

# THE NORTH-CAROLINIAN.

Extracts  
From the Address of the Central Committee,  
to the People of Kentucky.

The time was when Gen. Harrison would have deemed it degrading to hesitate to speak out like a republican and a freeman; when he would have indignantly repelled the idea of concealing his political creed; when he was an open advocate of a right which none but monarchists will question—the right of Electors to call for the sentiments of a candidate for office. In a note addressed, Sept. 16, 1822, to a paper then published in Cincinnati, (the Inquirer,) Gen. Harrison said:

"In your last paper you recommended to the candidates for the ensuing election, to publish their political creeds, that the electors may have a fair opportunity of choosing those whose sentiments best accord with their own. I HAVE EVER BELIEVED THAT EVERY ELECTOR HAS A RIGHT TO MAKE THIS CALL UPON THOSE WHO OFFER THEIR SERVICES TO THE PEOPLE, AND THAT THE CANDIDATES ARE BOUND TO ANSWER IT."

Since he, (Gen. Harrison,) proclaimed himself the "LEADER" of the Opposition,\* his sentiments have been solicited on the disturbing question of Abolition, by citizens of North Carolina, Virginia, New York, Alabama, Illinois, &c. In two or three instances his Committee of Safety responded that, as the National Federal Convention had set the example, [which has been followed by the State Conventions of that party generally,] the policy is, that the General make no further declaration of principles for the public eye; and when the following letter was presented to him at his residence at North Bend, by two respectable citizens, he said: "NOTHING COULD INDUCE HIM TO ANSWER SUCH INTERROGATORIES, COMING FROM EITHER FRIENDS OR FOES."

LOUISVILLE, April 2, 1840.

DEAR SIR:—The destinies of nations are occasionally influenced by factions at first disregarded—from whose labors, in the way of agitation, nothing is apprehended, until they acquire an amount of power which cannot be controlled. The history of Abolitionism in the colonial possessions of England may be cited as an ample verification of these truths; and, as it is now known that, between the opponents of the institutions of the Southern States of this Union, in Europe and America, a constant interchange of opinions is kept up, producing identity of sympathy and of purpose, the question, which has for some years disturbed the deliberations of Congress, and is beginning to be felt in the State and National elections, is manifestly too important to be overlooked by the friends of our glorious Union.

Concurring in the sentiments avowed on this subject by a majority of the House of Representatives of Kentucky, at the late session, we can say, in perfect sincerity, "that 'turb the amicable relations subsisting between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States of this Union, and would not by our votes aid in elevating to office any citizen allied to that ruthless faction of misguided fanatics, or coinciding in their opinions and plans.'"

The resolution, the body of which is quoted above, passed by a majority of nineteen; and it is proper to remark that the minority acted on two grounds in opposing it—1st, because it was not in their opinion sufficiently comprehensive—2d, because it stood connected with what they deemed irrelevant matter. But parties, however, joined in denouncing the ruthless faction; both agreed that it would be improper to elevate any citizen to office allied to that faction; and, both united in declaring their favorites, having nothing to conceal, would promptly and unequivocally respond to inquiries addressed to them, calculated to elicit a full expression of their respective sentiments on a subject so vitally important.

The undersigned believe, with a portion of this question in the Legislature of Kentucky at its late session, that Statesmen are often controlled by circumstances—at times impelled onward by currents which are scarcely perceived until they are bearing downward on their turbulent bosoms every thing valuable. They moreover believe, sir, that to the ruthless fanaticism of the Abolitionists, nothing can be successfully opposed save that love of the Union which the Father of his Country so feelingly inculcated in his Farewell Address, and which they have reason to hope is still sincerely cherished by the great mass of the two great political parties of the country. However widely we may differ on questions of policy, or as to the mode by which we would construe the constitution, it is to be hoped the two parties at least unite in the opinion that the happiness, the strength, the glory of the nation, depend on the perpetuity of the Union, and that each will ever be prepared, through its most distinguished members, or highest public functionaries, to avow unqualified repugnance to a faction whose labors obviously tend "to disturb the amicable relations subsisting between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States." It was, therefore, matter of congratulation, when the friends of the present President proposed, in the II. of Representatives of Kentucky, interrogatories on the subject of Abolitionism, to him and his distinguished competitor, that only the form, not the substance of the proposition, was deemed objectionable by the Whig majority. They contended that such a call from such a source, might imply a doubt they could not entertain. For this reason, and this alone, Legislative interrogation was opposed; and when reminded that Mr. S. Williams had, in 1836, propounded questions on the same subject to one of the candidates for the Presidency; (probably at the suggestion of the Kentucky delegation then in Congress;) that his inquiries were fully answered, and that such inquiries would be again responded to, without hesitation—the Whig members of the House, with entire unanimity, pledged themselves that their favorite stood as ready to re-

spond now as Mr. Van Buren did in 1836, and would reply as freely and frankly to any inquiries which might be made of him. We have therefore felt authorized to address you this letter; and to convince you that nothing unfair or discourteous is intended, we assure you a duplicate of the same has been transmitted to your distinguished competitor.

We maintain that the object of the cession of the District of Columbia "was to establish a seat of Government of the United States, and the grant in the Constitution, of exclusive legislation, must be understood, and should always be interpreted, as having relation to the object of the cession." It was so understood by Maryland and Virginia, when they made the cession—and, for this reason, we believe, however broad may be the language of the grant, "there are objections to the Abolition of slavery in the District, by Congress, against the wishes of the slaveholding States, as imperative in their nature "and obligation, in regulating the constitutional power would be."

We maintain that no power whatever was granted to the General Government with respect to slavery as it exists in the States, "but that which relates to taxation and representation, and the power to restore fugitive slaves to their lawful owners"—that "all other power in regard to the institution of slavery was retained exclusively by the States, to be exercised by them severally, according to their respective views of their own peculiar interests"—that "the constitution of the United States never would have been formed upon the principle of investing the General Government with authority to abolish the institution of slavery at its pleasure"—and that "it never can be continued for a single day, if the exercise of such a power be assumed or usurped."

We shall therefore be pleased to learn, whether you concur in the view taken of the Abolitionists and the tendency of their action, in the resolution adopted by the majority of the House of Representatives of Kentucky, at its late session?

Whether we have, in your opinion, correctly defined the powers of Congress in relation to the institution of slavery?

And, whether, if chosen President, you will go into office determined to veto any bill that may be passed by Congress for the Abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or in any one or more of the States?

With sentiments of high respect,  
We are your obedient servants,  
LEVI TYLER,  
D. GEIGER,  
D. MERIWETHER,  
THOS. J. REID,  
Democratic Central Committee, of Ky.

The following note from Capt. Wm. Chambers and C. Van Buskirk, Esq. confirms the statement we have made—shows that General Harrison will not come out on Abolition, to oblige friends or foes:

LOUISVILLE, Ky., April 12, 1840.  
GENTLEMEN:—Early on the 10th of April I. Harrison, at North Bend, Ohio. When we entered the house we were informed the General was indisposed; but in something less than an hour he made his appearance.— After the usual salutations were exchanged, one of the undersigned (Wm. Chambers) handed Gen. Harrison a letter addressed to him by the Democratic Central Committee of Kentucky, on the subject of Abolition.— He received it, perused it—turned back and re-examined parts of it; expressed astonishment that his opinions, so repeatedly expressed, were not known to those gentlemen, and said that nothing could induce him to answer such interrogatories, coming either from friends or foes.

In a subsequent conversation, he referred to opinions heretofore expressed by him, but made no further response to the letter of the Central Committee.

Very respectfully, yours, &c.  
WM. CHAMBERS,  
C. VAN BUSKIRK.

To the Democratic Central Committee of Ky.

A duplicate of the letter sent to Gen. Harrison, was, as is stated in the body of it, also transmitted to the President, who, instead of taking shelter behind a committee, or "standing mute," replied as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 21st 1840.

GENTLEMEN:—I have received your letter of the 2nd inst., and cheerfully comply with your request. You have inadvertently fallen into an error in supposing that the questions propounded to me by the Hon. Sherrod Williams, in 1836, embraced the subject of Abolition. My views and opinions in regard to it were, however, communicated to the people of the United States, in reply to a letter received in the same year, from Junius Amis, Esq., and other citizens of N. Carolina, and also through other channels. Perceiving that I cannot do justice to your inquiries in the form which you have given to them, by a general reference to the answers I have heretofore given, I will repeat the substance of them.

First: That the relation of Master and Slave, is a matter which belongs exclusively to each State within its own boundary,—that Congress has no authority to interfere, in any respect whatever, with the emancipation of the slaves, or in the treatment of them in any of the States; and that any attempt to do so by the General Government, would not only be unauthorized, but violate the spirit of the compact, which lies at the basis of the Federal Compact; and which is binding in honor and good faith on all who live under the protection of the Federal Constitution, and participate in its benefits. This doctrine is in strict conformity to the principle embodied in a Resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the United States, in 1790, upon the report of a Committee, consisting almost entirely of northern men.

Secondly: That conceding to Congress the abstract power of interfering with, or abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, under the broad grant of exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over that District, there are, nevertheless, objections to the exercise of this power against the wishes of the slaveholding States, as imperative in their nature and obligation, in regulating the conduct

of public men, as the most palpable want of constitutional power would be."

Thirdly: That I desired the people of the United States then to understand, that, if elected, I would go into the Presidential chair the inflexible and uncompromising opponent of any attempt on the part of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia against the wishes of the slaveholding States; and also with a determination equally inflexible to resist the slightest interference with the subject in the States where it exists.

The Twenty-Fourth Congress, whose constitutional term expired at the moment when mine, as President, commenced, had avowed its belief that it was "extremely important and desirable that the agitation of the subject of slavery should be finally arrested for the purpose of restoring tranquility to the public mind," and made it the basis of extensive and deliberate action in both Houses. In the House of Representatives, a Committee (a majority of whom were from non-slaveholding States) reported pursuant to instructions, two resolutions; the first was—"that Congress possess no constitutional power to interfere in any way with the institution of slavery in any of the States of the confederacy;" the second, "That Congress ought not to interfere in any way with slavery in the District of Columbia;" and a third, which was, in substance, that all papers and motions bearing upon the subject of slavery, should be laid upon the table without any further action thereon. They were accompanied by an elaborate and very able report, setting forth at large the reasons in favor of the opinions reported, and the course recommended by the Committee. The whole subject was finally discussed, considered and decided upon. The first resolution passed by a vote of 182 to 9—the second, of 132 to 45—and the third, of 117 to 68. In the Senate, the matter was considered upon a memorial from the Quarterly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, praying for the Abolition of domestic slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia. The subject was by that memorial presented in terms which offered no violence to the feelings of any class of citizens, and were best calculated to secure to the questions involved, a fair hearing and impartial decision. After several days' discussion, the prayer of the memorialists was rejected, by a vote of thirty-four to six.

An expression of similar opinions on the part of the Federal Executive, with an avowal of a determination to carry them out in his official acts, taken in connection with the known condition of the Congressional representation of the several States in regard to the slave question, would, it was thought, during the continuance of his constitutional term, prevent all agitation of the subject before Congress. The consequent certainty that nothing could for years at least be accomplished in that way, would, it was hoped, present sufficient inducements to all who were governed by conscientious motives, to desist from presenting their memorials, and leave all others without even a plausible pretence for continuance could, it was supposed, believe, that our Southern brethren could be driven into a peaceable emancipation by the mere force of agitation—by appeals to the fears of the master and the passions of the slave—these might indeed, if persisted in, draw after them a servile, and probably a civil war, with a final dissolution of the Union. Attempts to expose our country to such fearful hazards for no other assignable motive than to harass the slaveholding States, or to subvert political purposes, would not, it was confidently believed, be endured, much less countenanced, by the American people. Partaking largely in the general apprehension in regard to the fatal effects of this baleful agitation; having seen enough to satisfy me that no circumstance so directly and inevitably tended to impair the stability and interrupt the harmonious action of our complicated political system, as the existence of a doubt in the public mind concerning the action of the Federal Government upon this disturbing subject—sincerely anxious to promote the commendable design of Congress to restore tranquility to a large and uniformly patriotic portion of the Union; and deeming the subject to be of sufficient importance to justify a departure from the ordinary usage of the Executive, I embraced the first public occasion to refer to the opinions I had expressed before my election, and to declare, formally, that no bill conflicting with those views could ever receive my constitutional sanction. Those opinions, and that determination, have been greatly strengthened by subsequent experience and reflection.

No one can doubt that the tendency of this species of agitation is, as your House of Representatives have very justly observed, to "disturb the amicable relations subsisting between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States of this Union," and it is not the least remarkable feature in its history, that the means employed are precisely those best calculated to defeat the avowed objects of its authors. It is, to my mind, a most dangerous delusion to believe that the people of the slaveholding States are likely to be induced to change a condition of things over which, under the Constitution, they alone have the control, which they had no agency in producing, and for the consequences of which, whatever they may be, they cannot be justly held responsible—which is interwoven with their domestic relations and political institutions; by charging its existence upon them as a crime against God and man, against humanity and religion; or that to awaken the apprehensions of the master by appeals to the passions of the slave, is the way to improve the condition of the latter. All candid and temperate observers must, on the contrary, admit that such are not the means by which salutary ends are produced; that furious denunciations and unmitigated reproaches as little accord with Christian charity as with brotherly love, and are much more likely to produce stern resistance than quiet acquiescence. These truths are demonstrated in the results of the labors of the Abolitionists in the United States, which have hitherto been productive of nothing but evil, new restraints upon the colored race, vexation to the owner, and distraction to the councils of the nation. In reference, then, to such practices as those to which you

have called my attention, I can, as a public man, find the path of duty only in one direction; that of undisguised opposition,  
I am, gentlemen,  
Very respectfully,  
Your obt' servant,  
M. VAN BUREN.

Very respectfully,  
Your obt' servant,  
M. VAN BUREN.



## NORTH-CAROLINIAN.

FAYETTEVILLE:  
Saturday Morning, June 6, 1840.

REPUBLICAN NOMINATION.  
FOR PRESIDENT.

Martin Van Buren.  
FOR GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA.  
Romulus M. Saunders.

The coming together of the old Cumberland line of unchangeable Democrats, was a terror to the whiggery last Tuesday, at the Court House. It is heart cheering to see the substantial, farming strength and wealth of the country people, hereabouts, voluntarily assemble to consult together for their country's good, and cheer on the President of their choice, against the hot opposition that assails him. We have but to look such patriots in the face, to be assured of their untried, all conquering perseverance in the good cause.

The meeting nominated Walter F. Leak, esq. for Elector, and appointed thirty-two delegates to the Convention to be held in Raleigh on the 9th of July next to nominate a candidate for the Vice Presidency.

Humburg.  
A meeting of the Whiggery was held at the Court House on Wednesday last, called together by large printed hand bills in falling capitals, for the sole purpose of nominating candidates for the Legislature. "The mountain labored," and not even "a mouse came forth."

They assembled—and broke up—and—made no nomination! How is all this? Have they no Harrison available?

Will the Chronicle and Advertiser tell us, who are their whig candidates for the Legislature in New Hanover county?

A Test.  
In the month of January 1800, a test vote was taken in Congress upon the reduction of the standing Army. John Adams was then President. And Thomas Jefferson was a candidate against him.

All the friends of Jefferson, voted to reduce the Army. Nathaniel Macon and David Stone (of this State) voted against the reduction. Archibald Henderson (of this State) voted against the reduction. The last three were federalists and Adams men. The first three were democrats and Jefferson men. John Randolph and Albert Gallatin, (Democrats) voted for, and Bayard, and Dana, and Harper, and Marshall, and Lee, and Otis, (Federalists) voted against it.

The election for President was to take place in November of the same year (1800.) The first great battle between Federalism and Democracy, was then to be fought by the people at the polls.

The above votes show, that this reduction of the Army was a test question. Let us see then, on which side of this great question, William Henry Harrison took his stand.

As Harrison was a member from the Territory of Indiana, he was not entitled to vote. But, he was not dumb then, as he is now—and he made a speech against the reduction of the standing Army. Was this speech, on this test question, a Federal speech, or a Democratic speech? Was this speech "in favor of the alien and seditious law administration of John Adams," or was it in favor of the republican, Jefferson party? Can any man doubt its anti-republican character?

But as further proof of Harrison's being a federalist of "the reign of terror" stamp it will be observed that this Federal speech was made on the 9th of January 1800.

Now take notice, on the 12th of May 1800 John Adams the Federal President, appointed this same Harrison, Governor of Indiana. Would he have made this appointment, if Harrison had been against him in politics? Would he have trusted Harrison, if he had been a Jefferson man? No body will pretend that he would.

If General Harrison was a friend of Jefferson at that day, would he have accepted office under Adams?

Certainly Randolph who voted on the Jefferson side, must have known what position Harrison occupied; and what did he testify about it in Congress many years afterwards? He said, Harrison was "an open frank supporter of the alien and seditious law Administration of John Adams."

We will publish Harrison's speech in favor of "a Standing Army" in time of peace, next week, to let our readers see, what miserable treachery and vile deceit, those friends of Harrison practice who tell the people about Mr. Poinsett's plan to muster the militia and train them for the defence of the country.

The hot zeal of the log cabin, hard cider party for Harrison, is nothing, but the bursting out of the old British Federal fire of 1800, upon which, Jefferson put an extinguisher in November of that year. Martin Van Buren will put out the last spark of the old John Adams, federal, Harrison chunk, next November.

Those who "fell with the first Adams" (and by fraud) "rose with the second," will never by a second, and meaner fraud upon the people, "rise" to power with Harrison.

Democrats might as well vote for the elder Adams if he were now alive, and a candidate, as to vote for his bosom friend, and brother federalist Harrison.

Now, in all fairness, is this Harrison the man, that the old Republican party of the South, the true state-rights men of the slave holding states, are to support to carry out their principles?

Daniel Webster, whom the federal party supported with Harrison for the Presidency, is far preferable to Harrison, because he is honest enough, not to deny his federalism, while Harrison, seeks to keep his hid from the "public eye."

Another "Test."  
Does any body know, how Harrison voted on the Presidential question, in the year 1800?—Did he vote for Adams, or for Jefferson?

If he did not vote at all, being Governor of a Territory, will some friend of his, (the Observer, for instance,) write on to "Free E. Deberry" to write to J. C. Wright, to ask General Harrison's committee, to ask General Harrison, how he would have voted, on that great question.

"Hope I dont intrude"—"just pop't in!" will you write on gentlemen, or is it too much trouble? Will such questions be impertinent? Will not an answer to them, do "for the public eye?"

The Federal office hunters in New York, the true "spoils" party, have removed SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE Democrats from office, in a little over ONE YEAR, and filled their places with their own greedy sycophants.

This is not all; they have actually made (in the Legislature) THREE HUNDRED new offices in that State, to pay off that many more of their party hirelings. Making in all, ONE THOUSAND AND SIXTY ONE hungry whig (!) mouths filled with "Treasury pap."

At this rate, is it any wonder, that the Whigs everywhere, cry out "log cabin" and "hard cider!" They are looking for THEIR REWARD—verily they will have "their reward." The people will spurn their craving, whining, prayers for power and pelf.

No wonder they cry out—a change! A change! They only want a change that they may make money by it, as they have in New York.

They say to the Democrats, pray good people, turn out the men you have put in power, and put us in. Times are so hard, and we need the money so much! Do they think the Jackson Van Buren Democrats are such fools, as to grant their request? August and November will show.

From what Federalism was when Jackson crushed it at the Battle of New Orleans, Judge what it must be now.

Extract from the speech of Mr. Clifford of Maine, delivered in Congress on the 24th of April last.

After the labored defence of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I hope I may be excused for detaining the committee for a few minutes, while I exhibit some of the proofs which have induced the opinion which seems to think it so uncharitable. It is not necessary for me to remark that I have no other knowledge upon the subject, except what is available to all who will take the trouble to examine it. In the first place, I will refer to the mission of John Henry; Mr. Ryland, Secretary to Sir James Craig, late Governor General of the British Province in North America, to Mr. Henry.

(Most secret and confidential.)  
"QUEBEC, Jan. 26, 1809.

"MY DEAR SIR: The extraordinary state of things at this time in the Eastern States has suggested to the Governor in Chief the idea of employing you on a secret and confidential mission to meet the important end in view, without exposing an absolute obstacle in the way of your professional pursuits. The information and political observations heretofore received from you, were transmitted by his Excellency to the Secretary of State, who has expressed his particular approbation of them, &c.

From the instructions of J. H. Craig to Mr. Henry. ("Most secret and confidential.")  
"QUEBEC, 6th February, 1809.

"The principal object that I recommend to your attention is the endeavor to obtain the most accurate information of the true state of affairs in that part of the Union which, from its wealth, the number of its inhabitants, and the known intelligence of several of its leading men, must naturally possess a very considerable influence over, and will indeed probably lead the other Eastern States of America in the party they may take at this important crisis. It is thought necessary to put you on your guard against the sanguineness of an aspiring party. The Federalists, as I understand, have at all times discovered a leaning to this disposition, and their being under its particular influence at this moment, is the more to be expected from their having no ill founded grounds for their hopes of being nearer the attainment of their object, than they have been for some years past. It has been supposed that if the Federalists of the Eastern States should be successful in obtaining that decided influence which may enable them to direct public opinion, it is not improbable that they would submit to the continuance of the difficulties and distress to which they are now subject, they will exert that influence to bring about a separation from the general Union. The earliest information on this subject may be of great consequence to our Government, as it may also be that it should be informed how far, in such an event, they would look to England for assistance, or be disposed to enter into a connection with us."

Credential from Sir James Craig to Mr. Henry.  
"The bearer, Mr. John Henry, is employed by me, and full confidence may be placed in him for any communication which any person may wish to make to me in the business committed to him. In faith of which, I have given him this under my hand and seal at Quebec, the 6th day of February, 1809."  
"J. H. CRAIG."

In pursuance of this commission, Mr. Henry proceeded to the Eastern States, in prosecution of the design, which very clearly appears from the cautious and stealthy language of his letter of instructions. The following are extracts from his correspondence, which evinces, beyond controversy, the brilliant hopes he entertained of success, and the accuracy of his information as to the temper and disposition of parties in this country:

"I learn that the Governor of this State (Vermont) is now visiting the towns in the northern sections of it, and makes no secret of his determination, as commander-in-chief of the militia, to refuse obedience to any command from the General Government, which can tend to interrupt the good understanding that prevails between the citizens of Vermont and his Majesty's subjects in Canada."

Again, he says:  
"Notwithstanding, while there is every reason to hope that the Northern States, in their distinct capacity, will unite, and resist by force a war with Great Britain, great pains are taken by men of talents and intelligence to confirm the fears of the common people as to the concurrence of the Southern Democrats in the projects of France, and every thing tends to encourage the belief that the dissolution of the Confederacy will be accelerated by that spirit which now actuates both parties."

In another letter, he observes:  
"The Federal party declares, that, in the event of a war, the State of Vermont will treat separately for itself with Great Britain, and support to the utmost of the stipulations into which it may enter, without any regard to the policy of the General Government."

"This is like the Observer's objection to Poinsett's militia system. The federal editor "follows in the footsteps" of his old federal brother the Governor of Vermont.

Under date of March 5, 1809, he says:  
"I have sufficient means of information to enable me to judge of the proper period for offering the co-operation of Great Britain, and opening a correspondence between the Governor-General of British America and those individuals who, from the part they take in the opposition to the National Government, or the influence they may possess in any new order of things that may grow out of the present difference, should be qualified to act in behalf of the Northern States."

Boston, March 7, he again writes:  
"I have already given a decided opinion that a declaration of war is not to be expected; but contrary to all reasonable calculations, should the Congress possess spirit and independence enough to place their popularity in jeopardy by so strange a measure, the Legislature of Massachusetts will declare itself permanent until a new election of members—in a Congress, to be composed of delegates from the Federal States, and fix a separate Government for their common defence and common interest. This Congress would probably begin by abrogating the offensive laws, and adopting a plan of Government for the maintenance of the power and authority assumed. They would, by such an act, be in a condition to make or receive proposals from Great Britain."

This letter discloses a very remarkable fact, which cannot be passed over without notice.—Five years before the time of the Hartford Convention, this British agent informs his superior of the outline of the plan which was subsequently attempted, and partly carried into success, and which might have succeeded at the adjourned meeting which was to have been held the following summer, but for the triumph of our arms at New Orleans, and the news of the treaty of peace that immediately succeeded.—He states not only some of the important details of the convention, as it actually took place, five years after, but the motives that would induce it, and the general objects that were to be accomplished, one of which was a separate Government for their common defence and common interest.

You have above, a bird's eye glance at the Federal plot to destroy the Union, only twenty-six years ago. You see the British agent, sent among the Federalists to help forward their accursed treason. You see what Henry writes about the state of the plot. You remember the hatred you formerly felt for this Hartford Convention—refresh your memories a little about this Federal treason. Think of it, and of the party that planned it, in conjunction with the British spy, Henry. Think of these things, and then remember, that Daniel Webster, one of the most ultra federalists of the Hartford Convention family, was voted for in 1836, with Harrison and White, for President of this Union, by the same party that now call themselves whigs!

Harrison too, federalist as we have proved him to be, is now their candidate.

Who are the Federalists?

The gallant Col. Croghan, who defended Fort Stephenson, with 160 men against the British with four or five times his numbers, when General Harrison had ordered him to abandon and burn the fort, has given no definite answer to the whigs of Wheeling, who asked him to explain Harrison's conduct about that battle, and the petition. The petition, and the Sandusky affair, are like Harrison's political principles. You may ask many a question about them, but you will get not an answer—for fear of the "public eye."

In Croghan's reply to the Wheeling whigs, as to the red flannel petition, he refers the committee to the women of Chillicothe, (who of course, can tell, whether they presented General Harrison, with the red tunic in question)—There is not the slightest indecency intended. Will you answer ladies, if the whigs ask you? Do, gentlemen, make the enquiry.

On Victoria's crimson satin wedding garters, these words were wrought in gold, "England expects every man to do his duty." No doubt the dames of Chillicothe had such a motto in their heads when they gave our hero the red unmentionable. This motto would do as well at the bottom of the petition, as on the garters.

A Sign!  
Governor Dudley, the whig candidate in the year 1836, had a majority in Fayetteville District, of ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND NINETY-EIGHT votes over Mr. Spaight, the Democratic candidate.

Edmund Deberry (the whig member in Congress) had a majority in this District of only EIGHT HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIX last August. 50 A clear gain of EIGHT HUNDRED AND TWO for the Democracy!

Can Morehead get as many votes in this District, as Deberry did, who lives here. Certainly he cannot.

Add this 802 in this District, to the 1,500 in the Salisbury District, which our table last week showed clearly, we should gain in that District, and it makes General Saunders' gain on Dudley's vote TWO THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND TWO.

If Mr. Morehead shall get Dudley's vote in every other District in the State, except these two, the above changes in favor of Saunders, will leave him, only ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE votes behind Morehead—Dudley's majority being only 4729 in 1836.

Does any body doubt that General Saunders will sweep off these 195 votes, in Wilmington District alone? A gain of 63 for Saunders, will be enough.

Was not Dudley more popular in the Wilmington District, where he lived, than Mr. Morehead can be.

Who doubts General Saunders' election as Governor, in August next? No man, who will look at the votes for Congress last August, and the votes for Governor in 1836.

Let's see you "eipher on to this sum a spell," friend Hale.

We will give you some further figuring to do, in the same line, from time to time as we find it convenient.

Another "Raynor's Resolutions."  
The Hon. Kenneth Raynor (whig) adopted the resolution of caining or stabbing, the Hon. William Montgomery, (Dem.) from Orange.—He way-laid Doctor Montgomery, and struck him with a sword cane; he the Doctor, being unarmed, except with a small stick; which broke

\*See his letter in answer to an invitation to visit this city, published in the Louisville Gazette.