plea for Pennsylvania opens the doors of the Old Dominion to Fremont. If the South do not seek to extend slavery into Kansas, where can be the objection to a Fremont electoral ticket in Virginia, and in every other Southern State? Our Richmond organ may be playing a desperate trick. Its fears may have overruled its judgment; but we are entirely satisfied from our Southern correspondence that there is a large body of sensible men in the South, with whom the extension of slavery into Kansas is a matter of indifference compared with the higher object of a wholesome and general reform in the government, and in the politics of the country. We are satisfied that our blustering secessionists of the school of Mr. Toombs have been leading Mr. Fillmore and Mr. Buchanan astray, and that this cry of secession, should Kansas be admitted, fairly or unfairly, as a Free State, is all moonshine.

Here is the last article of the Enquirer, referred to above, which the reader must compare with that of June 16.

The False Issues of the Canvass.

Of all the fictitious issues which a ready ingenuity could suggest, the Black Republican leaders have invented the very issue which is best adapted to their wicked purpose. It was essential that the principle for which they profess to contend should be of kindred nature with the principle really involved in controversy; or they would not be able to confound the issues of the canvass in the popular apprehension. It was also necessary that the platform on which they pretend to stand should embody the anti-slavery prejudices of the North, without announcing the extreme views of the abolition party. It was important, moreover, that they should contrive to place the South in an attitude of aggressive usurpation, so as more fiercely to inflame the jealous passions of their section. Now, the distinctive principle of the Black Republican platform provides for all these necessities, and responds to all these conditions of success. The issue which the Black Republican party presents to

the country has all the captivating graces of a beautiful fiction.

Black Republicanism affects all respect for the legal safeguards of slavery. It does not propose to impair the security of the institutions of the South. It protests the utmost regard for the Constitution and the Union. It even disclaims a sectional character, and avows itself the champion of conservatism. Yet, it appeals to the fanatical prejudices of the North, and thus enlists the abolition element in its service, while it retains the adhesion of more moderate men by its professions of nationality. The Black Republican party contrive to secure this strong position *by representing themselves to be the champions of freedom, and the South as the propagandist of its peculiar institutions. The principle for which they affect to contend is, the restriction of slavery; the principle which they claim to combat is, the extension of slavery. This is the fictitious issue which they present to the country, and employ as the agency of sectional aggrandizement.* With so favorable a basis of operations, they conduct the campaign with wonderful skill and spirit. They accuse the slaveholders of oligarchic usurpation, of aristocratic selfishness, of despotic cruelty. *They represent the South to be possessed with the ambition of extending its institutions over the continent, and as engaged in a conspiracy to subjugate the Free States to its sway. To encourage the North in resistance to so criminal an enterprise, they expatiate on the imaginary evils of slavery, from the tribune, from the pulpit and in the fascinating pages of fiction. To rouse and organize a party subservient to its purposes, Black Republicanism has recourse to all the arts and agencies of popular agitation. Perversions of history, hyperbole of rhetoric, the machinery of a venal ambition and a corrupt conspiracy, are all employed to support the grave indictment against the South.*

Black Republicanism is in so frantic a humor that it is questionable if its victims are accessible to any appeal of truth and reason. But there are men in the North who are neither sworn to the support of an imposture nor incapable of appreciating an honest statement. To them we would submit a few words in refutation of the charge against the people of the South.

The Black Republican party misrepresent the issues of the canvass, in that they impute an imaginary purpose to the South, and claim a false credit for themselves. The South cherishes no ambition of sectional aggrandize-

ment, and has conceived no hostile enterprise against the interests of the North. We ask nothing of the federal government but protection in the enjoyment of our indisputable rights. *We do not desire to impose our peculiar social system upon any other community. We do not ask the North to aid us in the extension of slavery.* This is our position: we have a compact with the States of the North by which we are bound to respect the States of the South as co-equal sovereignties, and to render them a certain specific service. We demand the fulfilment of the obligations of the Constitution, and we demand nothing more. These obligations are too distinct for misconception. The South claims no inferential advantage and no constructive privilege. It stands upon the strict letter of its right.

So far from convicting the Slave States of an ambition to extend their institutions and to assert a supremacy over the Free States, the history of the country is but one consistent record of Southern compromise and Southern concession. The area of slave territory has not been extended a single acre. On the contrary, an empire of slave territory has been converted to free soil, and that too by the voluntary act of a Slave State. Virginia set the example of concession by the ordinance of '87. The Missouri Compromise of 1820 operated another large reduction of slave territory; and the Texas Compromise of 1850 converted still another vast region of slavery into free soil. We repeat, not an acre of territory which was originally free soil, is subject to slavery now; but by the act of the Slave States themselves, an immeasurable extent of country has been taken from the South and added to the dominion and power of the Free States. To these concessions on the part of the South we must add its consent to the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia; and as another instance of its moderation, we may mention the fact that the South never objected to the emancipation of slavery in the Northern States. Yet the South has as much right to object to emancipation in the North as the North has to complain of slavery in the South—nay, more, for emancipation endangers the security of the South, but slavery in the South does not injuriously affect the interests of the North.

It is easy to anticipate the reply to this vindication of the character of the South. Black Republicanism pretends to find in the repeal of the Missouri restriction incontestable proof of the sectional ambition and aggressive spirit of the South. This is another false impeach-

ment of the motives of the South. If we revert to the speeches of the supporters of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, we find a distinct and emphatic disavowal of any aggressive purpose on the part of the South. The repeal of the Missouri restriction was not intended as a measure of slavery extension, but of atonement to the Constitution for an outrage upon its spirit, and to the South for a violation of its rights and dignity. All the South contended for in the support of the Kansas-Nebraska bill was a recognition of its equality under the Constitution; and all the South now claims is, that its people shall not be driven from the common territory by the Sharp's rifles of emigrant aid societies. The South simply demands that the fair and legitimate expansion of its social system shall not be repressed by the arbitrary and unconstitutional action of the federal government, and that its institutions shall be adopted or excluded only by the people whom they are to affect. Is there anything of slavery propagandism in this principle? Is there anything of sectional encroachment in this position? Yet this is the position which the South occupies, and this is the only principle for which the South contends. If Black Republicanism is to triumph in this issue, the South must despair of the protection of its rights and honor under the present system of government.

In contrast with the modern doctrine of Slavery Extension, read what Washington said!

"I can only say that there is not a man living, who wishes more sincerely than I do to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it (slavery). * * AND THIS, SO FAR AS MY SUFFRAGE WILL GO, SHALL NOT BE WANTING."—*Letter to Robert Morris.*

Patrick Henry's View.

"I believe a time will come, when an opportunity will be offered to abolish this lamentable evil. If not, let us transmit to our descendants, together with our slaves, a pity for their unhappy lot, and our abhorrence of slavery."—*Letter of Patrick Henry to R. Pleasants, January 18, 1773.*

The voice of the South now, and of the Democratic party, is that the general government shall adopt as its policy the extension and perpetuation of Slavery.

Let us set opposite to this the counsel of our greatest statesmen, Mr. CLAY and Mr. WEBSTER.

MR. CLAY.

Extract from Colton's Life of Henry Clay, showing his views in early life, p. 187.

"In common with many eminent patriots of the Slave-holding States—such as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Marshall, Mercer, and a host of others—Mr. Clay has ever regarded slavery in the United States, not less as a social wrong, than a great political evil—as a sore on the body politic—demanding the greatest consideration of the wise and good, for the discovery and application of a constitutional remedy. His entrance on the theatre of public life in Kentucky, was as an emancipationist, in 1798, the year after he removed to that State, where he appeared first, in a series of articles published at Lexington in the Kentucky Gazette over the signature of SCÆVOLA; and soon afterward he took the field more openly, and headed a party of emancipationists during the agitation of remodelling the State constitution, proposing and advocating the introduction of an article for the gradual and ultimate abolition of slavery in the commonwealth. Though he and his coadjutors failed of their object, they nevertheless made an earnest and bold push, leaving a lasting impression on the public mind. Notwithstanding it exposed him to obloquy, and from that period has been politically injurious to him, in the State of his adoption, he has never retreated from the ground he then occupied, otherwise than in the diversion of labors which could be no longer of use, to other public objects.

"It is well known and has often been repeated, that about twenty years afterward, when advocating the compromise of the Missouri question, he said on the floor of Congress, that, were he a citizen of Missouri, he would contend for an article in her constitution, like that he had supported in Kentucky, for gradual emancipation, with a view to abolition, and that he earnestly recommended it to the people of that State."

His views in 1827.—Extract from a Speech delivered by Mr. Clay before the American Colonization Society, at Washington, January 20, 1827.

"We are reproached with doing mischief by the agitation of this question [slavery]. Collateral consequences we are not responsible for. It is not this Society which has produced the great moral revolution, which this age exhibits. What would they, who thus reproach us, have done? *If they would repress all tendencies toward liberty and ultimate emancipa-*

tion, they must do more than put down the benevolent efforts of this Society. They must go back to the era of our liberty and independence, and muzzle the cannon which thunders its annual joyous return. They must revive the slave trade, with all its train of atrocities. They must blow out the moral lights around us, and extinguish the greatest torch of all which America presents to a benighted world, pointing the way to their rights, their liberties, and their happiness. And when they have achieved all these purposes, their work will yet be incomplete. They must penetrate the human soul, and eradicate the light of reason and the love of liberty. Then, and not till then, when universal darkness and despair prevail, can you perpetuate slavery, and repress all sympathies, and all humane and benevolent efforts among freemen in behalf of the unhappy portion of our race doomed to bondage."

His Views in 1829.

Extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Clay before the Kentucky Colonization Society, at Frankfort, Dec. 17, 1829.

"More than thirty years ago an attempt was made, in this commonwealth, to adopt a system of gradual emancipation, similar to that which the illustrious Franklin had mainly contributed to introduce, in 1780, in the State founded by the benevolent Penn. And among the acts of my life which I look back to with the most satisfaction, is that of having cooperated with other zealous and intelligent friends, to procure the establishment of that system in this State.

* * * * *

I have never ceased, and never shall cease, to regret a decision, the effects of which have been to place us in the rear of our neighbors, who are exempt from slavery, in the state of agriculture, the progress of manufactures, the advance of improvements, and the general prosperity of society."

His Views in 1850.

In the great slavery debate of 1850, in reply to Jefferson Davis, then Senator from Mississippi, now Mr. Pierce's Secretary of War, Mr. Clay said:

"I am extremely sorry to hear the Senator from Mississippi say that he requires, first the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific, and also that he is not satisfied with that, but requires, if I understood him correctly, a positive provision for the admission

of slavery south of that line. *And now, sir, coming from a Slave State, as I do, I owe it to myself, I owe it to truth, I owe it to the subject, to say that no earthly power could induce me to vote for a specific measure for the introduction of slavery where it had not before existed, either south or north of that line.* Coming as I do, from a Slave State, it is my solemn, deliberate and well matured determination, *that no power, no earthly power shall compel me to vote for the positive introduction of slavery either south or north of that line.* Sir, while you reproach, and justly too, our British ancestors, for the introduction of this institution upon the continent of America, I am, for one, unwilling that the posterity of the present inhabitants of California and of New Mexico shall reproach us for doing just what we reproach Great Britain for doing to us. * * * * These are my views, sir, and I choose to express them; and I care not how extensively or universally they are known."

"These," says Mr. Benton, himself from a Slave State, in his Thirty Years' View, "*were manly sentiments, courageously expressed, and taking the right ground, so much overlooked or perverted by others.*"

In his speech of FEBRUARY 5TH, 1850, he used the following emphatic language.

We entreat the reader to note its application to the state of things now existing in Kansas, where a civil war is actually raging between the reckless propagandists of Slavery and the unoffending Free State settlers.

"But (said Mr. Clay) if, unhappily, we should be involved in war, in civil war, between the two parts of this confederacy, **IN WHICH THE EFFORT upon the one side should be to restrain the introduction of Slavery into the new Territories, and upon the other side to force its introduction there,** what a spectacle should we present to the astonishment of mankind, in an effort, *not to propagate rights,* but, I must say it, though I trust it will be understood to be said with no design to excite feeling, — *a war to propagate wrongs in the Territories thus acquired from Mexico.* It would be a war in which we should have no sympathies — no good wishes; in which all mankind would be against us; in which our own history itself would be against us; for from the commencement of the Revolution down to the present time, we have constantly reproached our British ancestors for the introduction of Slavery into this country."

MR. WEBSTER'S

Opinion of Slavery and Slavery Extension.

From the Boston Daily Advertiser.

With slavery in the States where it is established, Mr. Webster, and nobody else at the North who respects the Constitution, ever pretended or designed to interfere. But when the question relates to the introduction of slavery into territory where it does not already exist, the subject assumes an entirely different aspect. This question has repeatedly arisen in different cases, during the history of the Union, *and in every case during Mr. Webster's life when it arose, he uniformly put himself on the side of opposition to slavery;* he maintained the rights of the general government under the Constitution, and the duty of the people of the North, in justice to themselves and to the future population of the nascent States, to prevent the growth of what he and they believed to be a blighting influence.

The question arose pending the admission of Missouri into the Union; it arose again on the annexation of Texas; again in the discussions respecting Oregon; and again in the case of California, New Mexico and Utah, in which last case it was determined by circumstances which (in Mr. Webster's opinion) took it beyond the range of ordinary political considerations. *In all these cases, he expressed his opinions very decidedly and distinctly against the extension of slavery into free territory.*

The question is now forced anew upon the country, under very peculiar circumstances. A portion of our territory, which had once been dedicated to freedom "forever," by a law which Mr. Webster, thirty years after its passage, regarded as irrevocable, has been prepared for slavery by a repeal of that law. There is an obvious determination, to which no sane man can shut his eyes, on the part of the Southern politicians, cordially aided by the Democratic party, to introduce Kansas, and perhaps Nebraska, into the Union as slaveholding States, to be followed by a whole tier of slaveholding States stretching west to the Pacific. *We are brought back in 1856 to the state of things which existed before the admission of Missouri, when Mr. Webster said, "This is the last time the opportunity will happen to fix the limits of slavery, which else will roll on, desolating the vast expanse of continent to the Pacific Ocean."* We are brought back to this state of things, but have meanwhile been taught by experience some useful lessons as to the mode in which we must meet the question.

In this exigency, while we believe that Mr. Webster might agree with his friend Mr. Choate, in regarding the question of the presidential election as narrowed to a naked choice between Mr. Buchanan and Colonel Fremont, we cannot suppose that he could bring himself to support the former, a candidate pledged to the maintenance of the policy of the present administration, and the representative of the Democratic party which in each former crisis has been ready to yield a support to the interests of the slaveholding States, without which support Texas would not have been annexed, the Mexican war would not have been fought, and the Missouri compromise would not have been repealed.

Mr. Webster's opinions on these subjects are so well known to those who have studied his writings, that it is really quite unnecessary to allude to the matter as if there were any uncertainty about them. There is none; *he was a consistent and determined opponent of slavery extension.* But as there has been a singular evidence of a disposition to make a statement of his opinions by a stretched and arbitrary use of personal authority; and as some of our readers may not have all the documents at hand for reference, we have collected together in this morning's paper several of Mr. Webster's writings on this subject.

Mr. Webster's Boston Memorial.

The committee appointed by a vote of a meeting holden in the State House on the 3d instant, to prepare a Memorial to Congress on the subject of the Prohibition of Slavery in the new States, submit the following:—

DANIEL WEBSTER,
GEORGE BLAKE,
JOSIAH QUINCY,
JAMES T. AUSTIN,
JOHN GALLISON.

Boston, December 15, 1819.

MEMORIAL.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, inhabitants of Boston and its vicinity, beg leave most respectfully and humbly to represent: That the question of the introduction of slavery into the New States to be formed on the West side of the Mississippi River, appears to them to be a question of the last importance to the future welfare of the United States. If the progress of this great evil is ever to be arrested, it seems to the undersigned that this is the time to arrest it. A

false step taken now cannot be retraced; and it appears to us that the happiness of unborn millions rests on the measures which Congress may, on this occasion, adopt. Considering this as no local question, nor a question to be decided by a temporary expediency, but as involving great interests of the whole of the United States, and affecting deeply and essentially those objects of common defence, general welfare, and the perpetuation of the blessings of liberty, for which the Constitution itself was formed, we have presumed, in this way, to offer our sentiments and express our wishes to the National Legislature. And as various reasons have been suggested, against prohibiting Slavery in the New States, it may perhaps be permitted to us to state our reasons, both for believing that Congress possesses the Constitutional power to make such prohibition a condition, on the admission of a New State into the Union, and that it is just and proper that they should exercise that power.

And, in the first place, as to the Constitutional authority of Congress. The Constitution of the United States has declared that "the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory, or other property belonging to the United States, and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice the claims of the United States, or of any particular State." It is very well known that the saving in this clause of the claims of any particular State was designed to apply to claims by the then existing States, of territory which was also claimed by the United States as their own property. It has, therefore, no bearing on the present question. The power, then, of Congress over its own territories is, by the very terms of the Constitution, unlimited. It may make all "needful rules and regulations;" which of course include all such regulations as its own views of policy or expediency shall from time to time dictate. *If, therefore, in its judgment, it be needful for the benefit of a Territory to enact a prohibition of Slavery, it would seem to be as much within its power of legislation, as any other ordinary act of local policy.* Its sovereignty being complete and universal, as to the Territory, it may exercise over it the most ample jurisdiction in every respect. It possesses in this view all the authority which any State Legislature possesses over its own territory; and if a State Legislature may, in its discretion, abolish or prohibit Slavery within its own limits, in virtue of its general legislative authority, for the same reason Congress also may exercise the

like authority over its own Territories. And that a State Legislature, unless restrained by some constitutional provision, may so do, is unquestionable, and has been established by general practice.

* * * * *

Upon the whole, the memorialists would respectfully submit that the terms of the Constitution, as well as the practice of the governments under it, must, as they humbly conceive, entirely justify the conclusion, that Congress may prohibit the further introduction of slavery into its own Territories, and also make such prohibition a condition of the admission of any new State into the Union.

If the constitutional power of Congress to make the proposed prohibition be satisfactorily shown, the justice and policy of such prohibition seems to the undersigned to be supported by plain and strong reasons. The permission of slavery in a new State necessarily draws after it an extension of that inequality of representation, which already exists in regard to the original States. It cannot be expected, that those of the original States which do not hold slaves, can look on such an extension as being politically just. As between the original States, the representation rests on compact and plighted faith; and your memorialists have no wish, that that compact should be disturbed, or that plighted faith in the slightest degree violated. But the subject assumes an entirely different character, when a new State proposes to be admitted. With her there is no compact, and no faith plighted; and where is the reason that she should come into the Union with more than an equal share of political importance and political power? Already the ratio of representation, established by the Constitution, has given to the States holding slaves twenty members in the House of Representatives more than they would have been entitled to, except under the particular provision of the Constitution. In all probability, this number will be doubled in thirty years. Under these circumstances, we deem it not an unreasonable expectation that the inhabitants of Missouri should propose to come into the Union, renouncing the right in question, and establishing a Constitution, prohibiting it forever. Without dwelling on this topic, we have still thought it our duty to present it to the consideration of Congress. We present it with a deep and earnest feeling of its importance, and we respectfully solicit for it the full consideration of the National Legislature.

Your memorialists were not without the

hope, that the time had at length arrived, when the inconvenience and the danger of this description of population had become apparent, in all parts of this country, and in all parts of the civilized world. It might have been hoped that the new States themselves would have had such a view of their own permanent interests and prosperity, as would have led them to prohibit its extension and increase. The wonderful increase and prosperity of the States north of the Ohio, is unquestionably to be ascribed in a great measure to the consequences of the ordinance of 1787, and few, indeed, are the occasions, in the history of nations, in which so much can be done, by a single act, for the benefit of future generations, as was done by that ordinance, and as may now be done by the Congress of the United States. *We appeal to the justice and the wisdom of the national councils, to prevent the further progress of a great and serious evil. We appeal to those who look forward to the remote consequences of their measures, and who cannot balance a temporary or trifling convenience, if there were such, against a permanent growing and desolating evil.*

We cannot forbear to remind the two Houses of Congress that the early and decisive measures adopted by the American Government for the abolition of the slave trade are among the proudest memorials of our Nation's glory. That slavery was ever tolerated in the Republic is, as yet, to be attributed to the policy of another government. No imputation, thus far, rests on any portion of the American confederacy. The Missouri Territory is a new country. If its extensive and fertile fields shall be opened as a market for slaves, the government will seem to become a party to a traffic, which, in so many acts, through so many years, it has denounced as impolitic, unchristian, inhuman. To enact laws to punish the traffic, and at the same time to tempt cupidity and avarice by the allurements of an insatiable market, is inconsistent and irreconcilable. Government, by such a course, would only defeat its own purposes, and render nugatory its own measures. Nor can the laws derive support from the manners of the people, if the power of moral sentiment be weakened by enjoying, under the permission of Government, great facilities to commit offences. The laws of the United States have denounced heavy penalties against the traffic in slaves, because such traffic is deemed unjust and inhuman. We appeal to the spirit of these laws; we appeal to this justice and humanity; we ask whether they ought not

to operate on the present occasion with all their force? We have a strong feeling of the injustice of any toleration of slavery. Circumstances have entailed it on a portion of our community, which cannot be immediately relieved from it without consequences more injurious than the suffering of the evil. *But to permit it in a new country, where yet no habits are formed which render it indispensable, what is it, but to encourage that rapacity and fraud and violence, against which we have so long pointed the denunciations of our penal code? What is it, but to tarnish the proud fame of the country? What is it, but to throw suspicion on its good faith, and to render questionable all its professions of regard for the rights of humanity and the liberties of mankind?*

As inhabitants of a free country; as citizens of a great and rising Republic; as members of a Christian community; as living in a liberal and enlightened age, and as feeling ourselves called upon by the dictates of religion and humanity; we have presumed to offer our sentiments to Congress on this question, with a solicitude for the event far beyond what a common occasion could inspire.

Extract from Mr. Webster's Speech at Springfield, Mass., Sept. 29, 1847.

"There is no one who can complain of the North for resisting the increase of slave representation, because it gives power to the minority in a manner inconsistent with the principles of our government. What is past must stand; what is established must stand; and with the same firmness with which I shall resist every plan to augment the slave representation, or to bring the Constitution into hazard by attempting to extend our dominions, shall I contend to allow existing rights to remain."

"Sir, I can only say that, in my judgment, WE ARE TO USE THE FIRST, AND THE LAST, AND EVERY OCCASION WHICH OCCURS, IN MAINTAINING OUR SENTIMENTS AGAINST THE EXTENSION OF THE SLAVE POWER."

Exclusion of Slavery from the Territories.

Remarks made by Mr. Webster in the Senate of the United States, on the 12th of August, 1848.

EXTRACTS.

The Constitution of the United States recognizes it (slavery) as an existing fact, an existing relation between the inhabitants of the Southern States. I do not call it an "institution," because that term is not applicable to

it; for that seems to imply a voluntary establishment. When I first came here, it was a matter of frequent reproach to England, the mother country, that slavery had been entailed upon the colonies by her, against their consent, and that which is now considered a cherished "institution" was then regarded as, I will not say an *evil*, but an entailment on the colonies by the policy of the mother country against their wishes. At any rate it stands upon the Constitution. The Constitution was adopted in 1788, and went into operation in 1789. When it was adopted the state of the country was this: slavery existed in the Southern States; there was a very large extent of unoccupied territory, the whole Northwestern Territory, which, it was understood, was destined to be formed into States; and it was then determined that no slavery should exist in this territory. I gather now as matter of inference from the history of the time and the history of the debates, *that the prevailing motives with the North for agreeing to this recognition of the existence of slavery in the Southern States, and giving a representation to those States, founded in part upon their slaves, rested on the supposition that no acquisition of territory would be made to form new States on the Southern frontier of this country, either by cession or conquest.* No one looked to any acquisition of new territory on the Southern or Southwestern frontier. The exclusion of slavery from the Northwestern Territory and the prospective abolition of the foreign slave trade were generally, the former unanimously, agreed to, and on the basis of these considerations, the South insisted that where slavery existed it should not be interfered with, and that it should have a certain ratio of representation in Congress. And now, sir, I am one who, believing such to be the understanding on which the Constitution was framed, mean to abide by it.

* * * * *

I have now stated, as I understand it, the condition of things upon the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. What has happened since? Sir, it has happened that above and beyond all contemplation or expectation of the original framers of the Constitution or the people who adopted it, foreign territory has been acquired by cession, first from France, and then from Spain, on our Southern frontier. And what has been the result? Five slave-holding States have been created and added to the Union, bringing ten Senators into this body, (I include Texas, which I consider in the light of a foreign acquisition also)

and up to this hour in which I address you, not one Free State has been admitted to the Union, from all this acquired territory.

(Mr. Berrien in his seat). Yes, Iowa.

Iowa is not yet in the Union. Her Senators are not here. When she comes in there will be one to five, one Free State to five Slave States formed out of new territories.

* * * * *

Mr. President, what is the result of this? We stand here now, at least I do, for one, to say, that considering there have been already five new slave-holding States formed out of newly acquired territory, and only one non-slaveholding State at most, I do not feel that I am called on to go further! I do not feel the obligation to yield more. But our friends of the South say, you deprive us of all our rights. We have fought for this territory, and you deny us participation in it. Let us consider this question as it really is; and since the honorable gentleman from Georgia proposes to leave the case to the enlightened and impartial judgment of mankind, and as I agree with him that it is a case proper to be considered by the enlightened part of mankind, let us see how the matter it truth stands. Gentlemen who advocate the case which my honorable friend from Georgia, with so much ability sustains, declare that we invade their rights, that we deprive them of a participation in the enjoyment of territories acquired by the common services and common exertions of all. Is this true? How deprive? Of what do we deprive them? Why, they say that we deprive them of the privilege of carrying their slaves as slaves into the new territories. Well, sir, what is the amount of that? *They say that in this way we deprive them of the opportunity of going into this acquired territory with their property.* "Their property?" What do they mean by "property." *We certainly do not deprive them of the privilege of going into these newly acquired territories with all that, in the general estimate of human society, in the general, and common, and universal understanding of mankind, is esteemed property.* Not at all. The truth is just this. They have in their own States peculiar laws, which create property in persons. They have a system of local legislation on which slavery rests; while everybody agrees that it is against natural law, or at least against the common understanding which prevails among men as to what is natural law.

I am not going into metaphysics, for therein I should encounter the honorable member from South Carolina, (Mr. Calhoun,) and we should

find no end "in wandering mazes lost," until after the time for the adjournment of Congress. The Southern States have peculiar laws, and by those laws there is property in slaves. This is purely local. *The real meaning then, of Southern gentlemen, in making this complaint is, that they cannot go into the territories of the United States, carrying with them their own peculiar local law, a law which creates property in persons.* This, according to their own statement, is all the ground of complaint they have. Now, here, I think, gentlemen are unjust towards us. How unjust they are, others will judge; generations that will come after us will judge. It will not be contended that this sort of personal slavery exists by general law. It exists only by local law. I do not mean to deny the validity of that local law where it is established, but I say, it is, after all, local law. It is nothing more. And wherever that local law does not extend, property in persons does not exist. Well, sir, what is now the demand on the part of our Southern friends? They say, "we will carry our local laws with us wherever we go. We insist that Congress does us injustice unless it establishes in the territory in which we wish to go, our own local law."

This demand I, for one, resist and shall resist. It goes upon the idea that there is an inequality, unless persons under this local law, and holding property by authority of that law, can go into new territory and there establish that local law, to the exclusion of the general law. Mr. President, it was a maxim of the civil law, that between slavery and freedom, freedom should always be presumed, and slavery must always be proved. If any question arose as to the status of an individual in Rome, he was presumed to be free until he was proved to be a slave, because slavery is an exception to the general rule. Such, I suppose, is the general law of mankind. An individual is to be presumed to be free, until a law can be produced which creates ownership in his person. I do not dispute the force and validity of the local law, as I have already said; but I say, it is a matter to be proved; and therefore, if individuals go into any part of the earth, it is to be proved that they are not free-men, or else the presumption is that they are.

Now our friends seem to think that an inequality arises from restraining them from going into the Territories, unless there be a law provided which shall protect their ownership in persons. The assertion is that we create an inequality. Is there nothing to be said on the other side in relation to inequality? Sir,

from the date of this Constitution, and in the counsels that formed and established this Constitution, and I suppose in all men's judgments since, *it is received as a settled truth, that slave labor and free labor do not exist well together.* I have before me a declaration of Mr. Mason, in the Convention that formed the Constitution, to that effect. Mr. Mason, as is well known, was a distinguished member from Virginia. *He says that the objection to slave labor is, that it puts free white labor in disrepute; that it causes labor to be regarded as derogatory to the character of the free white man, and that the free white man despises to work, to use his expression, where slaves are employed.* This is a matter of great interest to the Free States, if it be true, as to a great extent it certainly is, that wherever slave labor prevails, free white labor is excluded or discouraged. I agree that slave labor does not necessarily exclude free labor totally. There is free white labor in Virginia, Tennessee, and other States, where most of the labor is done by slaves. But it necessarily loses something of its respectability, by the side of and when associated with, slave labor. Whenever labor is mainly performed by slaves, it is regarded as degrading to freemen. *The freemen of the North, therefore, have a deep interest in keeping labor free, exclusively free, in the new Territories.*

But, sir, let us look farther into this alleged inequality. There is no pretence that Southern people may not go into territory which shall be subject to the ordinance of 1787. The only restraint is that they shall not carry slaves thither, and continue that relation. They say this shuts them altogether out. Why, sir, there can be nothing more inaccurate in point of fact than this statement. I understand that one-half the people who settled Illinois are people, or descendants of people, who came from the Southern States, and I suppose that one-third of the people of Ohio are those, or descendants of those who emigrated from the South; and I venture to say, that in respect to those two States, they are at this day settled by people of Southern origin in as great a proportion as they are by people of Northern origin, according to the general numbers and proportion of people South and North. There are as many people from the South in proportion to the whole people of the South, in those States, as there are from the North, in proportion to the whole people of the North. *There is then no exclusion of Southern people; there is only the exclusion of a peculiar local law. Neither in principle nor in fact is there any inequality.*

The question now is, whether it is not competent to Congress, in the exercise of a fair and just discretion, considering that there have been five Slaveholding States added to this Union out of foreign acquisitions, and as yet only one Free State, to prevent their further increase. That is the question. I see no injustice in it. *As to the power of Congress, I have nothing to add to what I said the other day. Congress has full power over the subject. It may establish any such government, and any such laws, in the Territories, as in its discretion it may see fit. It is subject, of course, to the rules of justice and propriety, but it is under no Constitutional restraints.*

I have said that I shall consent to no extension of the area of slavery upon this continent, nor to any increase of slave representation in the other House of Congress. I have now stated my reasons for my conduct and my vote. We of the North have already gone, in this respect, far beyond all that any Southern man could have expected, or did expect at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. I repeat the statement of the fact of the creation of five new Slaveholding States out of newly acquired territory. *We have done that which if those who framed the Constitution had foreseen, they never would have agreed to slave representation.* We have yielded thus far; and we have now in the House of Representatives twenty persons voting upon this very question, and upon all other questions, who are there only in virtue of the representation of slaves.

Let me conclude, therefore, by remarking that, while I am willing to present this as showing my own judgment and position in regard to this case, and I beg it to be understood that I am speaking for no other than myself, and while I am willing to offer it to the whole world as my own justification, I rest on these propositions: First, That when this Constitution was adopted, nobody looked for any new acquisition of territory to be formed into Slaveholding States. Secondly, That the principles of the Constitution prohibited, and were intended to prohibit, and should be construed to prohibit all interference of the general government with slavery, as it existed, and as it still exists in the States. And then looking to the operation of these new acquisitions, which have in this great degree had the effect of strengthening that interest in the South, by the addition of these five States, I feel that there is nothing unjust, nothing of which any honest man can complain, if he is intelligent, and I feel that there is nothing with which the civilized world, if they take

notice of so humble a person as myself, will reproach me when I say, as I said the other day, that I have made up my mind, for one, that under no circumstances will I consent to the further extension of the area of slavery in the United States, or to the further increase of slave representation in the House of Representatives.

Extracts from the Speech of Mr. Webster at Marshfield, Sept. 1, 1848.

"I speak without disrespect of the Free Soil party. I have read their platform, and though I think there are some rotten places in it, I can stand on it pretty well. But I see nothing in it which is new and valuable; what is valuable is old, and what is new is not valuable.

"Gentlemen, if the term of Free Soil party or Free Soil men, designate one who is fixed and unalterable, is so to-day, and was so yesterday, and has been so for some time, then I hold myself to be as good a Free Soil man as any of the Buffalo Convention. I pray to know who is to put beneath my feet a freer soil than that which I have stood upon ever since I have been in public life. I pray to know who is to make my lips freer than they have ever been, for the utterance of truth and sound principle, as I understood it. I beg to know who is to inspire into my breast a more resolute and fixed determination, to resist unyieldingly the encroachments and advances of the slave power in this country, than has inhabited it ever since the day that I first opened my mouth in the councils of the country. * * *

I am bound to say on my conscience, that I think that of all the evils inflicted upon us by these acquisitions and accessions of slave territory, the North has borne its full part. * * * We talk of the North; there has been no North! I think the North star is at last discovered; I think there will be a North, but up to the recent session, and to the end of the session, there has been no North in regard to political questions, in regard to firm adhesion to what might be considered the interests of the North and the interests of patriots. Pope say:

'Ask where's the North; at York, 'tis on the Tweed,
In Scotland at the Arcades, and there,
At Greenland, Zembla, or the Lord knows where.'

And if we mean, when we speak of the North, a portion of the country united in just sentiments, firm, strong in opinion and action against the further extension of slavery, if there has ever been such a North, if it has ever existed any where, it has existed the Lord knows where. I do not."

"If I believed him (Gen. Taylor) to be a man that would plunge the country into further wars, for any purpose of ambition or conquest, I would oppose him, let him be nominated by whom he might. If I believed that he was a man who would exercise his official influence for the further extension of the slave power, I would oppose him, let him be nominated by whom he might."

Mr. Webster, on the 7th of March, 1850.

* * * "I will now ask my friend from Rhode Island to read another extract from a speech of mine made at a Whig Convention in Springfield, Massachusetts, in the month of September, 1847.

Mr. Greene here read the following extract:—

"We hear much just now of a panacea for the dangers and evils of slavery and slave annexation, which they call the 'Wilmot Proviso.' That certainly is a just sentiment, but it is not a sentiment to found any new party upon. It is not a sentiment on which Massachusetts Whigs differ. There is not a man in this hall who holds to it firmer than I do, nor one who adheres to it more than another.

"I feel some little interest in this matter, sir. Did not I commit myself in 1837 to the whole doctrine, fully, entirely? And I must be permitted to say, that I cannot quite consent that more recent discoverers should claim the merit and take out a patent.

"I deny the priority of their invention. Allow me to say, sir, it is not their thunder. . . .

"We are to use the first and the last, and every occasion which offers, to oppose the extension of slave power.

"But I speak of it here, as in Congress, as a political question, a question for statesmen to act upon. We must so regard it. I certainly do not mean to say that it is less important in a moral point of view, that it is not more important in many other points of view; but as a legislator, or in any official capacity, I must look at it, consider it, and decide it as a matter of political action."

"On other occasions, in debates here, I have expressed my determination to vote for no acquisition, or cession, or annexation, North or South, East or West. My opinion has been that we have territory enough, and that we should follow the Spartan maxim, 'Improve, adorn what you have,' seek no further. I think that it was in some observations that I made on the three-million loan bill, that I avowed this sentiment. In short, sir, it has been avowed, quite as often, in as many places, and

before as many assemblies, as any humble opinions of mine ought to be avowed. * * * *

“Sir, wherever there is a substantive good to be done, wherever there is a foot of land to be prevented from becoming slave territory, I am ready to assert the principle of the exclusion of slavery. I am pledged to it from the year 1837; I have been pledged to it again and again; and I will perform those pledges; but I will not do a thing unnecessarily that wounds the feelings of others, or that does discredit to my own understanding.

“Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I proposed to do, the proposition with which I set out, and upon which I intend to stand or fall; and that is, that *the whole territory within the former United States, or in the newly acquired Mexican provinces, has a fixed and settled character, now fixed and settled by law which cannot be repealed*, in the case of Texas, without a violation of public faith, and by no human power in regard to California or New Mexico; that, therefore, under one or other of these laws, every foot of land in the States or in the Territories has already received a fixed and decided character.” * * * *

Extract from Mr. Webster's Speech at Buffalo, May 22, 1851.

Now, gentlemen, that is the plain story of the Constitution of the United States, on the question of slavery. I contend, and have always contended, that after the adoption of the Constitution, any measure of the government calculated to bring more Slave Territory into the United States was beyond the power of the Constitution, and against its provisions. That is my opinion, and it always has been my opinion.

The “Laws” of Kansas.

EXTRACT FROM COLFAX'S SPEECH, ANALYZING THE “LAWS” OF KANSAS.

Besides these seven palpable, flagrant and unconcealed violations of the organic law organizing the Territory, I point you now to five equally direct and open violations of the Constitution of the United States; for that instrument has been trampled upon as recklessly as the laws of Congress.

First. The very first amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibits the passage of any law “abridging the freedom of speech;” and it is a significant fact, as can be learned from Hickey's Constitution, page 33, that this, with a number of other amendments

to the Constitution which follow it, was submitted by Congress to the various States in 1789, immediately after the adoption of the Constitution itself, with the following preamble:

“The Conventions of a number of States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its power, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added,”

Therefore the amendments that followed were proposed.

Thus it is conclusively proven that the amendment, prohibiting any abridgment of the freedom of speech, was adopted to prevent “an abuse of power,” which our forefathers feared might be attempted by some degenerate descendants at some later period of our history. But, though they thus sought to preserve and protect free speech, by constitutional provision, their prophetic fears have been realized by the enactors of the Kansas code. Its one hundred and fifty-first chapter, on pages 604 and 605, is entitled “An act to punish offences against slave property;” and there is no decree of Austrian despot or Russian Czar which is not merciful in comparison with its provisions. Here, sir, in the very teeth of the Constitution, is section twelve of that chapter:

“If any free person, by speaking or by writing, assert or maintain that persons have not the right to hold slaves in this Territory, or shall introduce into this Territory, print, publish, write, circulate, or cause to be introduced into this Territory, written, printed, published or circulated in this Territory, any book, paper, magazine, pamphlet or circular, containing any denial of the right of persons to hold slaves in this Territory, such persons shall be deemed guilty of felony, and punished by imprisonment at hard labor for a term of not less than two years.”

How many more than two years he shall be punished is left to the tender mercy of Judge Lecompte and the jury which “Sheriff Jones” will select for their trial. The President of the United States has sworn to support the Constitution; but this, with the other “laws of Kansas,” are to be enforced by him, despite that Constitution, with the army of the United States; and Mr. Buchanan is pledged by Judge Douglas to “the firm and undivided execution of those laws.” But, sir, in a few short months the people—the free people of the United States—will inaugurate an Administration that will do justice to the oppressed settlers of Kansas—that will restore to them their betrayed rights, will vindicate the Constitution, and will place in the offices of trust

of that ill-fated Territory, men who will overthrow the "usurpation," give their official influence to Freedom and the right rather than to Slavery and the wrong, and protect rather than oppress the citizens whom they are called upon to govern and to judge.

Second, The same constitutional amendment prohibits the passage of any law "abridging the freedom of the press;" and here, sir, in flagrant violation of it, is the 11th section of the same law in the Kansas code, page 605:

"If any person *print, write, introduce into, publish, or circulate, or cause to be brought into, printed, written, published or circulated, or shall knowingly aid or assist in bringing into, printing, publishing, or circulating,* within this Territory, any *book, paper, pamphlet, magazine, handbill or circular,* containing any statements, arguments, opinions, *sentiment, doctrine, advice or invendo, calculated to produce a disorderly, dangerous, or rebellious disaffection among the slaves in the Territory, or to induce such slaves to escape from the service of their masters or to resist their authority, he shall be guilty of felony, and be punished by imprisonment and hard labor for a term not less than five years."*

And, under this atrociously unconstitutional provision, a man who "brought into" the Territory of Kansas a *copy of Jefferson's Notes on Virginia,* which contains an eloquent and free-spoken condemnation of Slavery, could be convicted by one of "Sheriff Jones's" juries as having introduced a "book" containing a "sentiment" "calculated" to make the slaves "disorderly" and *sentenced to five years' hard labor.* Probably under this provision, as well as the charge of high treason, Geo. W. Brown, editor of *The Herald of Freedom* at Lawrence, has, after his printing press has been destroyed by the order of Judge Lecompte's Court, been himself indicted, and is now imprisoned, awaiting trial—kept, too, under such strict surveillance, far worse than murderers are treated in a civilized country, that even his mother and wife were not allowed to visit him until he had humbly petitioned the Governor for permission. And this upon the soil of a Territory which our forefathers, in 1820, in this very Hall, dedicated, by solemn compact, to "Freedom forever."

Third, The sixth amendment to the Constitution of the United States declares that, "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury." It is significant that, in the Constitution itself, it had been provided (article 3, section 2), "the trial of all crimes,

except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury." But to prevent "abuse of power," this, with other amendments, was adopted, declaring that the trial shall be by an *impartial jury.* I have already shown you how *impartially* they are to be selected by sheriffs who go about and imitate, in their conduct to ward Free State men, the example of Saul of Tarsus in his persecution of the early Christians, (Acts, chapter 8, verse 3, "entering into every house, and seizing men and women, committed them to prison;") and I have quoted you a section, showing you how *impartially* they are to be constituted with men on one side only; but in this very chapter the concluding provision, section 13 (page 606), repeats this gross violation of the National Constitution, as follows:

"No person who is conscientiously opposed to holding slaves, or who does not admit the right to hold slaves in this Territory, shall sit as a juror on the trial of any prosecution for any violation of any of the sections of this act."

Here, sir, in these instances which I have quoted, stand the Constitution of the United States on the one side, and the Kansas code on the other, in direct and open conflict—the one declaring that the freedom of speech shall not be abridged, that the freedom of the press shall be protected, that jurors, above all things else, shall be entirely impartial; the other trampling all these safeguards under foot. And because a majority of the settlers there, driven from the polls by armed mobs; legislated over by a mob in whose election they had no agency, choose to stand by and maintain their rights under the Constitution, you have seen how anarchy and violence, how outrage and persecution have been running riot in that Territory, far exceeding in their tyranny and oppression the wrongs for which our revolutionary forefathers rose against the masters who oppressed them; and yet, though the protection they have had from the General Government, has been only the same kind of protection which the wolf gives to the lamb, they have, while repudiating the territory of the Sheriffs, bowed in submission to writs in the hands of the U.S. Marshal, or when the soldiers of the United States, yielding to orders which they do not deem it dishonorable for them to despise, assist in their execution. Such forbearance—such manifestations of their allegiance to the national authority—become the more wonderful when it is apparent as the noonday sun that every attempt has been made to harass them into resistance to the authority of the United States, so as to furnish a pretext, doubtless, for

their indiscriminate imprisonment, expulsion or massacre.

Fourth, The Constitution also prohibits cruel and unusual punishments. I shall show, before I close, that this so-called Kansas Legislature has prescribed most cruel and unusual punishments, unwarranted by the character of the offences punished, and totally disproportioned to their criminality.

Fifth, The Constitution declares (article 1, section 9) that "the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* shall "not be suspended, unless when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it." But the Kansas code, in its chapter of *habeas corpus* (article 3, section 8, page 345,) enacts as follows:

"No negro or mulatto held as a slave within this Territory, or lawfully arrested as a fugitive from service from another State or Territory, shall be discharged, nor shall his right of freedom be had under the provisions of this act."

This provision suspending the writ of *habeas corpus* in the above cases, is not only a violation of the Constitution, but also of the organic law; for that provided, in section 28, for appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States on writs of *habeas corpus*, in cases involving the right of freedom, the issuing of which this Territorial law expressly prohibits. The language of the Nebraska Kansas act is as follows:

"Except also that a writ of error or appeal shall also be allowed to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the said Supreme Court, created by this act, or of any judge thereof, or of the District Courts created by this act, or of any judge thereof, upon any writ of *habeas corpus*, involving the question of personal freedom."

But the Kansas Legislature coolly set aside the law of the United States, by which alone their Territorial organization was brought into existence, and effectually prohibited any appeal to the Supreme Court "upon any writ of *habeas corpus*, involving the question of personal freedom," by declaring that the writ shall not be used in the Territory for any such purpose!

Having now referred to a few of the many acts embraced in this code, which conflict with the constitution of the organic law, I proceed to the examination of other provisions, some of which stamp it as a code of barbarity, as well as of tyranny—of inhumanity as well as of oppression. And first to "the imprisonment at hard labor," which is made the punishment for "offences against the slave property," in the sections which I have already quoted. The general understanding of the people at large

has been that, as there was no State Prison yet erected in Kansas, this imprisonment would be in some Missouri prisons near the frontier. But, sir, such is not the case. The authors of these disgraceful and outrageous enactments, with a refinement of cruelty, provided that the "hard labor" should be in another way; and that will be found in chapter 22, entitled: "an act providing a system of confinement and hard labor," section 2 of which (page 147) reads as follows:

"Every person who may be sentenced by any Court of competent jurisdiction, under any law in force within this Territory, to punishment by confinement to hard labor, shall be deemed a convict, and shall immediately, under the charge of the keeper of such jail or public prison, or under the charge of such person as the keeper of such jail or public prison may select, be put to hard labor, as in the first section of this act specified, to wit: 'On the streets, roads, public buildings, or other public works of the Territory.' [Sec. 1, page 146.] And such keeper or other person, having charge of such convict, shall cause such convict while engaged at such labor to be securely confined by A CHAIN SIX FEET IN LENGTH, of not less than four-sixteenths nor more than three-eighths of an inch links, with a ROUND BALL OF IRON, of not less than four nor more than six inches in diameter, attached, which chain shall be securely fastened to THE ANKLE of such convict with a strong lock and key; and such keeper or other person having charge of such convict may, if necessary, confine such convict while so engaged at hard labor, by other chains, or other means in his discretion, so as to keep such convict secure and prevent his escape; and when there shall be two or more convicts under the charge of such keeper, or other person, such convicts shall be FASTENED TOGETHER by strong chains with strong locks and keys, during the time such convicts shall be engaged in hard labor without the walls of any jail or prison."

And this penalty, revolting, humiliating, debasing at it is, subjecting a free American citizen to the public sneers and contumely of his oppressors, far worse than within the prison walls where the degradation of the punishment is relieved by its privacy, is to be borne from two to five long years by the men of Indiana and Ohio, of New England and New York, of Pennsylvania and the Far West, who dare in Kansas to declare by speech or in print, or to introduce therein a handbill or paper, which declares that "persons have not the right to hold slaves in this Territory." The chain and ball are to be attached to the ankle of each, and they are to drag out their long penalty for exercising their God-given and constitutionally-protected freedom of speech, manacled together in couples, and working, in the public gaze, under task-masters, to whom Algerine slaveholders would be preferable.

Sir, as this is one of the laws which the Democratic party, by its platform, has resolved to enforce, and which the President of the United States intends to execute, if needs be, with the whole armed force of the United States, I have procured a specimen of the size of the iron ball which is to be used in that Territory under this enactment, and only regret that I cannot exhibit also the iron chain, six feet in length, which is to be dragged with it, through the hot summer months and the cold winter snows by the Free State "convicts" in Kansas. [Here Mr. C. exhibited a large and heavy iron ball, six inches in diameter, and eighteen inches in circumference.]

Mr. Chairman, if the great men who have passed away to the spirit-land could stir themselves in their graves, and, coming back to life and action, should utter on the prairies of Kansas the sentiments declared by them in the past, how would they be amazed at the penalties that would await them on every side, for the utterance of their honest convictions on Slavery. Said Washington to John F. Mercer, in 1786 :

"I never mean, unless some particular circumstance should compel me to it, to possess another slave by purchase, it being among my first wishes to see some plan adopted by which Slavery in this country may be abolished by law."

Said Jefferson in his Notes on Virginia :

"The whole commerce between master and slave is a continual exercise of the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other." * * *

"With what execration should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one half of the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part, and the *amor patriæ*, of the other! Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure, when we have removed their only firm basis — a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God? that they are not violated but by his wrath? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, and his justice cannot sleep forever."

Surely such language, in the eyes of a Pro-Slavery jury, would be considered as "calculated" to render slaves "disorderly." And surely, in the language of the President and his party, "the law must be enforced." Come, then, "Sheriff Jones," with your chain and ball for each of these founders of the Republic, and manacled together let them, as they

pursue their daily work, chant praises to "the great principle for which our revolutionary fathers fought," and of which the defenders of the Nebraska bill told us *that* law was the great embodiment.

Said Mr. Webster in his Marshfield speech in 1848 :

"I feel that there is nothing unjust, nothing of which any honest man can complain, if he is intelligent, and I feel that there is nothing of which the civilized world, if they take notice of so humble an individual as myself, will reproach me, when I say, as I said the other day, that I have made up my mind, for one, that under no circumstances will I consent to the extension of the area of Slavery in the United States, or to the further increase of Slave representation in the House of Representatives."

And again in 1850 :

"Sir, wherever there is a particular good to be done — wherever there is a foot of land to be stayed back from becoming Slave Territory — I am ready to assert the principle of the exclusion of Slavery."

Said the noble old statesman of Kentucky, Henry Clay, in 1850 :

"I have said that I never could vote for it myself; and I repeat that I never can and never will vote, and no earthly power ever will make me vote, to spread Slavery over Territory where it does not exist."

Surely this, too, conflicts with the law of Kansas. Hurry them, Judge Lecompte, to the chain-gang; and as they commence their years of disgraceful and degrading punishment, forget not to read them from the Nebraska bill that "its true intent and meaning" is "to leave the people thereof perfectly free (not only free, but *perfectly* free) to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

There is another portion of this act to which I wish to call special attention. It is the succeeding section to the above (sec. 3, page 147) :

"Whenever any convict shall be employed at labor for any incorporate town or city, or any county, such town, city, or county, shall pay in to the Territorial treasury the sum of fifty cents for each convict, for every day such convict shall be engaged at such labor; and whenever such convict shall be employed upon *private hiring* at labor, it shall be at such price each, per day, as may be agreed upon with such keeper or other person having charge of such; and the proceeds of said labor shall be collected by such keeper and put into the Territorial treasury."

Not content with the degradation of the chain-gang, a system of white slavery is to be introduced by "private hiring;" and the "convicts," sentenced for the exercise of the freedom of speech and of the press, are to be hired out during their servitude, if their "keeper" sees fit, to the heartless men who this day are hunting them from their homes, and burning their dwellings over their heads. But "the laws are to be executed;" and though they are the offspring of the most gigantic fraud ever perpetrated upon a free people, if there is no change in the policy of the Government, and if the party which controls its action is not hurled from power, we shall doubtless next year see Governor Robinson (if not previously executed for treason) with the iron chain and ball to his ankle, hired from the convict-keeper by Governor Shannon to do his menial service; or to be punished, if he disobeys his master's orders, like a Southern slave. And Judge Lecompte would have the privilege, too, and would doubtless exercise it, of having Judge Wakefield as his hired serf, dragging, for two or five years to come, his chain and ball after him as he entered his master's presence, or obeyed his master's command. And Marshal Donaldson, with "Sheriff Jones" and Stringfellow, would not certainly be behind their superiors in the retinue of Free States slaves whom they could satisfy their revenge upon by hiring as their menials from the keeper of the Kansas convicts.

* * * * *

The whole country has heard, Sir, of the section in the election law which allows "inhabitants" to vote at the general election, without requiring them to have *resided* in the Territory a single day; and of the test oaths to *sustain* the Fugitive Slave law and the Nebraska bill, which are intended to shut out all men opposed to both from the ballot-box. And I will quote it from page 282, because I desire to contrast its provisions with another.

"SEC. 11. Every free white male citizen of the United States, and every free male Indian who is made a citizen by treaty or otherwise, and over the age of twenty-one years, who shall be an *inhabitant* of this Territory, and of the county or district in which he offers to vote, and shall have paid a Territorial tax, shall be a qualified elector for all elective officers: and all Indians who are inhabitants of this Territory, and who may have adopted the customs of the white man, and who are liable to pay taxes, shall be deemed citizens: *Provided*, That no soldier, seaman, or marine in the regular Army or Navy of the United States, shall be entitled to vote, by reason of being on service therein: *And provided further*, That no person who shall have been convicted of any violation of any provision of an

act of Congress entitled 'An act respecting fugitives from justice, and persons escaping from the service of their masters,' approved February 12, 1793; or of an act to amend and supplementary to said act, approved 18th September, 1850; whether such conviction were by criminal proceeding or by civil action for the recovery of any penalty prescribed by either of said acts, in any of the Courts of the United States, or of any State or Territory, or of any offence deemed infamous, shall be entitled to vote at any election or to hold any office in this Territory: *And provided further*, That if any person offering to vote shall be challenged and required to take an oath or affirmation, to be administered by one of the Judges of the election, that he will *sustain* the provisions of the above-recited acts of Congress, and of the act entitled, 'An act to organize the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas,' approved May 30, 1854, and shall *refuse to take such oath or affirmation, the vote of such person shall be rejected.*"

Merely being an "inhabitant," if the person is in favor of the Nebraska bill, and of the Fugitive Slave law, qualifies him as a voter in all the elections of the Territory affecting national and territorial politics. The widest possible door is opened for the invaders to come over and carry each successive election as "inhabitants" for the time being, of the Territory. But turn to page 750, and notice the following provision (section 8) defining the qualifications of voters at the petty corporation elections of Lecompton:

"All free white male citizens who have arrived to the full age of twenty-one years, and who shall be entitled to vote for Territorial officers, and who shall have resided *within the city limits at least six months next preceding any election*, and, moreover, who shall have paid a city tax, or any city license according to ordinance, shall be eligible to vote at any ward or city election for officers of the city."

Being an inhabitant a day clothes a person with the right to vote for Delegate in Congress, and Representatives in the Legislature; but to vote at an insignificant election, in comparison, six months residence is required! Am I wrong in judging that this inverting the usual rule shows that Missourians are wanted at one election, but not at the other? If any one deems this opinion unjust, let him study the following sections of the General Election Law, page 283:

"SEC. 19. Whenever *any* person shall offer to vote, he shall be *PRESUMED to be entitled to vote.*"

"SEC. 20. Whenever any person offers to vote, his vote may be challenged by one of the judges, or by any voter, and the judges of the election may examine him touching his right to vote; and *if so examined, NO EVIDENCE TO CONTRADICT SHALL BE RECEIVED.*"

Certainly these provisions explain themselves, without comment.

I will now invite your attention to a contrast in the penal code of this Territory, singular in its character, to say the very least. Section five of the act punishing offences against slave property, page 604, enacts as follows :

"If any person shall *aid or assist* in enticing, decoying, or *persuading*, or carrying away, or *sending out* of this territory, any slave belonging to another, with intent to procure or effect the freedom of such slave, or with intent to deprive the owner thereof of the services of such slave, he shall be adjudged guilty of grand larceny, and on conviction thereof SHALL SUFFER DEATH, or be imprisoned at hard labor for *not less than ten years.*"

A person who, by a Pro-Slavery packed jury, is convicted of aiding in persuading out of the Territory a slave belonging to another, is to suffer at least *twice as severe* a penalty as he who is convicted of committing the vilest outrage that the mind of man can conceive of on the person of your wife, sister, or daughter ! Nay, the contrast is still stronger. The jury, in the first instance, are authorized even to inflict the punishment of *death*—in the latter, see page 208, the penalty is "not less than five years." Such is the contrast in Kansas between the protection of a wife's or daughter's honor or happiness, and that which is thrown as a protecting ægis over the property of the slaveholder !

Again, on page 208, you will find that the ruffian who commits malicious mayhem—that is, without provocation knocks you down on the street, cuts off your nose and ears, and plucks out your eyes—is punished "not less than five nor more than ten years;" the same degree of punishment that is meted out in section 7 of the above act, page 605, on a person who should aid or assist, or even "harbor," an escaped slave !

On page 209 you will find that the man who sits at your bedside, when you are prostrated by disease, and, taking advantage of your confidence and helplessness, administers *poison* to you ; but, whereby death does not happen to ensue, is to be punished "not less than five nor more than ten years," though it is murder in the heart, if not the deed. And this is precisely the same penalty as that prescribed by the 11th section (quoted in my remarks above, on the five violations of the Constitution) against one who but brings into the Territory any book, paper, or hand-bill, containing any "sentiment" "calculated," in the eyes of a Pro-Slavery Jury, to make slaves "disorderly." The man who takes into the Territory Jefferson's Notes on Virginia, can

be, under this law, hurried away to the chain-gang, and manacled, arm to arm, with the murderous prisoner.

On page 210, the *kidnapping and confinement* of a free white person, for any purpose, even—if a man, to sell him into Slavery, or if a woman, for a still baser purpose—is to be punished "not exceeding ten years." *Decoying and enticing* away a child under twelve years of age, from its parents, not less than six months and not exceeding five years." But *decoying and enticing* away (mark the similarity of the language) a slave from his master, is punished by *death*, or confinement not less than ten years. Here is the section, page 604 :

"SEC. 4. If any person shall *entice, decoy*, or carry away out of this Territory, any slave belonging to another, with intent to deprive the owner thereof of the services of such slave, or with intent to effect or procure the freedom of such slave, he shall be adjudged guilty of grand larceny, and, on conviction thereof, shall suffer DEATH, or be imprisoned at hard labor for *not less than ten years.*"

I had hoped to find time to cite and comment upon other sections in this code, but I will quote but one more, showing that, while a *white man* is compelled to serve out the penalty of his crime at hard labor, these slaveholding legislators have, in their great regard for the value of the slave's labor to his master, enacted that a *slave*, for the same offence, shall be whipped, and then returned to him. Here is the section which I commend to the consideration of those who, while defending these laws, nickname the Republicans "nigger worshippers." It is found on page 252 :

"SEC. 27. If any slave shall commit petit larceny, or shall steal any neat cattle, sheep or hog, or be guilty of any misdemeanor, or other offence punishable under the provisions of this act only by fine or imprisonment in a county jail, or by both such fine and imprisonment, he shall, instead of such punishment, be punished, if a male, by stripes on his bare back, not exceeding thirty-nine, or if a female, by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding twenty-one days, or by stripes not exceeding twenty-one, at the discretion of the justice."

Such, sir, is an impartial analysis of the code of Kansas, every allusion to which has been proven by extracts from the official copy now in my hand, and in quoting which I have referred, in every instance, to the page, the number of the section, and its exact words ; and I think that the strong language at the outset of my remarks, in which I denounced this disgraceful and tyrannical code, has been fully justified by the proofs I have laid before you from its pages. Let it not be forgotten, Mr. Chairman, that it is because the people of

Kansas—an overwhelming majority of the actual settlers there—refuse to obey these enactments passed by a body of men elected by armed mobs of invaders, that they have been delivered over to persecutions without parallel and to all the horrors of civil war.

Had I time, I would desire to refer to the history of events in that Territory; to the reckless and ruthless violation of plighted faith in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, which opened the door for legislation like this; to the entire absence of any protection by the President to the settlers against personal outrage; to the repeated invasions by which the whole machinery of legislation was usurped, but the fruits of which the President upholds by cannon and bayonet, with proclamations and penalties; to the causes which led to the civil war that has existed in that Territory; to that most aggravating of all insults by which the very Jones who headed an invading party of Missourians at one of the polls, and with his revolver at the breast of an election Judge, gave him five minutes to resign or die, was commissioned as a Sheriff to ride booted and spurred over the people whose rights he had thus assisted in striking down; and many other things that make the blood of the great mass of freemen at the North course as it never before coursed through their veins. But I must allude, before concluding, to the mockery of relief held out to the people by the President and his coadjutors.

In his special message to Congress, on the 26th of January last, the President thus spoke:

“Our system affords no justification of revolutionary acts; for the constitutional means of relieving the people of unjust administrations and laws, by a change of public agents and by repeal, ARE AMPLE.”

And in his speech, as reported in *The Union* of June 10, made to the Buchanan ratification meeting, who marched to the White House, he coolly told them:

“There will be, on your part, no appeal to unworthy passions, no inflammatory calls for a second revolution, like those which are occasionally reported as coming from men who have received nothing at the hands of their Government but protection and political blessings, no declaration of resistance to the laws of the land.”

But I will not stop to allude to the “protection and political blessings” which the people of Kansas have received from the “hands of their Government.” It was bitter irony indeed.

Judge Douglas, too, at the same meeting, speaking of the Kansas laws, declared as follows:

“Or, if they desire to have any of the laws repealed, let them try to carry their point at the polls, and let the majority decide the question.”

Never, sir, was there was a more signal instance of “holding the word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope.” Where are the “ample” means of obtaining relief from the unendurable tyranny that grinds down the Free-State men of Kansas into the dust? How can they “carry their point at the polls?” Let facts answer:

I. The council which passed these laws has extended its term of service till 1858; so that, if the entire representative branch was unanimous for their repeal, the higher branch has the power to prevent the slightest change in them for *two long years!*

II. The Free-State men in Kansas are absolutely shut out from the polls by test-oaths, which no one with the soul of a freeman, who traces all the outrages there directly to the enactment of the Nebraska bill, can conscientiously swear to.

III. Even if they do go there, and swear to sustain the Nebraska bill and the Fugitive Slave Law, the election law is purposely framed, as I have shown, to invite invasions of Missourians, to control the elections in favor of slavery.

IV. They are driven from the jury-box as well as disfranchised, and prohibited from acting as attorneys in the courts, unless they take the test-oath prescribed by their conquerors.

V. Free speech is not tolerated. They are left “perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way,” except, if they speak a word *against* slavery, they are convicted of felony and hurried to the chain-gang.

VI. The presses in the Territory, at Leavenworth and Lawrence, in favor of Freedom, have been destroyed, and the two last by the authority of the court of Judge Lecompte, thus “crushing out” the freedom of the press.

VII. Indictments are found by packed juries against every prominent Free-State citizen; and those who are not forced to flee from the Territory are arrested and imprisoned; while those who have stolen from Free-State men, tarred and feathered them, burned their houses, or murdered them, go at large unpunished.

In such a state of affairs as this, to talk of going to the polls and having the laws repealed is worse than a mockery. It is an insult. It is like binding a man hand and foot, throwing him into the river, and telling him to swim on shore and he will be saved. It is like loading

**EXTRACTS RELATIVE TO TH
BROOKS OUTRAGE.**

EXTRACT FROM BROOKS' FAREWELL SPEECH IN
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

a man with irons, and then telling him to run for his life. The only relief possible, if Kansas is not promptly admitted as a State, which I hope may be effected, is in a change of the Administration and of the party that so recklessly misrules the land; and *that* will furnish an effectual relief.

Let every one remember that the result of the present struggle is to settle the policy of our Government on the slavery question, and to fix the character of our Territory from *Missouri to the Pacific*. A vote for Buchanan is a vote for slavery extension. A vote for Fremont is a vote for slavery restriction.

See what Col. Buford, the ruffian from Alabama, says of the Kansas struggle:

From the Boston Journal.

The Charleston (S. C.) Mercury publishes a stirring appeal to the South from Col. Buford, of Alabama, for funds to enable him to carry more pro-slavery emigrants to Kansas, "that indispensable breakwater to the angry tide of abolitionism." He says:

"Consider that if Kansas, our natural boundary to the Northwest, is lost, that then Missouri and all west of the Mississippi—nay, too, all east of it—must soon follow; while, if we maintain it, the Territories west of Arkansas and Texas are safe to us—nay, the future is safe. Ask yourselves whether you are prepared to surrender white supremacy in the South, to debase your blood, to degrade your social and political status to the level of an inferior race, by submitting to Abolition's mandate to fraternize with it. Remember that I, and all who know the country, will tell you that slaves thrive and do well in Kansas, and that there, and in western Missouri, their labor pays better than in any cotton State in the Union. Reflect that we have everything to encourage us in the struggle—we still control the government of the Territory, our immigration is daily increasing, while that from the North has greatly diminished."

The Major is very urgent in his demands for money to take out a colony of one hundred men. He betrays his disappointment in regard to his first company by the remark—"I want only men who, as long as required, will abstain from liquor and will implicitly obey orders." Wonder if his men read the Bibles that were given them with such a flourish of trumpets.

Mr. Brooks, (resuming).—If I desired to kill the Senator, why did not I do it? You all admit that I had him in my power. Let me tell the member from New Jersey that it was expressly to avoid taking life that I used an ordinary cane, presented to me by a friend in Baltimore, nearly three months before its application to the "bare head" of the Massachusetts Senator. I went to work very deliberately—as I am charged—and this is admitted—and speculated somewhat as to whether I should employ a horsewhip or a cowhide; but knowing that the Senator was my superior in strength, it occurred to me that he might wrest it from my hand, and then—for I never attempt anything I do not perform—I might have been compelled to do that which I would have regretted the balance of my natural life. (A voice)—"He would have killed him."

Here Brooks's cowardice is openly avowed. He used a cane so that he might disable Sumner and prevent him from resisting. And still further he distinctly confesses that if Sumner had resisted, he would have killed him. This is the natural construction of his words and it was that made, as it appears, from "the voice" at the time.

And yet the cowardly act of this ruffian is approved all over the South.

From the New Bedford Mercury.

The Outrage Approved.

The fact that a Senator of the United States has been stricken down and beaten to death in the Senate chamber for words spoken in debate—words which no man doubts to have been a faithful and forcible expression of his earnest convictions, on a question of the greatest national interest—sinks into utter insignificance in view of the still graver fact that the outrage was as purely representative in its character as was the argument to which it replied. Mr. Sumner's eloquent speech faithfully set forth that view of the wrongs and oppressions of Free Kansas by her ruffian invaders, which is cherished by the great mass of the humane, conscientious and enlightened citizens of the Free States; Mr. Brooks's assault was the only effective reply that could be made to it, and was just such an answer as,

in the opinion of the slave-driving aristocracy, which governs the South, (and just at present the Union,) the speech required and deserved. The principles of the contending hosts which now divide Congress and the Nation were admirably set forth in the speech and the reply. And the foremost journal of the South—*The Richmond Enquirer*—in its leading article of yesterday, thus clearly sets forth the slave-driving view of the whole transaction:

“THE SUMNER DISCIPLINE—THE NECESSARY REMEDY.—A few Southern journals, affecting an exclusive refinement of feeling or regard for the proprieties of official intercourse, unite with the Abolition papers in condemning the chastisement inflicted upon Sumner by the Hon. P. S. Brooks. We have no patience with these mealy-mouthed pharisees of the Press. Why not speak out and declare at once that you are shocked by the brutality of a ‘slave-holding ruffian?’ It is much more manly to adopt the violent vocabulary of *THE TRIBUNE*, than to insinuate disapprobation in the meek accents of a conscience-smitten saint.

In the main, the press of the South applaud the conduct of Mr. Brooks, without condition or limitation. Our approbation at least is entire and unreserved. We consider the act good in conception, better in execution, and best of all in consequence. These vulgar Abolitionists in the Senate are getting above themselves. They have been humored until they forget their position. They have grown saucy, and dare to be impudent to gentlemen! Now, they are a low, mean, scurvy set, with some little book-learning, but as utterly devoid of spirit or honor as a pack of curs. Intrenched behind “privilege,” they fancy they can slander the South and insult its Representatives with impunity. The truth is, they have been suffered to run too long without collars. They must be lashed into submission. Sumner, in particular, ought to have nine-and-thirty early every morning. He is a great strapping fellow, and could stand the cowhide beautifully. Brooks frightened him, and at the first blow of the cane, he bellowed like a bull-calf. There is the blackguard Wilson, an ignorant Natick cobbler, swaggering in excess of muscle, and absolutely dying for a beating. Will not somebody take him in hand? Hale is another huge, red face, sweating scoundrel, whom some gentleman should kick and cuff until he abates something of his impudent talk. These men are perpetually abusing the people and representatives of the South, for tyrants, robbers, ruffians, adulterers,

and what not. Shall we stand it? Can gentlemen sit still in the Senate and House of Representatives, under an incessant stream of denunciation from wretches who avail themselves of the privilege of place, to indulge their devilish passions with impunity? In the absence of an adequate law, Southern gentlemen must protect their own honor and feelings. It is an idle mockery to challenge one of these scullions. It is equally useless to attempt to disgrace them. They are insensible to shame; and can be brought to reason only by an application of cowhide or gutta percha. Let them once understand that for every vile word spoken against the South, they will suffer so many stripes, and they will soon learn to behave themselves, like decent dogs—they can never be gentlemen. Mr. Brooks has initiated this salutary discipline, and he deserves applause for the bold, judicious manner in which he chastised the scamp Sumner. It was a proper act, done at the proper time, and in the proper place. Of all places on earth the Senate chamber, the theatre of his vituperative exploits, was the very spot where Sumner should have been made to suffer for his violation of the decencies of decorous debate, and for his brutal denunciations of a venerable Statesman. It was literally and entirely proper that he should be stricken down and beaten just beside the desk against which he leaned when he fulminated his filthy utterance through the Capitol. It is idle to talk of the sanctity of the Senate chamber, since it is polluted by the presence of such fellows as Wilson, and Sumner, and Wade. They have desecrated it, and cannot now fly to it as to a sanctuary from the lash of vengeance.

“We trust other gentlemen will follow the example of Mr. Brooks, that so a curb may be imposed upon the truculence and audacity of Abolition speakers. If need be, let us have a caning or cowhiding every day. If the worse come to the worse, so much the sooner, so much the better.”

Mr. Buchanan's Opinion of the Sumner Assault.

The annual Commencement of the Franklin and Marshall College, at Lancaster, Pa., took place last Wednesday. Mr. Buchanan, as President of the Board of Trustees, was present on the occasion. Among the exercises of the day was an oration by W. W. Davis of Sterling, Ill. The subject was, the “Decline of

Political Integrity," and the speaker took occasion to condemn in strong terms the assault on Mr. Sumner. The letter from which we quote, in the New York *Tribune*, says :

Mr. Davis finished his oration and retired from the front of the stage amid thunders of applause, and showers of bouquets from his lady friends. For him it was truly a triumph. But on retiring to his seat, next to that of Mr. Buchanan, did he receive congratulation of the Sage of Wheatland? No, no. Mr. Buchanan said to him, loud enough that the whole class could hear: "*My young friend, you look upon the dark side of the picture. Mr. Sumner's speech was the most vulgar tirade of abuse ever delivered in a deliberative body.*" To which the young orator replied that he "hoped Mr. Buchanan did not approve of the attacks upon Mr. Sumner by Brooks and others." To which Mr. Buchanan rejoined that "*Mr. Brooks was inconsiderate, but that Senator Butler was a very mild man.*" Mr. Davis expressed his regret at the moderation of Mr. Buchanan's views, and dropped the conversation.

In contrast with this miserable language of apology uttered by the Democratic candidate, see the noble spirit that breathes in the following letter from the venerable Quincy. Which best represents the spirit of our Northern freemen?

LETTER OF HON. JOSIAH QUINCY.

E. R. Hoar, Esq.,—Sir: I have received your letter, inviting me to attend the Unitarian Festival, and expressing the gratification it would give you "to see and hear me on that occasion."

* * * * *

My mind is in no state to receive pleasure from social scenes and friendly intercourse. I can think or speak of nothing but of the outrages of slaveholders at Kansas, and the outrages of slaveholders at Washington—outrages, which, if not met in the spirit of our fathers of the Revolution, (and I see no sign that they will be)—our liberties are but a name, and our Union proves a curse. These outrages constitute a series of iniquitously contrived, well-connected, compact tissues, of which

The fugitive slave law was the first;

The repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the second;

The invasion of Kansas, and the taking the ballot-boxes by storm, by a mob of slaveholders, the third;

The encouragement of this sacrilegious *foray* against the right of free suffrage, and the ultimate support of it by the National Executive and military arm, the fourth;

The hostile irruption of two members of Congress, into the Senate chamber of the United States, openly armed with deadly bludgeons, and probably secretly, according to the habits of their breed, with bowie knives and revolvers, and there prostrating on the floor with their bludgeons a Senator of the United States, sitting peaceably in his seat, unconscious of danger, and from his position incapable of defence, inflicting upon him blows, until he sunk senseless under them, and which, if they do not prove mortal, it was not for want of malignant intent in the cowardly assassins—and all this for words publicly spoken in the Senate, in the course of debate, allowed by its presiding officer to be spoken, and exceeding not one hair's breadth any line of truth or duty. This is the fifth and the climax of this series of outrages, unparalleled, nefarious, and brutal.

* * * * *

In my opinion, it is time to speak on the house-top, what every man who is worthy of the name of freeman utters in his chamber and feels in his heart. By a series of corruption, intrigue and cunning, bribing the high by appointments of State, the low by the hope of emoluments; playing between the parties of the Free States, and counteracting one by the other; by flattering the vain, paying the mean, and rewarding the subservient, the slaveholders have, in the course of fifty years, usurped the whole constitutional powers of the Union, have possessed themselves of the executive chair, of the halls of Congress, of the national courts of justice and of the military arm, leaving nothing of hope to the spirit of freedom in the Free States, but public speech in the legislature and the ballot box. The one a slaveholder's mob is crushing in Kansas, the other a deputation from the slaveholders of the House of Representatives have attempted to crush by a slaveholder's bludgeon.

My heart is too full. If I should pour forth all that is in it, both paper and time would fail me.

Truly, I am yours, JOSIAH QUINCY.

Quincy, 27th May, 1856.

Brooks has been promptly returned to Congress and his base deed thus assumed and ratified by his constituents. Behold how they welcome the assassin!

Reception of Hon. F. S. Brooks—Public Demonstration—The Gathering of the People—An Immense Crowd—Presentation of Mayor Arthur—Speech of Mr. Brooks—The Serenade.

From the Carolina Times, Aug. 30.

On Thursday afternoon, Hon. Preston S. Brooks being expected by the afternoon train on the Charlotte road, a large number of citizens of Columbia, assembled around the depot to greet him on his arrival; but unfortunately for them, notwithstanding extensive preparations had been made, and a very handsome coach and four with neatly decorated horses were in waiting, he did not reach the city until 4 o'clock yesterday morning—having been detained by his friends and admirers in the upper districts.

At an early hour on Thursday morning, the arrival of Mr. Brooks being known, many of his friends called at his quarters, and a committee of citizens waited upon him, especially to urge the propriety of his remaining over one day, notwithstanding his anxiety to reach home at as early a period as possible.

* * * * *

At 8 o'clock the City Hall was so densely crowded that it was found necessary to move an adjournment to the street in front of the Court-House, upon the balcony of which, Mayor Arthur presented to Mr. Brooks, in presence of the assembled mass of citizens, a handsome Silver Pitcher, a Goblet, and one of Mr. Peckham's finest Hickory Canes, with a handsome gold head.

Each article was selected with great care, without regard to cost, by the citizens of Columbia, intended as a present to Mr. Brooks, as an evidence of their unqualified approval of his course as a Representative, and especially for the prompt and appropriate manner in which he chastised the notorious Charles Sumner, for his wanton abuse and cowardly assault upon the character of the venerable Senator from South Carolina, Andrew Pickens Butler, and the fair fame of his State.

The pitcher and goblet are beautiful specimens of the skill and taste of Messrs. Radcliffe & Guignard, at whose establishment they were purchased.

Mayor Arthur, on making the presentation, delivered a very handsome and appropriate speech, as follows:

Col. Brooks: On behalf of the citizens of

Columbia, it becomes my pleasing duty to present to you this pitcher, goblet and cane, as testimonials of our high appreciation of your recent conduct at Washington City. They were prepared some time since for presentation, but supposing that it would be more agreeable to you to receive them here in the midst of your own fellow citizens, they have been withheld for this occasion. I trust, sir, that I may be permitted to add that it is not alone that you have visited with merited castigation the vile slanderer of the State which gave you birth that we delight to honor you, but because your conduct throughout the trying scenes through which you have since passed has been such as to win the applause of all honorable men, and to justify our pride in claiming you as one of Carolina's noblest sons.

It is needless for me to allude more particularly to your noble bearing, and gallant conduct in maintaining the honor and interests of your State; for let me assure you, sir, they need no record but the hearts of your countrymen, where now they are already inscribed in characters which time cannot efface.

Allow me, sir, on behalf of the citizens, to welcome you to Columbia, and to tender to you our warm congratulations on your triumph over the malignant slanderers of your State and race, and to assure you of our cordial sympathy and approbation.

After the conclusion of Mayor Arthur's remarks, Col. Brooks advanced to the front of the portico, amid the cheers and applause of the multitude, and delivered a speech of nearly an hour in length, a brief, meagre, and very inadequate synopsis of which we give. He thanked the citizens for the compliment paid him on this occasion, and for the sympathy which his course had received. It was the spirit which actuated him to do the deed, more than the deed itself, which deserved their commendation. It was a deed which was the result of a high sense of duty, and any man who held his honor above reproach would have acted under similar circumstances, precisely as he did.

An ordinary castigation was nothing to excite a people as had this act of his excited the North. Abolitionists, seeking excuses for their vile slanders, had made it a pretext for more fanaticism. It was curious that the castigation of a Black Republican should beget so extraordinary an excitement. But they had used this act of his—executed under the highest sense of duty—as an instrument to kindle more fires of fanaticism. Their motive

was political power; they wished to enjoy the patronage and the emoluments of the Government.

Every foot of the way from Washington to this city he had met with kindness from the people of the South, and it gratified him to believe that were he to travel to the extreme verge of the South he should meet with the same hearty welcome as he had experienced here and elsewhere.

He would not say there was no honor or moral courage at the North; he knew there were some men of as true courage at the North as elsewhere. But what he wished to say was, that the moral tone of mind which would lead a man to become a Black Republican would make him incapable of courage and would involve a loss of all honor and moral principle whatever.

It was plain that the defeat of the Army bill was the act of the Black Republican majority in the House of Representatives. He was almost glad of it; though he had voted for the original bill, he was of opinion it ought to fail. He voted for it from a sense of duty, not liking to do evil that good might follow. The loss of the Army appropriation would not injure the South, because all the money nearly was expended at the North.

He rather wished the army appropriation bill would not pass, because it would effect the removal of the United States soldiers from Kansas and leave the people of the South free to go there and cut the throats of Lane and his Abolition comrades. We know the Black Republican platform; it is our duty either to counteract them or meet them boldly, face to face, and battle for our rights.

Their principles were the abolition of Slavery in the district of Columbia, the prohibition of the inter State slave-trade, no more Slave Territory, &c. Will they carry out these principles? The election of Banks as Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the defeat of the Army bill, teach us that we should meet and prepare to defend ourselves. With right upon our side, we should meet and conquer them.

All of us agreed that if we could not live in equality in the Union, our only course was to dissolve it. He was a cooperation disunionist—the same as he was in 1851. He felt convinced that South Carolina would respond to his position.

When he said lately in the House of Representatives that he had it in his power to raise a revolution, it was no egotistic boast. He felt that he had done as much as any one man to

concentrate the feeling of the South, and when he spoke of revolution, he knew that had he stepped forward and smote one of their Abolition crew in the House, their enmity to him would have precipitated them against him, and then his friends would have covered the floor of the House of Representatives with human blood.

He now came to a delicate question—the Presidency. The only hope for the South was to support Mr. Buchanan. His opponents were Fremont and Fillmore—the former a soldier who had never won a battle, a politician who had never made a speech; his birth-place, too, was as hard to fix upon satisfactorily, as was the identity of his father. Fillmore was a man of unexceptionable moral virtue; and between Fremont and Fillmore he would prefer the former, because the great issue would be precipitated, although the latter was as much an Abolitionist, having voted to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia, against the admission of Texas, and had opposed the Administration of Franklin Pierce, for his course on the Missouri Compromise.

Buchanan, the speaker frankly admitted, was not his first, second or third choice, but his last. His first choice was Franklin Pierce, because he had manifested a disposition to give the South her constitutional rights. After Pierce he was in favor of Douglass—a true friend, who had perilled his life by his position on the Nebraska bill, and who had the smoke and scars of the battle upon him.

There must be compromise everywhere—in society, in law and in politics. Buchanan was the standard-bearer in the coming contest, and the platform upon which he stood was the right one for the South. If its principles were carried out, the Government would be restored to the condition of a constitutional administration. Why should we refuse to take a part in the battle? If we are bound to have civil war, and if we must dissolve the Union, we must do it with a full appreciation of the consequences. He thought there would be no child's play when the conflict did come.

On the second Monday in November next the great question would be decided. For his part, if Fremont, the traitor to his section, should be successful, it was his deliberate opinion that on the fourth of March next, the people of the South should rise in their might, march to Washington, and seize the archives and the Treasury of the Government. We should anticipate them, and force them to attack us.

In conclusion, Mr. Brooks said he felt it to

be an obligation upon him to devote all the energies of his life to repay the generous sympathy with which he had been met by his fellow-citizens of the South and South Carolina; and that whenever an occasion offered he would be ready to stand up in defence of his State. In the language of a distinguished citizen of our State, he would say that through good and evil report, for weal or for woe, he would stand by South Carolina.

At the conclusion of these remarks, (which were frequently interrupted by hearty applause,) one general shout arose from the assembled crowd, and they quietly dispersed, but soon after reassembled with a band of musicians and repaired to the temporary residence of Col. Brooks, determined to give him a good old-fashioned Richland serenade, which was admirably sustained by the band of the Richland Volunteer Rifle Company, interspersed with a display of fireworks in front of the Congaree House.

For the "Boston Daily Advertiser."

The Three Candidates.

Which candidate is most conservative and least sectional?

Let each speak for himself or through his friends, as per extracts below:—

LETTER FROM COL. FREMONT.

NEW YORK, April 29, 1856.

Gentlemen,—I have to thank you for the honor of an invitation to a meeting this evening at the Broadway Tabernacle, and regret that other engagements have interfered to prevent my being present. I heartily concur in all movements which have for their object to "repair the mischiefs arising from the violation of good faith in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise." I am opposed to slavery in the abstract, and upon principle sustained and made habitual by long-settled convictions. While I feel inflexible in the belief that it ought not to be interfered with where it exists under the shield of State sovereignty, I am as inflexibly opposed to its extension on this continent beyond its present limits.

With the assurance of regard for yourselves,
I am, very respectfully, yours,

J. C. FREMONT.

To Messrs. E. D. MORGAN and others,
Committee, &c.

WHAT THE "RICHMOND ENQUIRER" SAYS OF MR. BUCHANAN.

The "Richmond Enquirer" thus endorses Buchanan:—

In private, as well as in public, Mr. Buchanan has *always stood on the side of the South*. The citizen and the statesman are one and the same individual. He supported the rights of the South when in office; he vindicated and maintained those rights when out of office. He not only voted for all measures of justice to the South, but he endeavored to carry them into effect. His is not a dead record of votes, but a living record of acts, which vindicate the honesty of the votes. Thus Mr. Buchanan exhorted the North to a faithful and cheerful fulfilment of the obligations of the Fugitive Slave Law. He protested against the prohibition of the jails in Pennsylvania to Federal officers for the confinement of captured slaves. He denounced the Wilmot Proviso. He approved the Clayton Compromise of 1847. And, to sum up in a single sentence, *he has at all times and in all places exerted the authority of his high character and great talents to uphold the Union, defend the Constitution, and protect the South*.

To recapitulate,—

1. In 1836, Mr. Buchanan supported a bill to prohibit the circulation of abolition papers through the mails.
2. In the same year, he proposed and voted for the admission of Arkansas.
3. In 1836-7, he denounced, and voted to reject petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.
4. In 1837, he voted for Mr. Calhoun's famous resolutions, defining the rights of the States and the limits of Federal authority, and affirming it to be the duty of the government to protect and uphold the institutions of the South.
5. In 1838-9 and 1840, he invariably voted with Southern Senators against the consideration of anti-slavery petitions.
6. In 1844-5, he advocated and voted for the annexation of Texas.
7. In 1847, he sustained the Clayton Compromise.
8. In 1850, he proposed and urged the extension of the Missouri Compromise to the Pacific Ocean.
9. But he promptly acquiesced in the Compromise of 1850, and employed all his influence in favor of the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave Law.
10. In 1851, he remonstrated against an enactment of the Pennsylvania Legislature

for obstructing the arrest and return of Fugitive Slaves.

11. In 1854, he negotiated for the acquisition of Cuba.

12. In 1856, *he approves the repeal of the Missouri restriction, and supports the principles of the Kansas-Nebraska Act.*

13. *He never gave a vote against the interests of Slavery, and never uttered a word which could pain the most sensitive Southern heart.*

The prominent facts of Mr. Buchanan's record touching Slavery are thus grouped into a single view; so that a person of the least patience in research may ascertain at a glance how the Democratic candidate stands in respect to the great issue of the canvas. In this succinct statement, we give not detached passages and isolated acts; but we bring the whole history of a long life to bear upon the popular mind with the irresistible force of truth. This rapid retrospect discloses a consistency and efficiency of service to the South which flattery can claim for no other living man. Mr. Buchanan is not only vindicated from calumny, he is not simply shown to be exempt from just reproach and worthy of confidence, — he is promoted to his proper position, in advance of any and every states-

man of the North, in the confidence and affection of the people of the South. He demands not a mere recognition of his attachment to the Constitution, but *unbounded applause for such service in the interest of the South as no other man can boast.* Against the captious criticism of a desperate adversary, refining upon technical distinctions and skulking among quibbles, the Democracy oppose this incontestable attestation of their candidate's fidelity.

EXTRACT FROM MR. FILLMORE'S SPEECH AT
ALBANY.

“ We see a political party presenting candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, selected for the first time from the Free States alone, with the avowed purpose of electing these candidates by the suffrages of one part of the Union only to rule over the whole United States. [Cries of “shame—shame.”] Can it be possible that those who are engaged in such a measure can have seriously reflected upon the consequences which must inevitably follow in case of success? Can they have the madness or the folly to believe that our Southern brethren would submit to be governed by such a Chief Magistrate ?