

The North Carolinian.

Secretary of State

"CHARACTER IS AS IMPORTANT TO STATES AS IT IS TO INDIVIDUALS; AND THE GLORY OF THE STATE IS THE COMMON PROPERTY OF ITS CITIZENS."

H. L. HOLMES, Editor and Proprietor.

FAYETTEVILLE, SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 1840.

VOL. 2.—NO. 15.—[Whole Number 68.]

TERMS.

\$2 50 per annum, if paid in advance; \$3 if paid at the end of six months; or \$3 50 at the expiration of the year. Advertisements inserted at the rate of sixty cents per square, for the first, and thirty cents for each subsequent insertion. No paper discontinued until arrearages are paid, except at the option of the Editor. No subscription received for less than twelve months. Court advertisements and Sheriff's sales, will be charged 25 per cent. higher than the usual rates. All advertisements sent for publication should have the number of insertions intended marked upon them, otherwise they will be inserted until forbid, and charged accordingly. Letters on business connected with this establishment, must be addressed—H. L. HOLMES, Editor of the North-Carolinian, and in all cases post-paid.

Political.

From the North Carolina Standard.
Raleigh, 27 May, 1840.

To the People of N. Carolina.

In November last I was called out to address a Democratic meeting in Wake County, and form some cause the speech I made has been much spoken against in different sections of the State. My neighbors and friends have urgently demanded its publication. It is contrary to my habit to publish political speeches. I have been some years engaged in politics, and this is the only time I ever yielded to such a request, and it is now done reluctantly.

My apology to the public for this intrusion, will be found in the solicitation of my friends, and also in what seems to me to have been an extraordinary misinterpretation of my remarks. I am not willing to appear affected by resisting the first any longer. I am not willing that a single member of the Whig party of North Carolina should believe that I ever charged him with being an Abolitionist, without shewing him what I did say.—If any such inference can be made from the speech, I can sincerely disavow it. It is their PARTY whose inconsistency I have attempted to expose, and although I believe that they are deceiving themselves and the South on an important matter, still I have no interest or feeling that could prompt me to say that they are doing this upon any worse impulses than the very madness of party spirit. That I do think, and I doubt not many of their own party must soon open their eyes to it. As the course of the Whig party in North Carolina appears to me alike inconsistent and injurious to my country, I owe no apology for resisting it.

The speech that follows is that which I made—omitting only those parts of it which were local, and others that were personal to myself. In these, the public at large cannot feel interested.

Respectfully,
WILL. H. HAYWOOD, Jr.

MR. HAYWOOD'S SPEECH.

At a Democratic meeting in Wake county, held during the 3rd week in November, 1839, Wm. H. HAYWOOD, Jr., was present, and after the Committee to prepare resolutions for the meeting had retired, and before their report, Mr. HAYWOOD was invited to address the people who were present, and he did so, as follows:—

FELLOW-CITIZENS:

The party opposed to us have borrowed a name to which they have no exclusive right, and even their title to share it has been questioned by many. They call theirs "the WHIG party." I confess that so far as my feelings are concerned, I am willing to let my friends of the Opposition name themselves after their own taste. The conduct of their party is so bad that I don't wonder at this solicitude on their part to catch up a good name. God knows they need a good name had enough. But the name of Whig shall not screen this party from any investigation of their misdeeds. I propose to lay before you some among the multiplied proofs of inconsistency in this Whig party. Their latter efforts to take absolute control of this State, and to drive us into a retreat from the long cherished principles of North Carolina, give me this right. Republicans are never defeated when the people are warned! Fellow-citizens, the conduct of the Whig leaders has been so exceedingly inconsistent that I have thought it might seem incredible to many of you, and therefore I have deemed it safer to bring with me the recorded evidence of their falsified professions. To these records I will refer, and to nothing else—except it may be to a few past incidents, which (though not recorded) every voter in the State recollects, and no decent man will venture to contradict under the sanction of his name. You shall be the judges whether they do not falsely charge us with their own practices.

Nothing is more common than for them to clamor against Republicans in our State and charge us with faults which a little examination into the facts will remove from those they accuse, and fix upon our Whig accusers. How unmanly! How inconsistent!

They say, for instance—and they have been repeating it for years—that it is the practice of our party to seize upon all the public offices and give them to partisans; and that acting upon a selfish maxim, "to the victors belong the spoils," we have habitually proscribed political opponents.

You read these charges upon us in their party press—in their party proceedings at caucuses—at conventions, and at all other sorts of Whig associations. I see some of our Whig friends are present, and I hope they will stay and hear me out. They may answer whether this charge has not been rung in the ears of the people of North Carolina for more than five years.

Now then, suppose I shew that the Republican party of North Carolina have not seized upon the public offices—that they have not proscribed the Whigs—that in fact the Whigs are the office-holders. Then tell me what epithet will properly characterize these party accusations by modern Whigs? I will leave you to choose the language for condemning such inconsistency, mine shall be the task to prove its existence. Here are the Journals of your Legislature, beginning with 1834 (the year I was chosen to represent you) and coming down to the present time. There can be no mistake about the facts. Read! Hear! Decide for yourselves!

PROSCRIPTION!

The Republican party had a clear majority in 1834. In the Assembly of that year the Whigs were in a majority. This will not be denied, for it was the year in which we re-elected Mr. BROWN to the Senate and instructed Mr. MANGUM. Yet these Journals tell us that Gov. SWAIN (a Whig) was not proscribed. He was re-elected.

Mr. HILL (a Whig) Secretary of State was not proscribed.

The office of Treasurer was vacated by Mr. MHOON's resignation, and the Republican majority did not seize upon it as spoils. On the contrary, Gen. PATTERSON (a Whig) was elected over a good Republican competitor!

The office of Comptroller was also vacant by the death of Mr. GRANT, and this same republican majority did not seize upon it as "spoils." On the contrary, Mr. STEDMAN (a Whig) was elected over a sound republican opponent!

As in these the chief offices, so also was it in the humbler offices. The republican majority proscribed nobody, but gave nearly all the offices to their political opponents.

[Mr. H. here alluded to some of the electioneering tricks of the Whig party, in the Wake election of 1835, when an effort was made to deprive him of the confidence of the Democrats because he had not been proscribing in his course towards Whig State officers.]

Now turn to the Journals of 1835! Again the Republicans had a majority, and although they had been irritated by the violence of the Whig party and their unjust denunciations about "proscription," "spoils," "partizanship," &c., they did not proscribe these Whig officers. The Whig Secretary of State was re-elected! The Whig Treasurer was re-elected! The Whig Comptroller was re-elected! The humbler officers of that year exhibit no instance of proscription! Not one! And much the larger share of them was given to Whig aspirants. True, Gov. SWAIN being no longer eligible to his office; RICH'D. DONNS SPAIGHT was chosen Governor in his stead, and I need not remind you what party proscribed him, nor is it necessary I should shew that he was ousted for a difference in political opinion, and for that alone!

Now look at the Journals of 1836.—This was our first Assembly under the Amended Constitution. These Journals tell us how every member voted, and as the Whigs had a majority in the Senate and the Republicans a majority in the Commons, we shall be able to compare their acts together. Here it is! Compare the one with the other, and then judge between them.

This Whig Senate proscribed their Speaker (Mr. MOSELEY) because he was a Republican, and for that cause alone! They turned out an able and experienced officer, against whom they had no charge except his politics, for he was personally a favorite of both sides. They proscribed an upright and impartial Speaker merely for the sake of giving his place ("spoils") to a Whig!

Look back to 1834, and compare this Whig Senate of 1836 with the Republican Commons of 1834. The latter re-elected Mr. ALEXANDER (a Whig) without a contest! Nay more! Although the Republican Commons of 1836 were thus irritated afresh by this Whig proscription of the Senate and by an unsuccessful attempt of this Whig party in the Commons to proscribe the old Speaker there also, still the Republican party in the Commons did not proscribe any of their Whig officers.

But it may be said that the Republican party had a majority in joint vote, and they proscribed the Whig officers of State. No!

What, not turn any of them out after this intolerance of the Whig party towards the republicans? No! not one of them! On the contrary the old officers were re-elected, and nearly all the vacant places were filled with Whig office-holders!—Here are the recorded facts. Listen!

The Whig Secretary of State was re-elected! The office of Comptroller was vacated by the resignation of Mr. STEDMAN, and Mr. COLLINS (another Whig) was put in his place! Four Judges of the Superior Court were elected—All Whigs! Three Solicitors were elected, and two of them Whigs!

I do not overlook the fact that Gen. PATTERSON resigned his office of Treasurer in 1836, and that Mr. COURTS, a Republican, was chosen in his place. It is also true, that Mr. COURTS got a large number of Whig votes. Candor however, compels me to withhold from that party any credit for this instance of apparent liberality. Mr. COURTS' republican friends, were unwilling to see him quit his post in the Legislature, as it might destroy our republican majority in the Commons, and therefore, many of them preferred to nominate some other person.

Nobody distrusted him, all were willing to confide in him, and he was worthy of that confidence. But I leave it with you to decide how far the whigs who supported him

were influenced or not by the very same reasons which kept off his republican associates. Take it however, that they were, in this instance, disinterested and free of party-spirit, and yet, it is no more than a SOLITARY EXAMPLE! Let those who are accustomed to rely upon these general denunciations of our Whig opponents, again look at these Journals of 1836!

They being with Whig proscription.—They continue, and end with it! They begin with Republican liberality to opponents. They continue, and end with the same!

If there be one incredulous man amongst you after hearing the language of facts like these, I ask him to turn to the Journals of 1838. Here the Whig party had a majority in both houses of the Assembly, and recollecting, if you please, how they have professed to condemn the "spoils of office," come and see their consistency. These Journals will answer whether they did not take "the Lion's share." Hear!!

In the Legislative Department.

Both the Speakers—Whigs!
All the Clerks but two are Whigs!
5 Whigs and 2 Democrats. Even an Engraving Clerk is proscribed and not allowed to labor for his "Whig Masters," because forsooth, he was a Democrat! Major Thomas, lately a citizen of Wake, and a good Clerk too, was the victim of this party malice!

In the Executive Department.

The Governor a Whig, and his Secretary "Ditto."

The Secretary of State, a Whig.
The Comptroller of State, Ditto.
Seven Councillors of State, All Whigs.
The Treasurer of State was the only Republican amongst them, and since that period he has resigned, and his place is now filled by another Whig!

So it seems that the office-holders in this Department, are whigs—All! Democrats—none!!

In the Judicial Department.

There are 7 Superior Court Judges—5 Whigs, and only 2 Democrats.

There are 6 Solicitors—5 Whigs! 1 Democrat!

There is an Attorney General, and he is a Democrat.

Who then are "the Office holders?"—Who "seize the spoils?" Who abuse office and hold it themselves? The people who are honest, want no answer to such questions, except that which these RECORDED FACTS furnish.

Rayner's Resolutions.

But the inconsistency (not to say more) of this party does not stop here. Indeed it is difficult to look back upon any past political event in our State, since this modern Whig party cast off other names and assumed their present one, without seeing some evidence of their inconsistency.

Who does not recollect, how this Whig party every where in our State, stirred up hostility to the Assembly of 1834, (the republican majority) for instructing Mr. Mangum, our Senator in Congress? It was called persecution and proscription—a party attempt to put down a gentleman of distinction, and ask him to degrade himself. Such was the substance of these were not the words of their accusations against the Legislature of 1834. Such is their reproof against us still. I wish that my strength and your patience could allow me to review that matter of the "Instructions to Mr. Mangum." It has been greatly misunderstood if not misrepresented. I will do it, should it fit opportunity offer. But at present—Let it be admitted, that the Whig party are all sincere in their condemnation of the Mangum Instructions.—Let it be admitted, that they (the whigs) are right in this, and that the whole was indeed proscribing and wrong altogether, and then what will they make out of their own "Rayner Resolutions?" Will any candid man among them, tell us what the "Rayner Resolutions" deserve to be called, if the Instructions to Mr. Mangum were any persecution and proscription of the man? If it "was illiberal, persecuting and proscribing to instruct Mr. Mangum to strike out a censure which he had gone out of his way and out of the Constitution, to affix to Jackson, when all the world knows, that Mr. Mangum was elected to the Senate as a JACKSON MAN. What epithet should honest politicians apply to the "Rayner Resolutions," which were intended to force Mr. Brown and Mr. Strange (our two Senators) into direct treachery against their own party—against their own opinions—and against the people of the State, who, (right or wrong) had thrice approved of the course which the "Rayner Resolutions" denounce and ask our Senators to reverse!

I see how men may differ about the Mangum Instructions, and I understand how some men honestly approve and others have honestly condemned them. I do not mean to complain, of this. But, how any man of ordinary intelligence can condemn the Mangum Instructions in such terms as I have alluded to, and then turn round and advocate the "Rayner Resolutions," does indeed excite my special wonder. When a whole party do it, they must expect that public intelligence will put this and that together and judge accordingly. Is there no reason to apprehend that such inconsistency would be practised only for the sake of vacating these high places, so as to make room for others to fill them? For you see that our review of the last five years has already shown us, how, with our whig-assembly men, in any scramble for office, "Every whig does his duty."

The Whig Convention.

But, I must hasten, to a review of the political doings of a later assemblage of whigs! I mean the Whig Convention, which met and adjourned in our City last week.—It may or may not, be a Caucus, but no matter about that, if it is only conceded to me, (as must be, that this was "The Whig party of North Carolina, by their Representatives met together." This highly respectable body of politicians have just promulgated their conclusions, and although the grounds of them are yet unpublished, it is at once our right and our duty to look into their resolutions. The "whereas," will no doubt be made known in good time. The "Resolutions," are before the world, and they exhibit a degree of inconsistency in their leaders which no ingenuity can defend and no sophistry excuse. I will compare some of their past professions with their present proceedings, and I doubt, if the people of their own ranks can ever sanction the latter.—They cannot do it, without condemning the past.

This Whig Convention then, have nominated Henry Clay for President! John M. Morehead for Governor! And though there is a little obscurity about it, the party may be regarded as pledged for N. P. Tallmadge for Vice President!!!

Henry Clay for President! Who, I ask have heretofore charged Mr. Clay with bribery and corruption? Have you forgotten the accusation or the accusers? And do the accusers of Mr. Clay, who are now become leaders of the Whig party, intend to confess that they slandered Mr. Clay and persevered in it for years, and still count upon being credited by you for their more recent imputations against our President and his supporters? If they calumniated Mr. Clay then, how are we to know—how can the people know, that they are not now also libelling Mr. Van Buren? What a spectacle is here! Politicians! North Carolinians! who stand amongst the most prominent partisans of the Whig ranks, who take lead at their meetings, who manage at their Caucuses, and who aspire to the chief places in the gift of their party, doing homage to a statesman whom they have so lately denounced as a Traitor to the people—another Judas who sold his vote for the spoils of office! Where is any apology for this change of position?

Further yet! When Henry Clay was thus assailed (whether the accusation was true or false, it does not now concern me to inquire) when his present admirers, but so lately his bitter accusers, called upon the people of North Carolina to come to the polls and register their detestation of Mr. Clay and his bargain with Mr. J. Q. Adams, and to shew their love and gratitude to Gen. Jackson, who was chosen as their agent and instrument to record this condemnation of Mr. Clay? I have here the Central address and the names of the Jackson Electors of 1828! I find amongst the Electors' names, that of Mr. John M. Morehead of Guilford.—He was elected. He and his associates, met in this City, and recorded the vote of North Carolina against Mr. Clay and this bargain. And now, what is it we see? The Whig party of the State have presented us a Ticket with Henry Clay for President and this same Mr. Morehead for Governor! Even so, these party leaders have couched on the Whig ticket of 1840, the names of Henry Clay and John M. Morehead! This is extraordinary enough.

I suppose they will ask the people to reverse their former decision, and to falsify this recorded judgment, and for what? How can they unsay their former decision against Mr. Clay without substituting another against his accusers? It is impossible. What an alternative! Does any one present doubt the fact that many of the most prominent leaders of our modern Whig party were once the open accusers of Mr. Clay? If such there be—let him look back at the proceedings of Jackson meetings in 1827 and 1828—let him recur to his own memory (for it is not a great while ago) and honestly ask who were they then?—Who are they now? A determination to be unexceptionably "courteous to all men" and to avoid bringing into a public debate the names and opinions of private individuals deters me from the easy task of designating many of them. However questionable may be my right to do this, I presume nobody denies the propriety of a recurrence to the names of candidates for office! to the list of public Committees and to published addresses! in proof of any historical events and the extraordinary mutations of party. Look back then and see who were the Central Committee of the Jackson party, in 1827? Who were the Wake Committee of that period? Do they still adhere to the cause of the people, or do they now belong some of them to the list of Whig office-holders, and some to the list of Clay-whig-party-leaders? You can judge for yourselves, and I dare my Whig friends who are present to examine the facts, and see for themselves.

I hold in my hand, fellow-citizens, a publication at the election of President in 1828, which the Central Committee addressed to the people to recommend the election of the Jackson Electors, and amongst these Electors was Mr. JOHN M. MOREHEAD! Hear it!—In speaking of Mr. Adams' election in 1824, it says:

"Mr. Clay, of Kentucky, was one of the four candidates for President, but having the lowest number of electoral votes was excluded from the House. The State from which he came had instructed her members in the event which happened to support General Jackson, but under the influence of Mr. Clay, a man of intrigue [mark that!] and

of eloquence, and of unbounded ambition, [mark that!] and of talents above mediocrity, these members with those of other Western States voted for Mr. Adams, and his election was the result.

"Immediately after his elevation, Mr. Adams appointed Mr. Clay Secretary of State—in power and influence the second station in our Government, and generally thought 'to be an introduction to the first. Between these two gentlemen there had been previously neither confidence nor affection, and Mr. Clay had publicly expressed, in language not to be misunderstood, a disbelief of Mr. Adams' political integrity and patriotism! [Mark that, my countrymen!]

"How then are we to account for Mr. Clay's support of Mr. Adams, in opposition to the declared wishes of Kentucky? &c. &c."

"Take these facts (says this address) and answer for yourselves, whether it be harsh or uncharitable to conclude that he voted for Mr. Adams in the expectation of being Secretary of State, and that this expectation decided his vote. Let the friends of Mr. Clay protest against this conclusion with whatever earnestness they may press into the service, and the common sense of mankind will still find in his conduct the ground of serious suspicion."

Was there ever such another instance of reconciled antipathies, as that which these Whig partisans now exhibit to Mr. Clay, except it may be the extraordinary case of Messrs. Clay and Adams, to which this address makes a very suspicious allusion. Yes!—We have here the proceedings of a party—the Whig party!—by which they have nominated Mr. Clay for President, and associated on his ticket, as their candidate for Governor, an Elector of 1828 who recorded the popular sentence against Mr. Clay upon a charge of bribery in his politics (a charge which was over and again repeated by a number of the modern Whig leaders)—an Elector who also voted for Mr. Van Buren for Vice President in 1832, unless I am greatly deceived! It makes no difference to this point whether Mr. Morehead accepts or rejects his nomination. His choice about that will be his own. The FACT that this Whig party, have nominated him upon the Clay ticket involves them in inconsistency, and forces upon them a most extraordinary dilemma! It will be time enough to consider his position after he assumes it.

And further yet! Really it would seem that this Whig Convention were resolved upon trying how much the supposed credulity or ignorance of the people would endure.—The picture of their party inconsistency required but a little finishing off, and the necessary touches are here given to it! They have also nominated an "expurger" for Vice President! The "Rayner Resolutions" you recollect (in 1838) denounced Mr. Tallmadge, with other expurgers, as being basely servile to party and guilty of a plain violation of the Constitution of the United States; and this same party in November, 1839, put his name on their ticket for Vice President. Those resolutions are still before the people. The people have not yet been heard upon them and before they are heard we see the very party that passed them acting in the teeth of their own professions.

To be faithful to the party and the pledges that elected him to the Senate, was base servility.—(Vide "Rayner Resolutions.") But to desert the side where no spoils were allotted to him, and do service to his new allies, is worthy of Whig party honors, and entitles him at once to their confidence and to the office of Vice President!—(Vide this nomination.)

Fellow-citizens of Wake County, I call on you to behold this combination of Whig candidates! Mr. Morehead! Mr. Tallmadge! This is the Clay ticket! the Whig ticket! THE ACCUSED for President and his ACCUSERS for Vice President and for Governor! The censurer of Jackson for President and the expurger of that accusation for Vice President! The traducer of Jackson for President and his old supporters for Vice President and Governor!

Now there is no man who entertains less malice about politics than I do—and yet when I read the assaults of my Whig friends upon the Republican party, and hear their chosen epithet of "Spoilsmen" applied to us, and then look at this picture and recollect how the Whig party lured off Judge White from his old friends in 1836—I cannot for my life repress the thought, that with the modern Whig party, it is a FACT as well as a MAXIM, "Not to the VICTORS but to the TRAITORS belong the spoils." I use that word however in nothing but a political sense.

The Caucus.

The proof of Whig inconsistency does not stop here. Now I do not know the fact because I was not present to witness it, but I give it publicly as my opinion and belief, grounded upon information which was satisfactory at the time, and no one of the parties so far as I know, has ever ventured to contradict the fact, that this Whig party nomination for Governor, was originally made by a CAUCUS!

I think this will not be denied upon any respectable individual authority. I mean a Legislative Caucus! A Caucus of members of the Assembly, from whom, the people though they had taken away the right to elect the Governor, and resumed it themselves. And what follows? The Whig party who have been denouncing a Caucus for more than 10 years, and affected to be indignant at the dictation of a Caucus, when it was convenient to abuse the Baltimore Convention,

have secretly practised what they openly denounced!

More! In a private-party-Caucus held at Raleigh, by the Whig members of 1838, they have nominated a candidate for Governor of our State, and then set about calling meetings of the people, to send Delegates to a Whig Convention to do what? Why just what the caucus had planned a year beforehand! Really such devices imply a distrust in public intelligence which it was hardly possible to believe the Whig party could feel.

I do not complain of the Whigs for holding as many Conventions and Caucuses, as they see fit. Of this, I do not find any fault at all. The ground of my accusation is this: They denounce it in others and then practise it themselves. They denounced open caucuses and then hold secret ones themselves. They are inconsistent in all this, and I leave it with the people, if it does not show their party to be unworthy of popular confidence.

In connexion with this subject, recollect how they clamored against the "Baltimore Convention." They called it a Caucus—a Caucus to dictate to the people, and this was the pretext with many for deserting the Jackson standard in 1832! You know that these are Facts. And in the face of them, you have seen this same Whig Convention appoint Delegates to a "Harrisburg Convention," and pledge their party beforehand to vote for whomsoever that Convention shall nominate—Civilian or Chieftain—Abolitionist or not—one of us or not one of us, they are to go for this Caucus nomination. This is their adherence to principles! This is the end of all their affected horrors at Caucus dictation!

Mr. Van Buren—Abolition—1837—1839.

Fellow-citizens, there is another topic which I feel bound to notice, but about which I shall as certainly be misrepresented as I do it. If the Whigs did not still pretend to feel jealous of the President on the subject of Abolition, it would be my choice to omit any allusion to it. I charge no one of being an Abolitionist. I know of none such in our State. But I am prepared to show that the Whig party of N. Carolina, who made rash war upon Mr. Van Buren and his friends in 1836, have now put a seal of condemnation upon their own conduct.

Their fears about Mr. Van Buren's sympathizing with negroes, were altogether affected. It is my right to speak the truth in plainness, but I will do it without adding any denunciations. You can then see whether the Whig clamors against a Northern President who had fearlessly pledged himself against the slightest interference with negro slavery by Congress, were the interested denunciations of a party, or only solemn convictions of the understanding. Will my countrymen of the Whig party who are present, dare to look plain facts straight in the face? I believe you will. Behold then! Did not this Whig party charge it as a crime in Mr. Van Buren that he voted in a New York Convention to give free Negroes opening property the right of suffrage? I know that you remember it.—I see some here whose fears were excited by it, and it drove off many Republicans from his support. And now have not this same Whig party nominated as their candidate for Governor a gentleman (John M. Morehead) who gave the self-same vote in a North Carolina Convention?

Incredible! But true! I say nothing of the correctness or incorrectness of this vote for that is not the point. Every honest man will however agree that it was not a crime in Mr. Van Buren to vote for Free negro suffrage in New York, where there are no Slaves, and yet, no crime at all in Mr. Morehead, to give the same vote in North Carolina, where we have Slaves. That which was a vice in Mr. Van Buren, could not be a virtue in Mr. Morehead. The Republican party maintained in 1836, that such a vote was no evidence of Anti-Slavery sympathies, none whatever. The Whig party denied this and constantly affirmed the contrary to rouse up your suspicions against Mr. Van Buren, and now they have absurdly nominated a Whig Candidate, who gave the same vote in North Carolina at a much later day! Oh Consistency! Consistency!

Again! Did not the Whig party at the last Election and since, assail members of Congress for voting to receive and lay on the Table petitions against Slavery in the District of Columbia? This too, excited Southern jealousy, and drove many republicans into the ranks of the whigs. And now what think ye? They have nominated for Governor a candidate who was in your Legislature of 1826, and if you will turn to the 203 page of the Journal of the Commons, you cannot doubt any longer that "Mr. Morehead presented the memorial of the Female Benevolent Association of Jamestown, Springfield, and Kennel on the subject of SLAVERY." "On motion ordered that said Memorial LIE "ON THE TABLE!"

I read to you the words of the record.—How will our Whig friends reconcile their party now with their party then? There is no chance for it by pretending to see a difference between Congress and our Assembly upon this point. Although the Constitution of the United States gives to Congress, the power to exercise "exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the District of Columbia, it was the Southern doctrine (especially of the Whig party) that this did not and does not confer the power of emancipating slaves. Why? Because the power of setting slaves free, without their owners consent, is not a "legislative power," and no