

POLITICAL.

From the Richmond Whig.

THOUGHTS ADDRESSSED TO THE OLD REPUBLICANS.

As has been for some time anticipated, the Anti-Masonic Van Buren Candidates to Congress, in Rhode Island, are supposed to be elected, by a majority of one or two hundred, and the Whig Candidates, Burgess and Cranston, defeated.

Mr. Jefferson expressed the opinion that New England would support any administration that continued more than four years, excepting Massachusetts from the bearing of the remark: and the course of Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island justifies his sagacity.

The South and West are receding from the Administration and the Administration's candidate—New England, always Federal, is taking him up. Why is it so? Can the intelligent mind be at a loss to decide? Is it the Republicanism of Jackson's Administration which has lost him so large a proportion of the old Republicans of the South and West, and gained him the ever Federal States of Rhode Island and Connecticut? Is it his Jeffersonianism which has driven from his ranks the almost entire mass of the disciples of Jefferson, and again recruited them with the Federal population of Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Connecticut? Apostates and Federal minions tell us so, but who besides weak dupes believe the silly nonsense? No. Let the South be told the truth, and let that truth sink deep into the hearts of the Southern people, and the friend of State Rights.

The Proclamation, more ultra Federal than Pickens and Hamilton, has won New England to General Jackson; the promise of his favorite to "walk in his footsteps" and "carry out his measures," has inclined the heart of New England Federalism to transfer the favor it entertains for the Hero to his favorite. This is the explanation of the change in Rhode Island and Connecticut—States once nearly unanimous against Jackson, but his firm adherents since the Proclamation and the popularity of its author, gave promise of a restoration of Federal principles and Federal ascendancy.

Let Van Burenism exult in the acquisition of Rhode Island. We wish as we believe it nowise improbable, that he could also get Massachusetts, for his principles entitle him to her support, and with all the Federal States in his train, we should have a hope that the South and West and Pennsylvania would open their eyes to the Federal thraldom with which they are threatened. Let Van Burenites rejoice in the acquisition of Rhode Island and Connecticut. Republicans will know then, where they ought to be found. If unable to discriminate upon the nature of measures as they arise, the Republican States will know that the principles of '93 are not to be found in the ranks which contain States that have uniformly opposed those principles.

Take Rhode Island, gentlemen federalists—take her—and joy go with her, say we. Tennessee and North Carolina have abandoned the Federal ranks, and this circumstance, conjoined with Rhode Island having united herself to them, will open the eyes of thousands of erring Republicans.

From the New York Courier & Enquirer of Aug. 29.

THE MEETING IN THE PARK.

We had not space yesterday for any commentary upon the resolutions passed by the Public Meeting in the Park, even if there had been time sufficient to draw the attention of our readers to their nonconformity with public opinion. With the exception of the Editors of the Evening Post and American—the abolition feelings of the former of whom, and the peculiar opinions of the latter, some of the Committee thought proper to propitiate—we suppose none of the corps editorial, had any information in relation to the character of the resolutions to be offered. Such, at least, was our case; and of course, we could only judge of their appropriateness after they had been passed upon. Now, however, that they have come to light, we all know that if they had been much stronger in their denunciation of the Fanatics they would have passed with the same unanimity and far greater enthusiasm, and that, indeed, any resolutions which might have been offered by the Committee, not of an abolitionary character, would have passed by acclamation.

So far as these resolutions go, they undoubtedly embody the feelings of our fellow-citizens; but it is due to the people of this city and to our brethren of the South generally, to say, that there exists a very general feeling of disappointment in relation to the tone of the Resolutions, and the feeling of apprehension which appears to pervade them, lest we should go too far in the expression of our sympathy for the South. We, who have labored so long in this cause, have probably more opportunities of judging of public sentiment than most others; and we hazard nothing in saying, that the feeling is almost universally, that we have failed to meet the crisis, and stopped short of what duty to ourselves and our country required of us.

The error was in suffering these resolutions to be offered and passed the same day. They should have been submitted to the public through the Press previous to the meeting, and then, by a free discussion of the question, the true feelings of the community would have been elicited. As it was, the Committee were not in possession of public sentiment, and of course they have failed to embody it in their resolutions.

Much has been said of the right of discussing the question of Slavery, and of the danger arising from any attempt to "abridge the freedom of speech and of the Press." But in our opinion, there is not sufficient attention paid to the position of the Slave-holding States at the time of our union and the adoption of the existing Constitution. We know that Mr. VAN BUREN holds the doctrine that the Constitution may be altered on this subject, and that in his disclaimer against interference with the question of slavery, he used the ominous words without "an alteration and amendment of the Constitution;" and his authority has doubtless misled many in relation to the peculiar character of the question of slavery, and the manner in which it is interwoven with our institutions.

We all know that the Constitution, in most respects, may be altered and amended in the mode pointed out in that instrument; yet a few brief observations will show that Mr. Van Buren and his followers are entirely in error in supposing that any amendment, touching the question of slavery, would be binding upon the Southern States, even if having the sanction of the requisite number of States thereto. If such amendment should be proposed and carried according to the mode prescribed in the Constitution, it would be virtually an abandonment of the fundamental principles of our Union, and the States would consequently stand in the same relation to each other that they did previous to the union. To illustrate this, it is only necessary to revert to our then condition. A union was proposed of the original thirteen States, and the South said, "we assent on certain conditions."

In the first place, you shall guarantee us in the peaceful and quiet possession of our Slaves, consent to our importing others for the period of twenty years, and hold the forces of the confederacy in readiness to put down any insurrection that may occur. Secondly, although our black population are to be considered Slaves they shall be represented in Congress through their masters, and three fifths of them shall be estimated accordingly in forming the basis of the representation in Congress. What did we of the North say to this? We abhorred slavery then as much and as sincerely as we do now, but we found that, upon these conditions and no other, would the South treat with us, and after duly weighing the value of Union on one side and the evils of Slavery on the other, our patriotism and our interest triumphed over our philanthropy, and we solemnly agreed to the conditions of the South and embodied them in our Constitution! How idle, therefore, is it in Mr. VAN BUREN, or any body else, to contend, that the Constitution may be amended in this regard. It is not possible, and the moment such an amendment takes place the Union ceases.

What, then, we would ask, are the fundamental principles which should be the rule of action in every State Legislature? We answer, those upon which was based the Union of the States. As a condition of that Union, we pledged the faith of the Northern States to protect the South in the quiet possession of their Slaves, and we neither have done, nor can legally do any act which in its nature will prevent our redeeming that pledge. If our people are publishing incendiary tracts, handbills, or newspapers, which in their tendency are calculated to excite insurrection among the slaves of the South, then the condition of the Union itself, which is paramount to all other considerations, requires at the hands of our Legislatures special enactments intended to suppress and prevent any such publications in future: And it is clearly within the powers of the Legislature, as it is its duty, to define what character of publications are calculated to disturb the South in that peaceable possession of their Slaves which the States have guaranteed, and all such not only may be, but should be suppressed by the strong arm of the Law.

These are not only our views, but we believe them to be the views of nine-tenths of our fellow-citizens; and such being the fact, we would respectfully ask—Do the Resolutions offered to the meeting in the Park, and adopted because none others were offered, express the feelings of the inhabitants of this city? We answer No. And we further say, that they are not such as will in any way tend to allay the excitement of the South on this subject. We are sorry to add, but it is nevertheless true and undeniable, that these resolutions owe their feeble character, and we had almost said, disreputable want of manly energy, to a disposition on the part of the Committee, to deprecate the censure of that portion of the Press, which, although nominally with us, are at heart devoted to the cause of the abolitionists. In our estimation, they leave the whole subject in a worse situation than before the meeting, and having omitted any specific recommendation to the Legislature, the only tendency of the meeting will be to induce the belief in the South that the real and thinly concealed abolition spirit of the Evening Post has but too many advocates among us, notwithstanding our disclaimers to the contrary. Our only hope now is in the Legislature. In that body we fondly trust, will be found those who dare do their duty to the country in defiance of either open or concealed enemies, and whose first act will be to enact the severest penalties of the law against any and every person who shall either publish, or cause to be published or circulated, Tracts or Papers calculated to promote insurrection among the Slaves of the Southern States.

From the Richmond Whig.

ANTI-ABOLITION MEETING IN NEW YORK.

After much note of preparation, and the rather ostentatious display of 28 Vice-Presidents at the meeting, New York has spoken. We confess ourselves less pleased with the proceedings in New York than we had hoped, and far less so than with those of Philadelphia, containing, to our apprehensions, much more heartiness and less parade, and omitting a good deal of offence contained in the former, unnecessary at any time, and especially ill-timed now. We proceed to specify examples.

What need then was there for "deploring the existence of slavery, and all the evils which attend it?" Does slavery impinge upon them? Does it jeopard their safety, or endanger their souls with God, or injuriously affect their interests, or compromise them in the eyes of foreign nations? We

consider this language itself as intermeddling—as calculated to encourage the Fanatics in their notions of removing a great "evil"—as tending to discontent the slave. Is the proposition, that the Northern People have no possible concern in our domestic relations, so unreasonable, so void of force and truth, so difficult of comprehension, that they can neither admit nor understand it? Of all spots on the face of the earth, the city of New York has the least right to complain of Southern Slavery as an "evil." It has been none to her at all events, whatever it may have been or now is to the Southern States. Her wealth and her palaces have been created and erected by the labor of Southern Slaves.

Nor can we but reprove at the tenor of the first and second resolutions. The South has asked the North to protect her women and children from assassination, by suppressing incendiary publications, calculated, if not designed to produce that consequence. She has appealed to Northern justice, humanity, and fraternal regard to effect this. The right of the South to require it is sustained by the laws of nations. What says Vattel?

"The sovereign ought not to suffer his subjects to molest the subjects of others, or to do them an injury, much less should he permit them audaciously to offend foreign powers; he ought to oblige the guilty to repair the damage, if that be possible, to inflict on him exemplary punishment, or, in short, according to the nature of the case and the circumstances attending it, to DELIVER HIMSELF UP TO THE OFFENDED STATE, THERE TO RECEIVE JUSTICE." This is pretty generally observed with respect to great crimes, and such as are equally contrary to the laws and safety of all nations. Assassins, incendiaries, and robbers, are seized every where, and at the desire of the sovereign of the place where the offence was committed, DELIVERED UP TO HIS JUSTICE.

Will it be contended that foreign sovereignties can require the enforcement of this principle against each other, and that confederated sovereignties cannot? That we may obtain that justice from an alien that is denied by an ally and brother? Has the Union reduced us to this helpless and humiliating condition? Is the silken chord of brotherly love not only to bind us to friendly offices, but to tie us neck and heels and submit our throats to the assassin? We are aware of the adverse argument—that the Constitution of the United States and that of New York guarantee the unlimited right of opinion, of the Press, and of discussion. To what does this amount? Why, to this—that no wrong is done, provided the press be the instrument of inflicting it—that there is no redress for injuries, however malicious, or cruel, and destructive, if those injuries result from the freedom of discussion! This argument, to add to its force, is urged by those who never before were guilty of strict construction—by Federalists and Latitudinarians!—If this be the Constitution of the United States, the South, with one voice and one acclaim, would dissolve its allegiance to that instrument. But it is a gross libel upon it—a shocking perversion of its benevolent spirit.

The cotreaty of the South to restrain the machinations of the Fanatics, is met by a great deal of profession indeed, by strong denunciations of the Fanatics, (wind) and by high-sounding talk about the Union, our Southern brethren, &c. &c., very well in its place, but totally misapplied when connected with a plump refusal to do what the South asks, to punish those who may instigate murder and arson; and yet more out of place when coupled with a direct recognition of the right of the Fanatics to continue their agitation. It is "great cry and little wool." It is encouragement to the abolitionists—for it is a vindication of the constitutionality of their past and future efforts. The meeting profess their readiness to aid the South against domestic violence—an overture which they will never be required to fulfil, for the South wants no protector in that matter. A little prevention is what was asked for—and no military aid whatever.

We regret to speak thus, but these reflections force themselves upon us. We regret that the New York meeting felt itself called upon to bewail the evil of slavery, and instead of an affirmative response to the call of the South, to give to the world a vindication of the constitutional right of the Fanatics to agitate the subject. Silence upon both heads had been as well, had been more prudent, had been more wise in the present state of things. The South is satisfied with her condition, and wants no bewailings and lamentations from any part of the earth. All she asks is, "hands off"—and since it is plain that words are only to be employed to subject the villains who are plotting against her tranquility, from those who alone have the power to act in her behalf, she must stand in her own defence, and look not beyond the vigor of her own laws, and the arms of her own sons. Those are sufficient. Her pride will now ask only to be spared the outpouring of sympathy, lamentations for her condition, professions of a readiness to protect her, and all that sort of thing, which has been repeated until nausea has supervened. Bread has been asked for, and a stone given. Stones and professions cost nothing—a fact which has been discovered elsewhere than in New York.

The Boston Commercial Gazette publishes the following reminiscence. It is of momentous importance, and ought to be repeated to every man at the North, who would palliate the offences of the Abolitionists. Mr. BIRNEY'S words show what are the visions which Abolitionists make the subject of their familiar contemplation.

REMINISCENCE: At the Second Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, held at New York in May, the speakers were Mr. S. B. Birney of Kentucky, the Rev. Mr. Stow of Boston, the Rev. Mr. Kirk, and Mr. George Thompson, the English Missionary. According to the official Report for the past year, the Auxiliary Societies had increased from about 50 to two hundred, and under the direction of the Society, within the last year, had been published no less than 222,000 copies of different works to promote their object!!! Mr. Birney made a speech on the occasion; and, among other remarks, uttered the following:—I SAY IT ADVISED: I. Y. THAT IF IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION IN THE SOUTH BE NOT GRANTED SOON A GENERAL INSURRECTION MUST TAKE PLACE THERE, WHICH MAY END IN A DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

A writer in Augusta, has written a long and able exposure of the Baltimore Convention Address. It was not worth his trouble; the thing has been only read by certain unhappy editors, as part of the drudgery of their vocation. It was a deadborn monster, and to dig it up to exhibit it, is as bad as criticising the Monks.

From the Raleigh Register.

PRECEPT versus PRACTICE.

The chief ground upon which the pretensions of Gen. Jackson originally rested, was the necessity which existed for a reform in every branch of the Government. The cry of corruption had been raised, not merely against the immediately preceding, but every former Administration. Abuses, it was said, had crept into the Government, and Gen. Jackson was the Hercules to whom was assigned the arduous task of cleansing the Augean Stable. "The recent demonstration of public sentiment," (says he in his Inaugural Address,) "inscribes on the list of Executive duties, in characters too legible to be overlooked, the task of Reform; which will require particularly the correction of those abuses which have brought the patronage of the Federal Government into conflict with the freedom of elections." That these pledges have been openly and shamefully violated, there is not a corner of our country, however obscure or remote, which does not furnish abundant evidence. The most recent instance which has occurred, happened in this State, and is disclosed in the following article from the Elizabeth City "Herald": "The Times?"

To the Editor of the Herald of the Times:

Sir: Enclosed I send you a correspondence which has accidentally fallen into my hands. I wish it published, that the people of the District of Elenton may see the attempts which have been made, by persons not residents of this District, to interfere in our affairs.

The Editor of the Globe, it seems, was too wary to be entrapped by Mr. Kinney; he would not reply to his letter until he was satisfied of his orthodoxy. If any thing was needed to satisfy the people that attempts are continually made by the Office-holders at Washington City to control the State elections, this letter of Mr. Blair's would, it seems to me, entirely dispel any doubts.

Who is this Mr. Blair that pretends to judge of honorable men? I am told he is one of the hired slanderers bought up and carried to Washington City for the express purpose of publishing a paper to sustain the Kitchen Cabinet and their tool, Martin Van Buren.

I, sir, am no candidate; I never sought, nor would I accept of any public office whatever; but I cannot restrain my indignation, when I see persons, that I know to be the very refuse of all parties, attempt to pronounce judgment upon men of character and respectability.

Your obedient servant, AITATOR. N. B.—Neither Kinney, Fowlkes, or Blair are residents of this District, or State.

ELIZABETH CITY, N. C., April 13, 1835.

MR. EDITOR: I wish you would do the Jackson party of Wm. B. Shepard's District the kindness to give me a particular account of the political character of that gentleman's votes and speeches in the House. Shepard will be opposed by a true Jackson man, and will certainly be defeated, if you will be so good as to give me the means of showing the people what he has been about at Congress for four years. More than three-fourths of his constituents are Jackson; and some of them are determined that he shall not misrepresent their views another two years. Do give an account of Shepard's work at Washington, as early as convenient. We want to know how he has acted, and send him to his plantation, if he has opposed the Administration.

Respectfully, sir, your servant, WM. H. KINNEY.

P. S. This is private. EDITOR OF THE GLOBE, Washington.

WASHINGTON, April 28, 1835.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed I declined answering, because I was not certain that the writer was a friend; and if he were not, I thought it possible that his object was to draw out such a reply as might be held up as an insidious attempt to injure Mr. Shepard—and an improper interference, on the part of persons at Washington, with the business of the people. Understanding from Mr. Wheeler that you are a true friend of the Republican cause, I have no hesitation in giving my testimony as to the facts about which I am interrogated in the letter, with liberty to you, to make whatever use you think proper.

The Hon. Wm. B. Shepard is known at Washington to be as decided an opponent of the President and the Administration, as any member in Congress. He has supported the press here, which has not only abused the Administration throughout the last six years, but which has abused the private character of the President, and excited that feeling in the opposition which it is not unlikely has led to assaults on his venerable person. Shepard's association has been with the most vindictive of the enemies of the Administration—and on all party grounds, his vote has been counted on as certainly beforehand by him, as it has been uniformly set down by the friends of the Administration "against them. In fact, no man ever considered Tristram Burgess more thoroughly identified with the opposition than both sides have held in mind. Mr. Shepard to be—and as for myself, I sincerely assure you, that I should consider the chance for the occasional support of John Q. Adams vastly more to be calculated on in behalf of the Administration than the member of Congress from your District. Mr. Adams is sometimes under the impulse of patriotic feeling, which gets the better of his party propensities—Mr. Shepard never, in one instance, to my knowledge.

Your obedient servant, P. P. BLAIR. P. S. You may retain and preserve this letter. TO DR. J. FOWLKES, Elizabeth City, N. C.

Trade of New Orleans.—We are furnished, by a calculator, with the value of a few of the leading articles embraced in the trade of New Orleans, for the past year—the estimate is as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Article Name and Value. Cotton, 37,000,000; Sugar and Molasses, 9,000,000; Tobacco, 3,250,000; Lard, Pork, and Bacon, 3,500,000; Flour and Corn, 1,750,000; Lead, 1,000,000; Bagging and Rope, 1,300,000; Whiskey, 500,000. Total: \$57,300,000.

Other articles received from the interior, probably \$12,700,000. Total: \$70,000,000.

The amount of the trade coastwise, and from abroad, including the goods that pass through the city, will amount to about an equal sum.

The whole domestic exports of the United States, for the year ending 30th September, 1833, amounted only to the sum of \$20,317,000.—The value of the imports for the same year was \$108,118,311.

New Orleans Bulletin.

The whole Union seems to be marching to the tune of "Blow ye breezes." The people of Burlington (New Jersey) having resolved to mob a black porter, attacked the wrong man, who defeated them, wounding three with buckshot. Sundry other riots, too tedious to mention, have occurred in different places.

From a statement of the affairs of the Bank of the United States, up to the 6th of July last, it appears that, after allowing six millions of dollars for bad debts, that institution has still a clear surplus of seventeen per cent, to divide amongst its stockholders!

A lot of cotton, comprising 6,000 bales, says the New Orleans Bulletin of July 7, changed hands yesterday, the amount of the bill of which was nearly half a million of dollars. This, it is believed, is the largest single transaction ever here recorded in the annals of cotton operations.



THE CAROLINIAN.

SALISBURY: SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1835.

"SIGNS OF THE TIMES."

Ever since the promulgation of the rank federal doctrines contained in the Proclamation, by Gen. Jackson, his Administration has been gradually gaining the favor and support of the Northern States. They have been going over, one by one, until there is now but one (Massachusetts) remaining out of the flock which is to be transferred from Jackson to Van Buren. The recent elections in Rhode Island have resulted in the entire overthrow of the Whigs, and the election of Van Buren Federalists to Congress and a majority of the same stamp to the State Legislature. At this result the Van Buren presses have set up a general shout of "The Aristocracy defeated!" "The Democracy" (!!) "triumphant!" "Rhode Island regenerated!" &c.

We must beg leave to differ with these presses as to the fact of Rhode Island's "regeneration," or that of any other of the New England States that have lately taken into their embraces Van Buren and his principles. These States have not abandoned their old and long cherished principles in taking up Mr. Van Buren. In what respect does the principles held out in the late prominent measures of the Administration differ from those of the Northern Federalists and Tariffites? In their construction of the Constitution, the Proclamation and Protest are as latitudinarian as the most ultra Federalist of 1793 could desire. They are the very same doctrines contended for by the old Federal party in the Convention that framed the present Constitution of the United States. What more could the Federalists desire, than to see a President who had been elected by the Republican party, for his Republican principles, whose popularity was almost unbounded, and in whose political orthodoxy a large portion of the American people unfortunately placed a confidence almost amounting to idolatry—coming over and making a full confession of faith in their political creed? Never, since the overthrow of the Federalists, with the elder Adams at their head, by the Republicans, with Mr. Jefferson at their head, had the auspices been so favorable to the re-ascendency of Federal men and Federal principles. It was unnatural to suppose that the Northern States would blight prospects so far for their once more grasping the reins of power, by refusing to act with and through men who had betrayed the confidence of the Republican party. They acted wisely, and they are acting steadily.

Mr. Van Buren's principles, in regard to a Protective Tariff, is another ground for his support by the Northern Manufacturing States. He will be elected, if elected at all, (which God, in his mercy avert!) by the votes of the Tariff States. He voted for the Tariff of 1828—the "Bill of Abominations." He has ever been opposed to Southern men and Southern principles; and it is a downright attempt at imposition for his presses in the South to say that he acted under instructions from his own State, in voting for the Tariff, when he himself procured these very instructions to be gotten up.

The only link now wanting to complete the train of Van Buren Federalism is, for Massachusetts to give in her adherence. The South then, probably, would begin to tear from her eyes the mask of Jacksonism that has so long rendered all the efforts to arouse her ineffective. And we are not unmindful of the course that events have already taken in the South and West. As the Northern Federalists are advancing to the support of Jackson Van Burenism, even Tennessee is receding. Has not North Carolina withdrawn from the support of the Northern party and Northern principles of Van Buren? Had it not been for the all-powerful name of Jackson, Van Burenism, in North Carolina, would have fallen to the ground still-born. Let the contest in this State be exclusive between Van Buren and any respectable opponent, and then see how awakened republicans will flock around the standard of Liberty.

VAN BUREN AND ABOLITIONISM.

It makes the Southern Van Buren men quite angry to tell them that their idol is an Abolitionist. Whether they believe so themselves or not, they endeavor to make others believe that all that is said about him by the Whigs and Nullifiers is utterly false. We have seldom heard it alleged against Mr. Van Buren that he is an active collaborer in the unrighteous cause of the Abolitionists, or that he is a member of any of the Societies at the North. But this we believe: it is not the injustice of the course and the diabolical intentions of the Abolitionists, or the dangerous consequences resulting to the Union at large, from the prosecution of their schemes, that has dictated his present non-committal course. His recorded acts, however, will show that his predilections, if he has any, are on the Abolition side of the fence. At the time of Missouri's admission into the Union, when an attempt was making to restrict Slavery within her limits, which is Abolition in its worst form, did not Martin Van Buren use his utmost efforts for the election of Rufus King to the United States Senate, on the express grounds of his restriction principles? He wrote a labored pamphlet in favor of Mr. King's election, who was, through these means, elected, took his seat in the Senate, and voted for the restriction. What renders the picture still stronger is, that a son of this same Rufus King edits a paper in New York, which espouses the abolition doctrines of the present day. As this son seems so correctly to inherit the principles of his father, is it not fair to infer that Mr. Van Buren still retains his? We think so, especially when there is no proof to the contrary.—Mr. Van Buren voted, in the New York Convention, to extend the right of suffrage to all free negroes, which is another straw to show which way the wind blows.—But, there is another evidence that he, and all his party, are not only abolitionists, but amalgamationists; that is, the nomination of Richard M. Johnson, a practice amalgamator, for the Vice-Presidency on the ticket with Van Buren.

From these facts we do not say that Mr. Van Buren is an abolitionist; but, if there is any truth in the old adage, that "acts speak louder than words," we think he had better have a few of his expunged.

The creatures at their dirty work again.—The band of northern desperadoes and mad-men appear determined upon the destruction of the Union, and deluging the South with the blood of its citizens. Foiled