

EXTRACTS FROM THE SPEECH OF MR. MANGUM, OF NORTH CAROLINA.

An Review of the "Democratic Platform," &c.

In SENATE, JULY 3, 1848.

I return to Gen. Cass and the Wilnot proviso. The "Nicholson letter" leaves us in the dark. The platform holds nothing to aid us. The Senator from Mississippi stands mute or speaks in stanzas on an unintelligible and as incomprehensible as the opinions of Gen. Cass himself.

Mr. Mangum. I am not at all surprised at any possibility that is exhibited by the Senator from Mississippi. I should feel it myself. But I have advanced no charge against Gen. Cass that he had any participation in any such meditated fraud. Nor have I any reason to believe that such is the case. As to what gentlemen may do in this House or the other I know nothing. I do know, however, that here is a plain palpable case of meditated fraud, one of great enormity, seeking to mislead and delude the people upon matters of the highest delicacy and greatest importance to their interests.

While your jails and penitentiaries groan with criminals, convicted of "false pretence and frauds in trifling pecuniary matters," who ought to be done with the vile malefactor who, by flagitious frauds like this, cheat the people, not out of a few shillings, but out of their dearest rights, in matters touching their private happiness and the public prosperity!

Here are the pamphlets. I hand them over to the gentleman to examine, hoping they may be able to investigate the fraud, trace it to its source drag the guilty culprit from his hiding place, and expose him and his infamy to the scorn, the hisses, and the contempt of the public.

Mr. Foote. The letter of Gen. Cass respecting the Wilnot Proviso was written as early as December—long anterior to the French meeting; and whether that is not sufficient!

Mr. Mangum. I certainly think it would be very proper, if it were published as late as the 18th of March, 1848, a reference should be made to his views upon the late French Revolution—They would not have been referred to in the March edition. But I do not see the propriety of excluding from the June pamphlet all the matter contained in the March edition upon the "Wilnot Proviso"—a question so widely agitating and deeply dividing the public opinion.

I cannot conceive how the biographer should have deemed a sympathizing speech of more merit to the public, in a sketch of the life of a candidate for the Presidency, than the excess of their alarms, imagine may shake the pillars of the Union. It cannot be so. The purpose must have been sinister—a fraud was meditated.

To shake the pillars of the Union! The "Wilnot proviso" to shake the pillars of the Union! I feel no such apprehension. These fears are idle; they are ridiculous. This Union thank God is not in the keeping of ambitious political aspirants or disappointed partisans. This great Republic is not in the keeping of the great and noble principles of the Whig party, and the representative of that party. I mean Gen. Taylor.

And here let me say to the Senator from Mississippi that I have just read his printed speech in the main with much pleasure. There were a few things I regretted to see. I regretted to see such labored disquisitions upon the rights of the people, and the rights of the people, and the rights of the people.

Mr. Mangum. I take a common destiny with my countrymen, whether for weal or for woe; I would live or I would die, as I trust, by the side of my countrymen upon a proper occasion; but as to this "Wilnot Proviso," as a practical question, I regard it as of exceedingly slight importance. I stand by the right of the South; I reprobate "proviso," as implying an offensive disparagement; I resist it, as having no warrant in the constitution, in good faith, or in equity.

Mr. Mangum. It is sufficient that I have them. The Globe office will not dare deny their publication there; their types speak the truth, and, if need be, there is other evidence at hand. One of the pamphlets has written upon it "North," the other "South." One is evidently designed for a northern latitude and the other for a southern. The one, as I suppose, designed for the North contains on the last page an eloquent outburst of Mr. Cass on the Mexican war, in reply to some most sensible remarks of mine. It will be found in the Senate by reading them, as we have all been thrilled and electrified by them heretofore. It contains also on the same page a long extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Cass, at Old Fellows' Hall, in this city, at a meeting held to express the sympathies of the American people for France upon the result of the late French revolution.

It also has on the same page an account of Mr. Cass's nomination for the Presidency, with some remarks upon his qualifications, his public life, his virtues, and his merits; but not one word upon the "Wilnot proviso." On the preceding page there is a very slight notice of Mr. Cass's vote on the three million bill in the winter of 1847, and of the attaching of the proviso to that bill, from which the inference is fair and plain that he voted against it, because it was out of place there, and for that reason only. The pamphlet, designed as it supposes for the South, has on the last page the same notice of Mr. Cass in reply to nothing upon the subject of the French revolution. But the "Wilnot proviso" and his opinions on it are strongly and impressively noted by the biographer, with a commendatory cast of reasoning and conclusion, as if I had not conclusively shown in a preceding portion of my remarks. The pamphlets are in all other respects, precisely alike. I read what is found in this pamphlet for the South on the "Wilnot proviso." It is as follows:

"In December, 1847, Gen. Cass gave his views at length upon the Wilnot Proviso, in a letter to Mr. Nicholson, of this State. In this letter he avowed himself opposed to the measure, and to the exercise of any legislation by Congress, over any of the territories of the United States, respecting the domestic relations of their inhabitants. He believed that all questions of that nature should be settled by the people themselves, who ought to be allowed to regulate their internal concerns in their own way, and that Congress has no more power to abolish or establish slavery in such territories than it has to regulate any other of the relative duties of social life—that of husband and wife, or parent and child, or master and servant, or in connection with the Wilnot proviso, to take from its legitimate tribunal a question of domestic policy, having no relation to the Union, as such, and to transfer it to another, assumed by the people for a special purpose, and foreign to the subject matter involved in this issue. We are to leave principles, we go back to the original source of safety. Leave to the people, who will be affected by this question, to adjust it upon their own responsibility and in their own manner, and we shall render another tribute to the original principles of our Government, and furnish another example of its permanence and prosperity."

Mr. Foote. Does the Senator charge that there is any inconsistency or conflicting principles to the two pamphlets?

Mr. Mangum. They do not come in conflict; for one takes the road directly to the North, the other the shortest cut for the South. Mr. Foote. Does the meaning conflict?

Mr. Mangum. The meaning of the two is not at all coincident. They do not approximate each other on the "proviso"; there is no similitude in the subject; there is manifest incongruity, and in the spirit, in the language, in the tone, in the North, General Cass is represented as voting against the "proviso" because offered by a Federal Senator from New England, with a view of embarrassing the Administration in a vigorous prosecution of the war. We all know that Gen. Cass, in season and out of season, whether sleeping or waking, always went for a vigorous prosecution of the war. Why, I can almost fancy that I hear the late Senator, Cass rising from his seat, with his good natural face slightly touched with a shade of anxiety, and moving "the postponement of the previous order, and to proceed to the consideration of the ten regiment bill," and, if opposed, I can almost see the slight air of humble yet slightly tinged, I do not say detracting, from his bearing, invariably courteous and gentlemanly.

Mr. Mangum. Will the Senator allow me two more minutes? I have a matter to say that at the close of his speech another bill will be called up, and I shall not then have an opportunity of making any observations. I trust the Senator will not, for one moment, suppose that either Gen. Cass or any friend of his would ever countenance the publication of a document for one reason or another different from those published in the Globe. I know not whence these two documents were procured, but by whose authority they were procured, I do not know. I do not know who they were procured by, but I do know that the Globe office will not dare deny their publication there; their types speak the truth, and, if need be, there is other evidence at hand. One of the pamphlets has written upon it "North," the other "South." One is evidently designed for a northern latitude and the other for a southern. The one, as I suppose, designed for the North contains on the last page an eloquent outburst of Mr. Cass on the Mexican war, in reply to some most sensible remarks of mine. It will be found in the Senate by reading them, as we have all been thrilled and electrified by them heretofore. It contains also on the same page a long extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Cass, at Old Fellows' Hall, in this city, at a meeting held to express the sympathies of the American people for France upon the result of the late French revolution.

intended for each part of the Union. Can the Whig make a similar declaration? Mr. Mangum. I am not at all surprised at any possibility that is exhibited by the Senator from Mississippi. I should feel it myself. But I have advanced no charge against Gen. Cass that he had any participation in any such meditated fraud. Nor have I any reason to believe that such is the case. As to what gentlemen may do in this House or the other I know nothing. I do know, however, that here is a plain palpable case of meditated fraud, one of great enormity, seeking to mislead and delude the people upon matters of the highest delicacy and greatest importance to their interests.

While your jails and penitentiaries groan with criminals, convicted of "false pretence and frauds in trifling pecuniary matters," who ought to be done with the vile malefactor who, by flagitious frauds like this, cheat the people, not out of a few shillings, but out of their dearest rights, in matters touching their private happiness and the public prosperity!

Here are the pamphlets. I hand them over to the gentleman to examine, hoping they may be able to investigate the fraud, trace it to its source drag the guilty culprit from his hiding place, and expose him and his infamy to the scorn, the hisses, and the contempt of the public.

Mr. Foote. The letter of Gen. Cass respecting the Wilnot Proviso was written as early as December—long anterior to the French meeting; and whether that is not sufficient!

Mr. Mangum. I certainly think it would be very proper, if it were published as late as the 18th of March, 1848, a reference should be made to his views upon the late French Revolution—They would not have been referred to in the March edition. But I do not see the propriety of excluding from the June pamphlet all the matter contained in the March edition upon the "Wilnot Proviso"—a question so widely agitating and deeply dividing the public opinion.

I cannot conceive how the biographer should have deemed a sympathizing speech of more merit to the public, in a sketch of the life of a candidate for the Presidency, than the excess of their alarms, imagine may shake the pillars of the Union. It cannot be so. The purpose must have been sinister—a fraud was meditated.

To shake the pillars of the Union! The "Wilnot proviso" to shake the pillars of the Union! I feel no such apprehension. These fears are idle; they are ridiculous. This Union thank God is not in the keeping of ambitious political aspirants or disappointed partisans. This great Republic is not in the keeping of the great and noble principles of the Whig party, and the representative of that party. I mean Gen. Taylor.

And here let me say to the Senator from Mississippi that I have just read his printed speech in the main with much pleasure. There were a few things I regretted to see. I regretted to see such labored disquisitions upon the rights of the people, and the rights of the people, and the rights of the people.

Mr. Mangum. I take a common destiny with my countrymen, whether for weal or for woe; I would live or I would die, as I trust, by the side of my countrymen upon a proper occasion; but as to this "Wilnot Proviso," as a practical question, I regard it as of exceedingly slight importance. I stand by the right of the South; I reprobate "proviso," as implying an offensive disparagement; I resist it, as having no warrant in the constitution, in good faith, or in equity.

Mr. Mangum. It is sufficient that I have them. The Globe office will not dare deny their publication there; their types speak the truth, and, if need be, there is other evidence at hand. One of the pamphlets has written upon it "North," the other "South." One is evidently designed for a northern latitude and the other for a southern. The one, as I suppose, designed for the North contains on the last page an eloquent outburst of Mr. Cass on the Mexican war, in reply to some most sensible remarks of mine. It will be found in the Senate by reading them, as we have all been thrilled and electrified by them heretofore. It contains also on the same page a long extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Cass, at Old Fellows' Hall, in this city, at a meeting held to express the sympathies of the American people for France upon the result of the late French revolution.

It also has on the same page an account of Mr. Cass's nomination for the Presidency, with some remarks upon his qualifications, his public life, his virtues, and his merits; but not one word upon the "Wilnot proviso." On the preceding page there is a very slight notice of Mr. Cass's vote on the three million bill in the winter of 1847, and of the attaching of the proviso to that bill, from which the inference is fair and plain that he voted against it, because it was out of place there, and for that reason only. The pamphlet, designed as it supposes for the South, has on the last page the same notice of Mr. Cass in reply to nothing upon the subject of the French revolution. But the "Wilnot proviso" and his opinions on it are strongly and impressively noted by the biographer, with a commendatory cast of reasoning and conclusion, as if I had not conclusively shown in a preceding portion of my remarks. The pamphlets are in all other respects, precisely alike. I read what is found in this pamphlet for the South on the "Wilnot proviso." It is as follows:

"In December, 1847, Gen. Cass gave his views at length upon the Wilnot Proviso, in a letter to Mr. Nicholson, of this State. In this letter he avowed himself opposed to the measure, and to the exercise of any legislation by Congress, over any of the territories of the United States, respecting the domestic relations of their inhabitants. He believed that all questions of that nature should be settled by the people themselves, who ought to be allowed to regulate their internal concerns in their own way, and that Congress has no more power to abolish or establish slavery in such territories than it has to regulate any other of the relative duties of social life—that of husband and wife, or parent and child, or master and servant, or in connection with the Wilnot proviso, to take from its legitimate tribunal a question of domestic policy, having no relation to the Union, as such, and to transfer it to another, assumed by the people for a special purpose, and foreign to the subject matter involved in this issue. We are to leave principles, we go back to the original source of safety. Leave to the people, who will be affected by this question, to adjust it upon their own responsibility and in their own manner, and we shall render another tribute to the original principles of our Government, and furnish another example of its permanence and prosperity."

Mr. Foote. Does the Senator charge that there is any inconsistency or conflicting principles to the two pamphlets?

Mr. Mangum. They do not come in conflict; for one takes the road directly to the North, the other the shortest cut for the South. Mr. Foote. Does the meaning conflict?

Mr. Mangum. The meaning of the two is not at all coincident. They do not approximate each other on the "proviso"; there is no similitude in the subject; there is manifest incongruity, and in the spirit, in the language, in the tone, in the North, General Cass is represented as voting against the "proviso" because offered by a Federal Senator from New England, with a view of embarrassing the Administration in a vigorous prosecution of the war. We all know that Gen. Cass, in season and out of season, whether sleeping or waking, always went for a vigorous prosecution of the war. Why, I can almost fancy that I hear the late Senator, Cass rising from his seat, with his good natural face slightly touched with a shade of anxiety, and moving "the postponement of the previous order, and to proceed to the consideration of the ten regiment bill," and, if opposed, I can almost see the slight air of humble yet slightly tinged, I do not say detracting, from his bearing, invariably courteous and gentlemanly.

Mr. Mangum. Will the Senator allow me two more minutes? I have a matter to say that at the close of his speech another bill will be called up, and I shall not then have an opportunity of making any observations. I trust the Senator will not, for one moment, suppose that either Gen. Cass or any friend of his would ever countenance the publication of a document for one reason or another different from those published in the Globe. I know not whence these two documents were procured, but by whose authority they were procured, I do not know. I do not know who they were procured by, but I do know that the Globe office will not dare deny their publication there; their types speak the truth, and, if need be, there is other evidence at hand. One of the pamphlets has written upon it "North," the other "South." One is evidently designed for a northern latitude and the other for a southern. The one, as I suppose, designed for the North contains on the last page an eloquent outburst of Mr. Cass on the Mexican war, in reply to some most sensible remarks of mine. It will be found in the Senate by reading them, as we have all been thrilled and electrified by them heretofore. It contains also on the same page a long extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Cass, at Old Fellows' Hall, in this city, at a meeting held to express the sympathies of the American people for France upon the result of the late French revolution.

It also has on the same page an account of Mr. Cass's nomination for the Presidency, with some remarks upon his qualifications, his public life, his virtues, and his merits; but not one word upon the "Wilnot proviso." On the preceding page there is a very slight notice of Mr. Cass's vote on the three million bill in the winter of 1847, and of the attaching of the proviso to that bill, from which the inference is fair and plain that he voted against it, because it was out of place there, and for that reason only. The pamphlet, designed as it supposes for the South, has on the last page the same notice of Mr. Cass in reply to nothing upon the subject of the French revolution. But the "Wilnot proviso" and his opinions on it are strongly and impressively noted by the biographer, with a commendatory cast of reasoning and conclusion, as if I had not conclusively shown in a preceding portion of my remarks. The pamphlets are in all other respects, precisely alike. I read what is found in this pamphlet for the South on the "Wilnot proviso." It is as follows:

in war with Great Britain. In that event she might have hoped for much, but alone and single-handed she would have dreamed of it. Disregarding this obvious policy, the Executive pushed into Mexico a minister who acted upon them more like a firebrand than a messenger of peace. The President moved the army from Cooper's Creek to the Rio Grande. That made the war inevitable. It was an act of war—the one-man power in the worst, most dangerous form—and I hold him and his advisers, General Cass as one of them, responsible for this dangerous violation of the Constitution, and for all the blood and treasure that that war has cost our people. It may be that it was not wickedly begun; if not, the President was wickedly deluded into it, and I may say he blundered out of it; for peace came against all Executive expectation, and when, in truth, they had no one in Mexico authorized to make a treaty. Yet, when come it did, it is due to the President to say—he being probably more anxious for peace than any other man in the Republic—that he patriotically, and I think wisely, overlooked serious irregularities, and against a strong opposition in his cabinet, took the responsibility and sent the treaty to the Senate. He did not do this until his commission was satisfied. But Gen. Cass was not to be thwarted wholly; though he had not got or "swallowed" the whole of Mexico, yet he afterwards got through his ten regiment bill; and but for the Baltimore Convention calling him from his post—for the loss of his country—if the treaty had not been so long delayed, it cannot be doubted that Mr. Cass would have got through his twenty regiment bill also.

"That this war has been prosecuted from the very first views of territorial aggrandizement, is now obvious to every eye. It is did not originate in the interests of the people, but in the interests of the few. It was a war of conquest, and not of a just and honorable ambition. Mr. Cass has encouraged, aided, and stimulated every excess. The election of Mr. Cass will be but the elongation of this incompetent and dangerous administration, grown into greater height and boldness by the results of a singular and fortunate policy, which they have escaped the natural consequences of their want of judgment and foresight. The aggressive ambition of this portion of the Democracy is boundless and unappeasable. When it shall lift its foot again under the auspices of Mr. Cass it will be planted on the Sierra Madre, Tehuantepec, and, perhaps, Cuba."

Sir, I turn from these reflections, and look out for a safe resting place for the country and its great interests in this crisis of troubles and portentous dangers. I look to the great and noble principles of the Whig party, and the representative of that party. I mean Gen. Taylor.

And here let me say to the Senator from Mississippi that I have just read his printed speech in the main with much pleasure. There were a few things I regretted to see. I regretted to see such labored disquisitions upon the rights of the people, and the rights of the people, and the rights of the people.

Mr. Mangum. I take a common destiny with my countrymen, whether for weal or for woe; I would live or I would die, as I trust, by the side of my countrymen upon a proper occasion; but as to this "Wilnot Proviso," as a practical question, I regard it as of exceedingly slight importance. I stand by the right of the South; I reprobate "proviso," as implying an offensive disparagement; I resist it, as having no warrant in the constitution, in good faith, or in equity.

Mr. Mangum. It is sufficient that I have them. The Globe office will not dare deny their publication there; their types speak the truth, and, if need be, there is other evidence at hand. One of the pamphlets has written upon it "North," the other "South." One is evidently designed for a northern latitude and the other for a southern. The one, as I suppose, designed for the North contains on the last page an eloquent outburst of Mr. Cass on the Mexican war, in reply to some most sensible remarks of mine. It will be found in the Senate by reading them, as we have all been thrilled and electrified by them heretofore. It contains also on the same page a long extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Cass, at Old Fellows' Hall, in this city, at a meeting held to express the sympathies of the American people for France upon the result of the late French revolution.

It also has on the same page an account of Mr. Cass's nomination for the Presidency, with some remarks upon his qualifications, his public life, his virtues, and his merits; but not one word upon the "Wilnot proviso." On the preceding page there is a very slight notice of Mr. Cass's vote on the three million bill in the winter of 1847, and of the attaching of the proviso to that bill, from which the inference is fair and plain that he voted against it, because it was out of place there, and for that reason only. The pamphlet, designed as it supposes for the South, has on the last page the same notice of Mr. Cass in reply to nothing upon the subject of the French revolution. But the "Wilnot proviso" and his opinions on it are strongly and impressively noted by the biographer, with a commendatory cast of reasoning and conclusion, as if I had not conclusively shown in a preceding portion of my remarks. The pamphlets are in all other respects, precisely alike. I read what is found in this pamphlet for the South on the "Wilnot proviso." It is as follows:

"In December, 1847, Gen. Cass gave his views at length upon the Wilnot Proviso, in a letter to Mr. Nicholson, of this State. In this letter he avowed himself opposed to the measure, and to the exercise of any legislation by Congress, over any of the territories of the United States, respecting the domestic relations of their inhabitants. He believed that all questions of that nature should be settled by the people themselves, who ought to be allowed to regulate their internal concerns in their own way, and that Congress has no more power to abolish or establish slavery in such territories than it has to regulate any other of the relative duties of social life—that of husband and wife, or parent and child, or master and servant, or in connection with the Wilnot proviso, to take from its legitimate tribunal a question of domestic policy, having no relation to the Union, as such, and to transfer it to another, assumed by the people for a special purpose, and foreign to the subject matter involved in this issue. We are to leave principles, we go back to the original source of safety. Leave to the people, who will be affected by this question, to adjust it upon their own responsibility and in their own manner, and we shall render another tribute to the original principles of our Government, and furnish another example of its permanence and prosperity."

Mr. Foote. Does the Senator charge that there is any inconsistency or conflicting principles to the two pamphlets?

Mr. Mangum. They do not come in conflict; for one takes the road directly to the North, the other the shortest cut for the South. Mr. Foote. Does the meaning conflict?

Mr. Mangum. The meaning of the two is not at all coincident. They do not approximate each other on the "proviso"; there is no similitude in the subject; there is manifest incongruity, and in the spirit, in the language, in the tone, in the North, General Cass is represented as voting against the "proviso" because offered by a Federal Senator from New England, with a view of embarrassing the Administration in a vigorous prosecution of the war. We all know that Gen. Cass, in season and out of season, whether sleeping or waking, always went for a vigorous prosecution of the war. Why, I can almost fancy that I hear the late Senator, Cass rising from his seat, with his good natural face slightly touched with a shade of anxiety, and moving "the postponement of the previous order, and to proceed to the consideration of the ten regiment bill," and, if opposed, I can almost see the slight air of humble yet slightly tinged, I do not say detracting, from his bearing, invariably courteous and gentlemanly.

Mr. Mangum. Will the Senator allow me two more minutes? I have a matter to say that at the close of his speech another bill will be called up, and I shall not then have an opportunity of making any observations. I trust the Senator will not, for one moment, suppose that either Gen. Cass or any friend of his would ever countenance the publication of a document for one reason or another different from those published in the Globe. I know not whence these two documents were procured, but by whose authority they were procured, I do not know. I do not know who they were procured by, but I do know that the Globe office will not dare deny their publication there; their types speak the truth, and, if need be, there is other evidence at hand. One of the pamphlets has written upon it "North," the other "South." One is evidently designed for a northern latitude and the other for a southern. The one, as I suppose, designed for the North contains on the last page an eloquent outburst of Mr. Cass on the Mexican war, in reply to some most sensible remarks of mine. It will be found in the Senate by reading them, as we have all been thrilled and electrified by them heretofore. It contains also on the same page a long extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Cass, at Old Fellows' Hall, in this city, at a meeting held to express the sympathies of the American people for France upon the result of the late French revolution.

It also has on the same page an account of Mr. Cass's nomination for the Presidency, with some remarks upon his qualifications, his public life, his virtues, and his merits; but not one word upon the "Wilnot proviso." On the preceding page there is a very slight notice of Mr. Cass's vote on the three million bill in the winter of 1847, and of the attaching of the proviso to that bill, from which the inference is fair and plain that he voted against it, because it was out of place there, and for that reason only. The pamphlet, designed as it supposes for the South, has on the last page the same notice of Mr. Cass in reply to nothing upon the subject of the French revolution. But the "Wilnot proviso" and his opinions on it are strongly and impressively noted by the biographer, with a commendatory cast of reasoning and conclusion, as if I had not conclusively shown in a preceding portion of my remarks. The pamphlets are in all other respects, precisely alike. I read what is found in this pamphlet for the South on the "Wilnot proviso." It is as follows:

"In December, 1847, Gen. Cass gave his views at length upon the Wilnot Proviso, in a letter to Mr. Nicholson, of this State. In this letter he avowed himself opposed to the measure, and to the exercise of any legislation by Congress, over any of the territories of the United States, respecting the domestic relations of their inhabitants. He believed that all questions of that nature should be settled by the people themselves, who ought to be allowed to regulate their internal concerns in their own way, and that Congress has no more power to abolish or establish slavery in such territories than it has to regulate any other of the relative duties of social life—that of husband and wife, or parent and child, or master and servant, or in connection with the Wilnot proviso, to take from its legitimate tribunal a question of domestic policy, having no relation to the Union, as such, and to transfer it to another, assumed by the people for a special purpose, and foreign to the subject matter involved in this issue. We are to leave principles, we go back to the original source of safety. Leave to the people, who will be affected by this question, to adjust it upon their own responsibility and in their own manner, and we shall render another tribute to the original principles of our Government, and furnish another example of its permanence and prosperity."

Mr. Foote. Does the Senator charge that there is any inconsistency or conflicting principles to the two pamphlets?

Mr. Mangum. They do not come in conflict; for one takes the road directly to the North, the other the shortest cut for the South. Mr. Foote. Does the meaning conflict?

Mr. Mangum. The meaning of the two is not at all coincident. They do not approximate each other on the "proviso"; there is no similitude in the subject; there is manifest incongruity, and in the spirit, in the language, in the tone, in the North, General Cass is represented as voting against the "proviso" because offered by a Federal Senator from New England, with a view of embarrassing the Administration in a vigorous prosecution of the war. We all know that Gen. Cass, in season and out of season, whether sleeping or waking, always went for a vigorous prosecution of the war. Why, I can almost fancy that I hear the late Senator, Cass rising from his seat, with his good natural face slightly touched with a shade of anxiety, and moving "the postponement of the previous order, and to proceed to the consideration of the ten regiment bill," and, if opposed, I can almost see the slight air of humble yet slightly tinged, I do not say detracting, from his bearing, invariably courteous and gentlemanly.

low, vulgar, ragsman's deceiver, who had just returned from the war. Sir, the aristocratic editor of the Senator, reminds me of a vulgar story that I have seen or heard somewhere of the Dictionary and all pointed at first with mastery and exquisite skill and written and was produced, and best for "horses" for all the amateurs—the judges of horse flesh—just to touch and alter, so as to exhibit a perfect animal. The amateurs (they were doubtless Democrats of the genus Loco Foco) went to work one elongated the ears; another—but you know the story. As the work proceeded, however, none could have known whether it was ass, lion, or horse. The Senator first works at the ears, (this is instinct—Democratic instinct); he should recollect that the mere ass's ears might make an ass of Balaam—the proud Balaam who that spurred any rider but the master of the world. I mean no disparagement of this body—which for talent, virtue, and patriotism, may not shrink from a comparison with any other. But I mean the people live, move, and have their being in a clear, pure, and calm atmosphere; no cliques, no passions, no prejudices, no artificial standards, no personal interests, strong as we have to bias and thwart strong, sound, plain, common sense. No, sir, this studied—! must think, ungenerous disparagement, can do no harm. It has no purpose to exalt Gen. Taylor. It would be as offensive to his simple tastes as to the aristocratic editor of the Senator. I am not, by nature, strung and tuned to give out the music of eulogy and encomium to men in power or to be in power. It is not my wont, to me it would be a new vocation. Sir, I leave him in his simple dignity and grandeur of character to the people, and the people will do him justice. I would have the *Venus de Medicis* furbled and founced in the tinseled finery of modern millinery! Would you have the statue of Hercules crowned with a tawdry cap and feathers? Would you have me weave garlands for the pinnales of the *Serra Madre*, that lift their heads and bathe their manes in the sunlight far above the region of the clouds. Given down to immortality as they are in history, in poetry, and in song, by the associated glories of the hero of Monterey and Buena Vista, I leave them in their simple grandeur. The people will know how to estimate him. His strong sense, fine sagacity, and piercing judgment—firmness of purpose, integrity of character, and his open downright frankness and honesty of heart—firm and fearless as it is kind and humane. His expansive view—looking to the whole country as his country, and every part of the country as his part of the country—knowing no partisan cliques or mere sectional interests—planting himself upon the constitution and the whole people. All this the people know well.

Sir, I shall support General Taylor, and support him cordially, as the true representative of all the great conservative characteristics of the Whig party. I shall support him as a man of peace—opposed to all wars of conquest—opposed to that rapacious ambition which would pick a quarrel with a neighbor, and then seize his goods. I support him for his sound constitutional views in regard to the relative duties of the respective departments of the government. King Veto will not be put in chains, but confined to his proper sphere. It will not be permitted, as a manarator, to make forays upon every department of the Government and upon every public and private interest. I support him also because I believe he will suffer the will of the people to become the law of the people within constitutional limits; because I believe that things that lie before us in the present hour, will be taken up by the people, and that the people will do them with a firmness and a wisdom that will be a glory to the people and the whole country.

Sir, I shall support General Taylor, and support him cordially, as the true representative of all the great conservative characteristics of the Whig party. I shall support him as a man of peace—opposed to all wars of conquest—opposed to that rapacious ambition which would pick a quarrel with a neighbor, and then seize his goods. I support him for his sound constitutional views in regard to the relative duties of the respective departments of the government. King Veto will not be put in chains, but confined to his proper sphere. It will not be permitted, as a manarator, to make forays upon every department of the Government and upon every public and private interest. I support him also because I believe he will suffer the will of the people to become the law of the people within constitutional limits; because I believe that things that lie before us in the present hour, will be taken up by the people, and that the people will do them with a firmness and a wisdom that will be a glory to the people and the whole country.

What care I whether he has exact and precise views (do we all have them?) upon many of the transient and unimportant questions of the day? Might not Washington have been worried in political metaphysics—say the Resolutions of '98 and '99—by many a knight of the green bag, scarce out of his teens? And one, who would not have been a neighborly neighbor with the trial of a cause of the value of one hundred dollars? And yet the people entrusted in the hands of that same Washington the honor, the safety, and the glory of this great Republic—Were they unwise?

What care I to know, in that his views are moderate, conservative, national, his tendencies toward wholesome and gradual development and progress. He who has learned by experience the miseries and horrors of war, if he be a good man, will generally be the most strenuous advocate of peace, as long as peace can be preserved with national honor. Who so pacific as Washington? Who could have curbed the wild passions and preserved peace during the frenzy of the first French revolution but Washington? Who so powerful an advocate of peace on the continent of Europe as he who struggled on a hundred battle fields—Soul? Who has done so much to preserve the peace of Europe as Wellington, the conqueror of Napoleon I. and A. Taylor, with equal virtue, equal moderation, and equal bravery, will act upon the wise maxims of peace.

OLD ROUGH AND READY. Hearty and hale, on the downhill life, Nurtured by labor and strengthened by strife Gray from exposure, where the danger was rife, Our Zetac has grown rough and grown old. Quick as the flash from the flint and the steel, Prompt to express a true patriot's zeal, He is watchful, and ready, and bold.

Old—like the oak in whose age we delight, Rough—like the diamond whose heart is still bright, Ready to wake like the watch-dog at night, When the wolves shall break into the fold.

Long may he live to his country endeared! Long as his ruler may he be revered! By friends well beloved, and by enemies feared, When the tales of his prowess are told, Boston Atlas.

ONE HUNDRED GUNS FOR STANLEY. Stanley is emphatically the Banner County of the State. Ever since she set up for herself the Loco-foco vote has been growing "Small by degrees and beautifully less." In 1844, it was 81; in 1846 it was 28; and in 1848, out of 772 voters Mr. Reid and Agrarianism, got 26; Mr. Stanley got 100; and the rest of the voters, 746; in 1840 it was 532; and now it is 720. By November we expect to make a clean sweep, so that no Loco shall be left to tell the tale to the breaker of other counties. We shall continue to wear Stanley with a good grace. Many dangers have been averted, but they shall not be averted here. The London Times of July 12th says: "We are inclined to look upon Gen. Taylor as the fittest and best man to be President of the United States, and the one most likely to be raised to that exalted post by the voice of the people."

MR. BADGER AND THE MISCALLED COMPROMISE BILL. We learn from the correspondent of the "Commercial Advertiser" and from other sources, that Mr. Badger, though anxious to alleviate the present excited state of the country upon this question, saw in the passage of this bill no reasonable hope of benefit to the South, and expressly stated that in his opinion, by this bill, the South was yielding everything and gaining nothing. He saw in it nothing in the nature of a compromise. Neither did he believe that it would produce reconciliation or allay excitement. In a few days, however, we hope to receive the published opinions of the Senators, as contained in their arguments. Until then, we content ourselves with the following extract from the correspondent of the "Commercial Advertiser," above referred to:—"Mr. Badger, of N. C. spoke at length in opposition to the bill. He complained of the hot haste which had marked the action of the committee, and regretted that the bill had been reported without a more severe and deliberate investigation of the subject. Indeed he seemed to be of opinion that it would have been much better to postpone the attempt to settle the question in any way, to another session of Congress. He admitted the heated and excited state of the public mind upon the question, but he did not believe that this bill would produce reconciliation, or that it would have any tendency to allay excitement or soften asperities of feeling. "He went on to say that Congress had full jurisdiction over the new territories, and that the only limits and restrictions to its right of legislation were to be found in the constitution. He then said that the doctrine of the Mexican provinces, and that in his judgment it could not exist in those acquired by us unless established there by law. He then set the issue tendered by Mr. Calhoun and his supporters, and distinctly refused to stand upon the "platform" erected by them for the South. He then proceeded to discuss the bill with great distinctness the fallacy of the above doctrine. He supposed that in the course, perhaps, of the present generation, our policy might require that we should by some means obtain possession of an island or fortress in the outskirts of the Chinese Empire, for protection of our commerce. So, could it be supposed that our country would voluntarily surrender to the spot to the laws of slavery? We had the constitutional power to acquire territory for many other purposes besides that of making new states. We might, for instance, in time acquire Cuba, and so far as the question of power was concerned, might hold it or any part of it in a state of tutelage, "to the last syllable of recorded time."

"He showed from the records of the Senate that this doctrine of the constitutional establishment of slavery, without the intervention of law, was altogether new. He spoke of the course of the distinguished Senator Pinckney, of Maryland, upon the Missouri compromise, as the model of great distinctness the fallacy of the above doctrine. He supposed that in the course, perhaps, of the present generation, our policy might require that we should by some means obtain possession of an island or fortress in the outskirts of the Chinese Empire, for protection of our commerce. So, could it be supposed that our country would voluntarily surrender to the spot to the laws of slavery? We had the constitutional power to acquire territory for many other purposes besides that of making new states. We might, for instance, in time acquire Cuba, and so far as the question of power was concerned, might hold it or any part of it in a state of tutelage, "to the last syllable of recorded time."

"Mr. Calhoun said he had the authority of one of the Maryland Senators for saying that Mr. Pinckney was an abolitionist, and therefore his opinion on such an occasion would be taken as the opinion of an abolitionist. Mr. Badger said that if Mr. C. made that charge he should be prepared to prove it. He thought that the very opinion he had then read conclusively proved that Mr. Pinckney was not an abolitionist. "Mr. Calhoun replied that he spoke upon information of a Senator of Maryland—(both these Senators were present at the moment)—that Mr. Pinckney, Badger, whether he was or was not an abolitionist would not affect the weight of his judgment and opinion as a lawyer and a statesman.

"Thus, inasmuch as the law was clearly against the South on this question, and as the Supreme Court would be bound by the law, he considered this bill as giving up the whole question, and he could not vote for it. He would rather vote for a bill expressly declaring that slavery should be excluded from these territories. That would be plain and honest. He was told that by this bill the honor of the South was saved. He did not perceive it, and was not influenced by the argument. "Still he would vote for the bill if he thought it would terminate this dangerous agitation, but he believed it would