

Boston, October 24, 1839.

national Declaration of Independence, the People in their public meetings declared that the cause of Boston was the cause of all. Before Mr. Mecklenburg's Declaration, the example of Boston stimulated the People of North Carolina, while her wrongs were deemed sufficient cause of quarrel with England; and when the patriots of Mecklenburg, on the 20th of May, 1775, "dissolved the political bands which connected them with the mother country," when they freed themselves from all allegiance to the British Crown, when they declared themselves a free and independent People, and for the maintenance of that independence solemnly pledged to each other their lives, fortunes, and most sacred honor, one powerful cause which operated upon them was, that the blood of the American patriots in Lexington had been indignantly shed by British soldiers. One feeling animated the whole country. One sympathetic chord bound all the Colonies together.

Before I read this letter of the estimable gentleman from Boston, I must refer to another letter from a distinguished man in Massachusetts. Over whose election has the Globe recently reported? Who is recently elected Governor of Massachusetts? Has the gentleman from Tennessee heard of the election of Marcus Morton, now Governor of Massachusetts? I have no doubt this information makes the gentleman from Tennessee write very fast—write on, sir—has he not asked him, does this result impart joy to his bosom? Has not the gentleman participated in the delight which pervades his party at the joyful news that Massachusetts has a Van Buren Governor? Oh, yes; to doubt it would imply the gentleman was not a good democrat. And who is Marcus Morton? No Federalist, I suppose? It is said not, and I am truly glad to hear it. The old Commonwealth will not be so severely afflicted as I feared; for, of all hybrid politicians that ever cursed a State, Jacksonian Van Buren Federalist is the worst. There is nothing he will hesitate to do which the interest of his party requires. This Mr. Morton speaks of slavery in terms like those used by other friends of Mr. Van Buren, and other abolitionists, vilifies Henry Clay for his efforts at the time of the admission of Missouri. Let it be remembered this is the same Marcus Morton over whose success the Administration party have raised such shouts of triumph. I will refer to the gentleman from Tennessee this letter from one whom he thinks a good democrat.

Extracts from a letter from Marcus Morton to Mr. Eddy, Esq. dated Northampton, Sept. 28, 1837.

"I deem slavery to be the greatest curse and the most portentous evil which a righteous God ever inflicted upon a nation; and that every effort, consistent with moral duty and the Constitution and the laws of the Union, ought to be made to mitigate, and, if possible, to exterminate it from our land.

"That Congress has the control of the whole subject within the District of Columbia. I can entertain no doubt. I have seen two droves of human beings, manacled and chained together, driven like cattle by a driver, under the walls of the Capitol, in which were assembled the Representatives of a People proud and boastful of their liberty. Can such things be suffered to continue without bringing down upon our nation the vengeance of an offended Deity? What ever wisdom and justice may be to remove such a reproach should be done.

"In relation to the admission of new States with the power to hold slaves, I need no more than refer you to my recorded votes against the admission of Missouri with this power. That opposition, which it required some firmness to persevere in, would doubtless have proved successful but for the extraordinary influence and extraordinary efforts of one man, (Henry Clay) who, as you suppose by some to have resorted to extraordinary means to accomplish his purpose.

MARCUS MORTON.

Does the gentleman hear this? Write on, write on—but your constituents shall hear this too. Yes, the South will hear it, and yet be true to herself; she will yet thank this great man, Henry Clay, for those "extraordinary efforts" by which he protected the rights of the Southern people and transplanted a distracted country. Well might this Van Buren abolitionist find fault with these extraordinary powers. Such a man as Henry Clay must always use extraordinary efforts; Nature has endowed him with extraordinary gifts, and he has often used them for the good of his country. I may now speak of him without being suspected of flattery for he has no patronage or power to confer; though he has not always commanded success, he has done no more, he has deserved it.

Mr. Parmenter here rose to explain. With the permission of the gentleman I wish here to interpose a word in behalf of Governor Morton. The gentleman has read his letter on the subject of slavery, but he does not draw the distinction between anti-slavery and abolitionism. One is a mere opinion—a sentiment; the other is the policy of a party who are ready to carry their measures against the Constitution. Let me state a fact: The organ of the abolitionists in Massachusetts was opposed to Morton's election; it is therefore manifest that they had not confidence in him as an abolitionist. I wish the gentleman would define abolitionism more strictly.

Mr. Stanly. What is your definition of it? Mr. Parmenter said, it is the project of a party disposed to carry abolition in the District of Columbia without reference to the welfare of the nation, and without regard to the Constitution. Mr. Stanly asked him, are you an abolitionist? Mr. Parmenter. No.

Mr. Stanly. Very well. The gentleman says Morton is an anti-slavery man, but not an abolitionist. Is his colleague, (Mr. Williams) whose letter I have read, an anti-slavery man or an abolitionist? Listen, Mr. Speaker, and you, advocates of the humbug resolutions, to the language of these "anti-slavery" men. Hear these words from one who said not to be an abolitionist. Read for yourselves the letters of H. Williams, W. Parmenter, and Marcus Morton, all true Van Buren men, and tell me what you think of this distinction. These anti-slavery men, who look upon slavery as "the greatest curse which a righteous God ever inflicted upon a nation," who think it is the imperative duty of Congress to adopt immediate measures for its abolition in the District of Columbia; these men, we are to be told, are not abolitionists! Really, sir, the gentleman will be famous for the clearness of his distinctions. He will deserve to have it said of him—

"He could distinguish and divide
A hair, 'twixt south and southwest side."
I will send these definitions to my constituents, and let them judge of their sincerity.

[These some gentleman offered to move an adjournment.] No, no; I will not go into the subject today; the Globe would publish me, and get a headache, too, to prove it, as having consumed sweat and rail at my spending the public money by consumption of time.

I said, sir, I had a letter signed Abbot Lawrence, of Boston, which I will now read to the House. I am willing this letter should be circulated with those from the same State I have just read.

GENTLEMEN: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 21st, in which you ask me whether I am in favor of the "immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia," and "whether I am opposed to the admission of any new State into the Union whose Constitution may tolerate slavery."

I answer, in regard to the first question, that my vote would depend upon the circumstances, terms, and conditions under which such a bill should be presented to Congress.

An answer to the second proposition may be found upon the Journals of the Twenty-fourth Congress, and to the votes I then gave I now refer you.

In regard to that part of your letter which alludes to politicians obtaining power by a non-committal policy, in the concealment of their opinions, I beg leave to avail myself of the present occasion to state that I do not entertain opinions which I wish to conceal upon any subject, especially upon those concerning the public welfare.

I have been again brought before the People for their suffrages, not with any agency of my own, but contrary to my wishes, and reluctantly consented, after strong and urgent solicitations of my personal friends, to be a candidate for Congress.

The approaching session will doubtless be one of deep interest to the country, and should I be elected, I shall devote my humble energies to promote what I believe to be for the permanent interests of the whole People. I wish you, gentlemen, and every other individual who has the right to cast a vote in this district, to believe that I shall not give pledges of any kind whatsoever to support particular men or measures; & those of my fellow-citizens who honor me with their suffrages will understand that I must be left to pursue that course of conduct in legislation which commends itself to my judgment, and that the question of slavery, and all others upon which I may be called to act, must be as open and free to me as the air we breathe.

If my character is sufficient to give me a majority of the votes upon such conditions, I shall be ready to take my place in Congress, and serve the People to the best of my abilities.

I thank you, gentlemen, for the expressions of respect contained in your letter, while

I remain your obedient servant,

ABBOT LAWRENCE.

To Francis Jackson, Charles Truworth Hill, Dr. Thos. R. Sewall, Ellis Gray Loring, Esquires, Boston.

It was needless, sir, for the author of this manly, independent letter to say he had no opinions he wished to conceal. All who know this gentleman will acknowledge the truth of this; all who know him believe he is ready to devote his energies for the permanent interests of the whole People. You do not see here any gross denunciations of slavery. No attempt to excite the People, by calling down the anger of Heaven upon what abolitionists call this great evil. Such a man is worthy to represent that People, and to serve his country.

I now pass to the Gibraltar of the Union—little Rhode Island. I do not speak of her as the Gibraltar in reference to her size, but because she so nobly resisted the assaults of Toryism last fall. The gentlemen who so ably represent her on this floor were pronounced abolitionists, because they voted against the dough faced, humbug resolutions. Who was brought out to oppose these resolutions? A Mr. Dur, a thorough abolitionist, a "to-be-repudiated" abolitionist, one of the executive committee of an anti-slavery society. But the People of this gallant little State, trusting to the tried integrity and ability of her present Representatives, sent them back, and here they are; in spite of the Van Buren abolitionists.

I suppose the comprehensive gentleman from Tennessee could not condescend to look upon such small spots as Massachusetts or Rhode Island.

Well, sir, the gentleman proceeded to discuss the state of abolition in Ohio. Does he know, sir, whom the Van Buren party of Ohio have sent to the Senate of the United States? Does he know Mr. Tappan, brother to the notorious abolitionist of that name? But, Mr. Speaker, before I speak further of Ohio, let me call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee to some other votes in the journals of the last session of Congress. I wish to do this while I think of it. I am forced to discuss this question rather discursively, as nothing was further from my thoughts than to make a speech on this subject.

By referring to the journals, the gentleman will see that on the 13th day of December, 1838, Mr. Calhoun of Kentucky (Mr. Calhoun, a gentleman of superior abilities and many excellent traits of character—I should exceedingly regret his absence, were not his place so well filled) introduced the following resolution, to which I beg leave to call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee.

On the 77th page of the journals of the last session, it will be seen that—

"Mr. Calhoun, of Kentucky, moved that the rules be suspended to enable him to move the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to report a bill making it unlawful for any person to aid fugitive slaves in escaping from their owners, and providing for the punishment in the Courts of the United States, of all persons who may be guilty of such offence."

"And that they be further instructed to report a bill making it unlawful for any person in the non-slave holding States of this Union to use any means to induce slaves from their owners, and providing for the punishment, in the Courts of the United States, of all persons who may be guilty of such offence."

Upon this motion there were, yeas 90, nays 107. Only one Southern man voted among the nays, only one opposed so reasonable a resolution. Upon this the whole South was united. Among the 90 who voted with the South, there were 13 members from non-slave holding States, seven of whom were Whigs, and six were Van Buren men. Only six of the whole of these patriotic gentlemen voted for this resolution! And, sir, not even the gentleman whose name in my part of the world is synonymous with humbug—not even he who introduced these deceptive resolutions, which the gentleman from Tennessee commends so highly, is to be found voting with "us of the South!"

This resolution, I know, meets with the approbation of the gentleman from Tennessee. But why did the friend of the gentleman from Tennessee—the gallant gentleman from New Hampshire, (Mr. Atherton), the advocate-general of the Secretary of the Treasury—why did not he then step forward in defence of the South? Oh, no. He was metamorphosed into a States-rights man in a minute, ranged under "the black banner." I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will look a little further into the journal before he charges all the Whigs with being abolitionists, and thanks so cordially all the Van Buren men of the North for their support of Southern rights.

I must go a little further on in the journal to exhibit these humbuggers in their proper light. On the 17th December, a petition was offered praying that Congress should "recognize, in the usual form and manner, and enter into the cus-

tomary international relations with the Republic of Hayti." The reception of this petition was objected to by my friend from Virginia (Mr. Wise) not because he was desirous to throw any obstacles in the way of commerce, but because he regarded this petition as having for its object an abolition of all distinctions on account of color, and, upon examination, it appeared that these petitions were printed, and the same paper which requested Congress to "enter into the customary international relations with Hayti" also contained the request that Congress should abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and prevent the slave trade between the States. It was, therefore, essentially an abolition movement.

These facts were made known to the House. A vote was taken by yeas and nays upon this question: Shall the petition be received? The vote was: Yeas 159, nays 92. The thirty-two were called "Southern fanatics." No Northern man of either party voted against the reception of this petition. A few of us (two gentlemen from Maryland, Messrs. Jolinson and Jenifer, Mr. Pope, of Kentucky, Mr. Wise and myself) voted against the reception; for this we were denounced as "fanatics," while those of us who did not vote for the humbug resolutions were called abolitionists. Not one Van Buren man from the North voted against a petition praying us to allow a black minister to come here upon terms of equality with us! Not one of those whom the gentleman from Tennessee, in his overflowing superabundant gratitude, so kindly thanked, would vote against such a proposition! Really, sir, when we think of this vote, and of the fate of Mr. Calhoun's resolution just referred to, we must allow that the gentleman from Tennessee is exceedingly anxious to feel gratitude, and is very thankful for very small favors.

The gentleman from Tennessee has not gone far enough into the journals, or like the old Federalist from Kinderhook (Mr. Vanderpool), he is not firing off his own ammunition. I call back again upon the gentleman to "stand by his integrity." I ask him to look to his Southern loving friend from New Hampshire to "stand by his integrity," or to take up integrity upon this subject. Will he vote for a law to punish those who would aid slaves to escape? Will he vote to enter into the customary international relations with Hayti? Or will he like many others of his party are in the habit of doing upon this subject, dodge the question?

Now, sir, I wish to say a word relative to Ohio abolition. The gentleman referred to the proceedings of the Ohio Legislature. Does he know, sir, what Mr. Morris, a thorough dove, told Mr. Van Buren, said on the floor of the Senate? I am informed he said there, that if he had been in the Legislature of Ohio when the Kentucky delegates came there, he would have tried to have them imprisoned. And if the gentleman from Tennessee thinks the South-ern people ought to thank Ohio for passing an act to enable Kentucky to recover her fugitive slaves, what does he say for his friends on this floor who refused to vote for Mr. Calhoun's resolution before referred to? Not one Van Buren man from Ohio voted for that resolution; three Whigs from Ohio voted for it, and eight friends of Mr. Van Buren from Ohio (Messrs. Cheney, Duncan, Hamer, Hunter, Leadbetter, Shepler, Swearingen, and Webster) voted against it. Yet these gentlemen will be called democrats and friends of the South by the gentleman from Tennessee!

Well, sir, the Senator from Ohio, (Mr. Morris), an avowed Van Buren abolitionist, was sent home. And whom did the Van Buren Legislature of Ohio send here in his place? Does the gentleman from Tennessee know Mr. Tappan from Ohio? Is he acquainted with his kind feelings for the South?

[Mr. Weller, of Ohio, rose to explain: If the gentleman from North Carolina intends to charge the new Senator from Ohio with being an abolitionist, he will find himself greatly mistaken. No man can be more opposed to modern abolition than Mr. Tappan.]

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman's explanation; but, sir, what a disgraceful system of humbuggery the Van Buren abolitionists wish to practise on the South! What does the gentleman say? That Mr. Tappan is opposed to abolition? No, sir; but he is opposed to modern abolition; and, sir, what is that? Here, sir, is another distinction. Now we have the old-fashioned abolition, then comes anti-slavery abolition, and last; modern abolition! What wretched folly! Let me, sir, give a specimen of the feelings of a Van Buren friend of the South, who is opposed to "modern abolition." A gentleman asked Mr. Tappan (the Van Buren Senator from Ohio) about the time of the Southampton insurrection, "what do you hear from Virginia?" Mr. Tappan with customary courtesy (I understand he is a very polite man) replied, "what the devil is that to either of us?" The gentleman replied to him, he felt deep interest in the fate of the whites in Virginia, and thought it might be necessary to march to their assistance. Mr. Tappan replied, in substance, "that if his son should obey a summons and dare to march to Virginia on such an errand, he would dismember him; any man he added, who held a false creature in bondage ought 'to have his damned throat cut!" Sir, I cannot find language strong enough to convey my detestation for such a creature.

[Mr. Webster asked, "What is your authority for such a statement?"]

Mr. Stanly. When you bring your Senator to deny it, I am ready to prove it. Does the gentleman deny it? Ohio has a strong band here of Administration men; I call upon them to deny it. Not a man, sir, will venture to do so. This is the man who is opposed to "modern abolition!" His abolition is old-fashioned—to abolish slavery by cutting throats seems to suit his fancy! I am informed, sir, by a gentleman near me that these facts were proved before the Senate when Mr. Tappan was nominated as a district judge, and he was rejected on account of it. The Van Buren party from Ohio have sent here a man who would disinherit his son for assisting the South at such an hour. To say he deserved to be hanged on a gallows higher than Haman's would be a compliment to him! He opposed to "modern abolition!" I dare say he is, because modern abolitionists endeavor to unite themselves to religious societies. His abolition has nothing to do with religion. Is not that the reason the new Senator from Ohio is opposed to "modern abolition"? What a noble specimen of Van Buren friendship for the South we have here! Yet, sir, the Southern people have been told often and again that all the Whigs of the North are abolitionists, because they voted against the Atherton resolutions, and all Van Buren men were friends of the South. If any little "Jim Crow" politician who professed to be a Whig, and was anxious to change sides, that he might be in the majority in his district—if he found it expedient to change sides, and turned round so fast that his clothes would not follow him, he had sufficient excuse in saying "all the Whigs are abolitionists—the Van Buren men are the only friends of the South." I was accused of favoring abolition because I spurned these humbug resolutions. I am proud that I did so; I rejoice that I treated them as they deserved to be treated, with scorn and contempt. A parcel of Southern gentlemen, in company with anti-slavery Van Buren men from the North, assembled in the back room of some tavern, or in some dark hole in this Capitol, and

having excluded all the Whigs of the South, concocted resolutions under the advice and assistance of those who would not have assisted the people of Virginia, though they were in danger of having their throats cut! I repeat, sir, I rejoice that I did not reject and despise these resolutions. I was told it would ruin me; that my constituents would not understand my conduct. I was asked what I would do when I reached home? But, sir, I knew the people who sent me here. I knew they had confidence in me. I had confidence in their intelligence, and I was not disappointed. They would not have forgotten me if I had done wrong. I went through my whole district, and denounced the abolition resolutions, as I did in the last Congress, as I do now, as hypocritical and delusive. They keep.

The word of promise to our ear,
But break it to our hope.

They were not intended—it was not desired by the caucus that prepared them—that they should allow an unholy excitement. They were not designed to secure the South, but were prepared "with the view" of benefiting a party, and furnishing an excuse for an unholy coalition. I told my constituents they did not even deny to Congress the power to abolish slavery in this District, or in the Territories. One of these resolutions is as follows. I quote part of it:

"The agitation of the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia or the Territories, as a means and with a view of disturbing or overthrowing that institution in the several States, is against the true spirit and meaning of the Constitution, an infringement of the rights of the States affected, and a breach of the public faith, on which they entered into this Confederacy."

My constituents agreed with me, that adopting such a resolution would be abandoning the ground we had hitherto occupied; it was calculated to encourage abolitionists to send their petitions to Congress, and say they wished slavery abolished in this District and in the Territories, without the views disturbing or overthrowing that institution in the several States. And these are the miserable resolutions for which the gentleman from Tennessee tenders his heartfelt thanks! I am proud in remembering that I told my constituents, if I should be defeated for refusing to vote those resolutions, that I should not glory in such a defeat. I proclaimed that I did not wish the support of any man who disapproved of my conduct upon those resolutions. After these repeated declarations, I have returned, sir, ready to devote all my energies to the advancement of the welfare and the protection of the interests—not of the South alone, but of my whole country.

Let me appeal against Southern gentlemen. Does it become them to make this subject a mere political plying? If they are sincerely desirous to secure from danger their institutions, and the rights and property of their constituents, does it become them to attempt to delude the People by passing resolutions without meaning, and unintelligible?

A gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Pickens) maintains that abolition petitions were not received under the Atherton resolutions. There is not one Northern Administration man who will agree with him in his opinion of these resolutions. I wrote a letter to Speaker Polk, and after he had given me half a dozen answers, which he did not intend I should understand, and which meant nothing, that at last told me none but sophist would say that these petitions were not received. But, sir, a gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Cushing) put the direct question to the Speaker, & he said the petitions were received. And the gentleman from New Hampshire who offered the resolutions said in his speech: "At any rate, I may be pardoned for saying of that constituency, [his own] that they are too intelligent to be misled by the idle and utterly unfounded pretence that the adoption of such a resolution is a denial of any right of petition!" And, after this, it was expected that these resolutions would receive the support of Southern gentlemen!

After this declaration, it was humiliating to see Southern men driven, like so many oxen, to support resolutions which admitted the reception of abolition petitions—resolutions which admitted that Congress had power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia and in the Territories! I call again upon the gentleman from Tennessee to stand by his integrity, to bring his friends from the North to reject these petitions. Let him try it, sir; he may get a few; they might offend their constituents; but they may please the party. I shall vote, sir, to reject these petitions, and, at a proper time, I shall offer a resolution to reject them. While I do this, sir, I have no hesitation in saying that I believe the furious opposition which was made some years since against these petitions has increased the flame of abolition. I believe, if they had been received, and no further notice taken of them, we should not have been troubled now. By an opposition we have given consequence to fanatics, who have raised the cry, that "the right of petition is trampled upon." This is the watchword which has added numbers to the petitioners. We ought, in the first place, to have regarded their interference with indifference. But things have changed. The Administration party wish to alarm the South with the ridiculous ought to be put a rest. I think the people of the non-slaveholding States have no constitutional right to petition upon this subject. It is a grievance to them. If slavery is a grievance, it is a grievance to the white people of the South. If slavery is an evil, it is an evil to the whites—that it is a blessing to the negroes, in their present condition, to man acquainted with the Southern country can deny.

If you will not reject these petitions, let us see what you will do: I am ready for action, so are my constituents. I am sick—the country is disgusted with the disgraceful conditions between the pretenders to chivalry and the anti-slavery resolution makers. These political jugglers have fretted their hour upon the stage; let us have no more of their farcical performances.

If we had petitions here from the Southern country praying Congress to abolish the banking system, the railroads, or the manufacturing establishments of the North, I should say, reject them. If banks and manufacturing establishments are grievances, they are so to those States in whose borders they exist.

I remember, sir, at the last session of Congress, I inquired if there were any abolitionists in New Hampshire who support the present Administration. I was uniformly answered, no; they all belong to the Whigs. It was a long time before I could procure information from that benighted region, but at last I did gather some facts, which I will give.

Although I was told that there were no Van Buren abolitionists in New Hampshire, I had accidentally seen a paper from there, edited by Edmund Burke, the same gentleman now a member from that State. This paper, to my surprise, contained an appeal to "democratic abolitionists," beseeching them not to be entrapped in the toils of Federalism. This paper is called

the "Argus and Spectator." If I am wrong in supposing the gentleman from New Hampshire to be the person in whom I have alluded, I hope he will say so. Does he deny it?

[Mr. Burke of New Hampshire, observed that the gentleman from North Carolina had read an extract only; he wished him to read the whole of the article.]

Mr. Stanly. Read the whole! I might read until midnight, if I read the whole of the articles to which I have referred. I ask the gentleman if he denies it?

[Mr. Burke requested Mr. Stanly to repeat the question.]

Mr. Stanly asked if there were not many abolitionists in New Hampshire who supported the Van Buren party, and if he was not the editor of the paper from which he had just read an extract? Does the gentleman deny it? Yes, sir, I was told frequently that all the abolitionists in New Hampshire were Whigs. But here is the editor of the Argus and Spectator on the same ticket with the gentleman who introduced the humbug resolutions, addressing the democratic abolitionists of New Hampshire.

I give a few extracts:

"But we would caution such democrats as may favor anti-slavery principles to be ware, and not get entrapped in the toils of federalism, while they imagine they are advancing their own peculiar doctrines."

"We find no fault with their dissenting from slavery, and desiring its removal." &c. I have heard the names of some of the leading abolitionists in New Hampshire, one of them is Peter P. Woodbury, (brother of Levi Woodbury.) The Secretary of the Treasury has one brother in Massachusetts an abolitionist, and here, sir, is another from his own State. In one of the abolition papers of New Hampshire I found an article signed a "A Uniform Democrat," in which the writer says: "The high character of New England would be degraded by making the impression at the South, or elsewhere, that our democratic citizens are the miserable apologists or advocates of the unholy cause of slavery." These "democratic citizens" are, of course, supporters of the present Administration. They very modestly appropriate the name of Democrats, while they are ultra Federal in principle and practice.

I will no longer fatigue the House with these details. I have exhibited abundant proof that the charge against the Whigs of being identified with the abolitionists is ridiculous and untrue.

In Indiana, I am informed, the Legislature passed strong resolutions against the abolition movements, and the only man who voted against the resolutions was a Van Buren man.

After the gentleman from Tennessee, had finished with abolition, he commenced an acquisition against Judge Burnet, by calling him a Federalist. I learn that Judge Burnet was a Federalist, and he was once opposed to Gen. Harrison, because he was a Jeffersonian Republican. But if it be a charge against Harrison that any of his friends were once Federalists, let me ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he is not aware his argument will work both ways. Are there no Federalists in the Van Buren ranks? Let the gentleman go to the Senate, and look at Mr. Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, who said, if he thought he had one drop of democratic blood in his body, he would let it out. Let him look at Mr. Wall, of New Jersey, who said during the last Congress, in the Senate, he was a Federalist and never denied it. I have a colleague on this floor, a staunch Van Buren man, (Mr. McKay), who was an old Federalist. Can it then be a grave charge against Gen. Harrison, that some of his friends are Federalists? Is not the Senator from Ohio, who is opposed to modern abolition, a Federalist too? I ask the gentleman from Ohio; who speaks for his Senator, if he was not a Federalist? I have before me a speech of a friend of Gen. Harrison, in 1836, in which he states that this charge against Harrison is an "unfounded falsehood." Hear what he says:

"A more unfounded falsehood was never invented. My personal acquaintance with him commenced in 1796, under the administration of Washington. The intimacy between us was great, and our intercourse was constant, and from that time, till he left Cincinnati, I was in the habit of arguing and disputing with him on political subjects. I was a Federalist—honestly so, from principle, and adhered to the party till it dissolved, and its elements mingled with other parties formed on different principles. I can, therefore speak on this point with absolute certainty, and I affirm most solemnly that, under the administration of Washington and the administration of the elder Adams, William Henry Harrison was a firm, consistent unyielding Republican of the Jefferson school. He advocated the election of Mr. Jefferson, and warmly maintained his claims against Mr. Adams."

Thus, sir, is this charge nailed to the counter.

In a late number of the Globe I find a letter published, which I will read to the House:

"We have just received news from the Federal National Convention, now in session at Harrisburg, for the purpose of nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States in opposition to the Republican candidates. The information is, that General Harrison of Ohio, has been nominated. It is said that the Convention preferred Mr. Clay, for his superior talents and past services to the Federal party; but, as he was opposed to modern abolitionism, because of its revolutionary tendency to divide the States and dissolve the Union, he could not, in their opinion, unite the Federal party in the Northern States, and, as General Harrison teas himself an abolitionist, and in favor of taxing the People for the purpose of purchasing the slaves of the South and setting them free—and entertaining, in common with the Federal party throughout the Union, the principles preferred upon in the administrations of the elder and the younger Adams, they determined to sacrifice their first choice, (Mr. Clay,) and nominate General Harrison, because, he would bring to his

support the entire force of the North."

Really, sir, the anti-slavery man who actually found out that of "superior talents" not only discovered known for more than has found out what Mr. Clay had rendered a great leader of the public life opposed to the great leader of the Federal party? It is not what amazing character plays. Henry Clay was an abolitionist! These since reviled him, an abolitionist, and will admit that he is in opposition! Sir, wonder!

I call upon the come forth with an abolitionist. Let or acknowledge without proof. He was pronounced a slanderer, and I know evidence to sustain a highly respected from Indiana in the remarkable for his Cumberland road, such attempt at "flutterings of wounded this is the fluttering death struggle of a numbered. The

"What will the say to this? Can the leaders during the pledged themselves the nominee of they dare to avow the Harrison? If they in Tennessee will be als guard.

"I am, sir, very

"What will the to this? They is not true. You Clay is no abolition ago you told us he believe?"

"Will they dare to of Harrison? The letter-writer does not be a Whig. The like the Whigs becomes a man; he none. I should have prophet if he had charges against Harrison.

Let me ask, what nessee say to the Tappan? What would visit their States trines? They would students would, "Keep the creek," for no man you bear, whether you ern abolition or not, bonable opinions you under the laws of Tennessee, (Mr. W been here long enough accurately of the party abolitionists, I will read Emancipator of Decem paper is well known to nity and falsehood indulges towards the am happy to see such Harrison. Some place will be fortunate this dirty work of duty Hear the Emancipator.

GENERAL HARRISON posed that it might executive Committee of Harrison, now that candidate the President of election to respect to the abolition where is the use? the rejection of Henry a slaveholder, and a Gen. Harrison, we know. Neither is Mr. one thinks it necessary Van Buren. Why? Van are known to be dancy of the SLAVE People of Gen. Harrison any man of his party, and the absoluteness of nominating a slaveholder devoted of slavery with Gen. Harrison, no lifting slavoholery, Virginia, for Speaker.

But we submit, in son's principles are his deeds, of which we summary in the Rochester

In December, 1822, Indiana Territory, the convention of the pro held at Vincennes, and grees a memorial of ing that the sixth article of '87" which might be suspended, pers, 1802.) His effort a slave State were pro he was Governor of the

In 1819, Feb. 16, as a member of the tive, against a clause the introduction of and against a clause in participation (at 25) of the State. Two days after a clause prohibiting of slavery into Arkansas the future emancipation Arkansas.

So basely did he Ohio was shocked, rejected at the next Ohio in 1822. The Oct. 20, 1822, says