

The Weekly Raleigh Register.

VOLUME LIII.

CITY OF RALEIGH, WEDNESDAY MORNING, JULY 14, 1852.

NO. 40.

THE RALEIGH REGISTER.

PUBLISHED BY SEATON GALES, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR, AT \$2.50 IN ADVANCE, OR \$3 AT THE END OF THE YEAR.

PALEIGH, N. C.

REPUBLICAN WHIG TICKET.

FOR PRESIDENT, GEN. WINFIELD SCOTT, OF NEW JERSEY.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT, WILLIAM A. GRAHAM, OF NORTH CAROLINA.

FOR GOVERNOR, JOHN KERR, OF GASWELL, ELECTION ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 9th.

FOR THE SENATE, JOHN W. HARRISS.

FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, SIGN H. ROGERS, MAJ. WILLIE D. JONES, MAJ. WILLIAM F. COLLINS.

N. C. RAIL ROAD COMPANY.

The Board of Directors of this Company met in this City on Tuesday last, and had not adjourned to the moment of our going to Press.

The Stockholders of the Company convened in the Commons Hall, in this City, on Thursday last.

The Board of Directors of this Company met in this City on Tuesday last, and had not adjourned to the moment of our going to Press.

The Stockholders of the Company convened in the Commons Hall, in this City, on Thursday last.

The Board of Directors of this Company met in this City on Tuesday last, and had not adjourned to the moment of our going to Press.

The Stockholders of the Company convened in the Commons Hall, in this City, on Thursday last.

The Board of Directors of this Company met in this City on Tuesday last, and had not adjourned to the moment of our going to Press.

The Stockholders of the Company convened in the Commons Hall, in this City, on Thursday last.

The Board of Directors of this Company met in this City on Tuesday last, and had not adjourned to the moment of our going to Press.

The Stockholders of the Company convened in the Commons Hall, in this City, on Thursday last.

The Board of Directors of this Company met in this City on Tuesday last, and had not adjourned to the moment of our going to Press.

The Stockholders of the Company convened in the Commons Hall, in this City, on Thursday last.

The Board of Directors of this Company met in this City on Tuesday last, and had not adjourned to the moment of our going to Press.

The Stockholders of the Company convened in the Commons Hall, in this City, on Thursday last.

THE GREENSBORO DISCUSSION. FRAUD AND MISREPRESENTATION!

We inserted a hasty postscript in our last, after our paper had gone to Press, in which we pronounced, upon the authority of several highly respectable citizens of Guilford, then and now in this City, the statement of the "Raleigh Standard," that "Mr. Kerr, in that County, refused to commit himself to the basis, as it is,"—changed his tone upon the basis, &c., a corrupt and willful perversion of the facts. We say that we thus denounced these statements at the express authorization of these gentlemen—having received no other information, ourselves, relative to the matter up to that time, and we are certain, that if considered necessary, they will be ready, under their own names, to sustain the assertion. It is proper, here, for us to state, that, with the exception of a few particulars, contained in the letter of the "Standard's" correspondent, which we shall proceed to notice, the denial and denunciation were intended to be confined mainly to the inferences which the Editor of the "Standard," himself, had the disinclination to draw, and the effrontery and recklessness to proclaim as facts. In these "particulars," however, to which we propose now to refer, there are gross misrepresentations.

In the first place,—taking these "particulars" in the order in which they come—the correspondent of the "Standard" asserts that Mr. Kerr declared that "a majority of the people had a right to change their Constitution, and that a majority of the people of the United States had a right to change the Constitution of the United States." And upon the strength of this statement, that paper asks the question, with the view of representing Mr. Kerr to have taken a position that would justify subjecting him to the odium of the people of North Carolina,—"what safety would there be to slave property, if the right were conceded by Southern men, to the people of the United States, to change the Federal Constitution as the result of the action or vote of a bare majority?" Now we are informed, upon evidence that "does not admit of disbelief, that Mr. Kerr took this position. He insisted upon the Republican principle, that a majority have the right to govern, and that, should a majority of the voters of North Carolina declare in favor of a Convention, although that fact would not, of course, of itself, be sufficient for the calling of said Convention, still he recognized a political obligation upon the part of the Legislature to carry the people's wish into execution, which it would not do well to disregard. And in illustrating his meaning, here, and in enforcing his own devotion to the sacred cause of popular rights, he remarked, "if a majority of the People, IN ALL AND EACH OF THE RESPECTIVE STATES, declared in favor of the amendment or change of our Federal Constitution, the man who denied their right to effect it would 'come to the political block.'" Does not the view entertained by Gov. Reid really deny this right? Is the Editor of the "Standard" prepared to deny it? Is there a locofoco leader in North Carolina who will dare to stand up and repudiate this privilege? Did not these leaders, during the last session of the Legislature, on the other hand, actually go so far, in their eager desire to dissolve this glorious Union of ours, as virtually to proclaim that a majority of the people of any single State have the right to break up our existing form of Government? Let us have an answer!

The "Standard's" correspondent also says:—"On the subject of the basis of representation Mr. Kerr's remarks were few. He did not declare here, as it is reported in the Raleigh Register to have done in Raleigh, that he was in favor of 'the present basis remaining as it is.'" He contented himself simply remarking that he was in favor of a mixed basis."

We are authorized to state that Mr. Kerr did expressly declare himself in favor of the present basis of representation in the Legislature remaining as it is; and that, in employing the term "mixed basis," he was unequivocally understood, by every man who chose to understand him, as designating the present basis—a basis upon which persons are represented in the House of Commons, and property in the Senate. He declared it in Guilford, as he has uniformly declared elsewhere, to be the duty of Government to protect the one as well as the other. We need say no more, then, on this point. There needs to be a question of veracity between our informants and this correspondent of the "Standard." We leave the issue between them, simply expressing our own belief—aye, our conviction,—that Mr. Kerr has not varied the shadow of a shade from the position which he has hitherto assumed. And every man who knows him will be with us.

Once more, the "Standard's" informant wishes it understood that "Mr. Kerr omitted to declare in Greensboro, as he had done in the East, that he was opposed to a change in the present mode of distributing the School Fund." And yet, according to this same writer, Reid took special pains, by reiterating the fact two or three times, to have it distinctly understood that Mr. Kerr was opposed to any such change. Are we informed that Mr. Kerr denied having taken any such position, or that he sought, by the slightest evasion or indirection, to escape any consequences to which it might subject him? No—no; but the unjust and slanderous impression is sought to be left that he sought to conceal his opinions, and to induce the people of Guilford to believe that they had not been fairly stated! We learn that no one understood Mr. Kerr as occupying a ground different in the minutest particular from that which he has heretofore taken on this question. The "Greensboro Patriot," a zealous and very able advocate of a change in the basis of which we are speaking, furnishes a lengthy account of the discussion, in which it says:

"It is not our intention to go into any lengthy report of the speeches; because we have copied from the newspapers very full reports of the discussions heretofore, and nothing in addition or differing materially from the past was advanced by either speaker."

THE MANIFESTO—GEN. SCOTT.

Our readers will find, in another column, the manifesto which it was some time since announced was to be put forth by Messrs. Stephens, Toombs, & Co., giving their reasons why they can not support Gen. Scott for the Presidency. A more puerile paper never emanated from the same or any other number of eminent men. Let us examine their reasons briefly:

First, they cannot support him, because "he obstinately refused, up to the time of his nomination, to give any public opinion in favor of the compromise measures." Is this true? Did he not always—on all occasions—express his approval of those measures? Did he not say often, that he labored, while acting as temporary Secretary of War, as faithfully and earnestly as any member of Congress or Officer of the Government, to procure the passage of those measures? And were not these conversations made public? What great publicity was needed, when every body knew the facts, and not one of these gentlemen, themselves, doubted the soundness of Gen. Scott's? But, it seems, they wanted not a public but a private pledge, before his nomination. Gen. Scott had determined, long before the assembling of the Convention, to write no more letters, as Col. POLK, VAN BUREN and TAYLOR did, previous to their nominations. So that, if Gen. Scott was so very obstinate, he was in every respectable company. For ourselves, we regard it as "a feather in his cap," that he refused to let himself down to make written pledges, after the appliances that were brought to bear in order to coerce him to do so. First, the locofocos commenced the game of brag. They challenged, coaxed, dared him to write—attempts to goad him on by calling him the worse candidate, and this cry was caught up by a few indiscreet Whigs. But all this could not induce the old General to put himself in the trap set for him by the locofocos. Hence the real cause of grievance.

But the recusants say that Gen. Scott "has not, since his nomination, made any declaration of his approval of those measures, as a final adjustment of the issues in controversy." Is this true? If he approves his own nomination, he approves the compromise, for, in his letter of acceptance, he says, "I accept the nomination, with the resolutions annexed." But that is by no means all of the approval of the Adjustment, contained in this. He says that if elected, he will neither remain in nor appoint to office, any one "deficient in capacity, or integrity, or in devotion to the Constitution and the Union!" This language had a meaning when he wrote it, and has a meaning yet. Who are and have been called the Constitutional Party—the Union Party? Are they not those who, par excellence, supported the compromise acts, against the malignant attacks of the free-soilers and abolitionists at the North, as well as a much more honest, but equally misguided faction at the South?

Again, Gen. Scott says in his letter:—"I am convinced that harmony and good will between the different quarters of our broad country is essential to the present and future interests of the republic, and with a devotion to those interests that can know no South and no North, I should neither countenance nor tolerate any secession, disorder, faction or resistance to the laws or the Union, on any pretext, in any part of the land."

This surely looks much like "an approval, since his nomination, of those measures," which have done so much to quell this resistance to the laws and to the Union.

The recusants admit, that "the Resolutions of the Convention are as clear and as explicit upon this question, as needed." It would seem, then, that when Gen. Scott accepts the nomination, with the resolutions annexed, his position is as sound as "gold."

The recusants complain that "the only pledge and guaranty he offers for his adherence to the principles of the resolutions are the known incidents of a long public life," &c. What better pledge could they ask? Would these unhappy gentlemen have one letter, or ten, or a thousand, promising faithful adherence to the principles of the resolutions? You have them, gentlemen! written in his own blood. Words are six-penny promises are easily made. Men sometimes make them without any serious intention to keep them. But he who has, by his own strong arm and bold heart, spent forty years in protecting his native land, has promised already to save his country. His heart is in the deed and its best blood has sealed the covenant. Ask no written pledge from such a man, that he will be a patriot hereafter. He who has fought all over his country and covered himself all over with glory will surely know no North and no South, if he will be the head of that glorious country he has fought for and loved so well. His broad breast will swell, and his eye flash with exultant pride, as he looks over this great land—his own native land; his country—his whole country.

But Gen. Scott "has suffered his name to be held up before the people of several of the States as a candidate for the Presidency by the open, avowed enemies of the compromise measures." Pray what ought Gen. Scott to have done in the premises? Should he have written to these "enemies," and repudiated them, individually and collectively. They may have one sound corner in their hearts left, in which they have enthroned the greatest general of the age. Was it his business to have torn himself from that small corner, and called them names, because they, with all their faults, would love him still? His very reasonable gentlemen would put him upon practicing "winning ways to make folks hate him." But the Old Hero is not poetical like them. He has his ways; if people will like them, he can't help it.

But where are these Tertium quidnuncs going in their trepidation at the bare mention of the name of Seward? Will they lie down, side by side, with that wretched Northern malwith Southern feelings—and his son John—and Hale and Giddings, and Preston King, and Chase, and Sumner, and Rantoul—to say nothing of that brace of

THE MANIFESTO—GEN. SCOTT.

Our readers will find, in another column, the manifesto which it was some time since announced was to be put forth by Messrs. Stephens, Toombs, & Co., giving their reasons why they can not support Gen. Scott for the Presidency. A more puerile paper never emanated from the same or any other number of eminent men. Let us examine their reasons briefly:

First, they cannot support him, because "he obstinately refused, up to the time of his nomination, to give any public opinion in favor of the compromise measures." Is this true? Did he not always—on all occasions—express his approval of those measures? Did he not say often, that he labored, while acting as temporary Secretary of War, as faithfully and earnestly as any member of Congress or Officer of the Government, to procure the passage of those measures? And were not these conversations made public? What great publicity was needed, when every body knew the facts, and not one of these gentlemen, themselves, doubted the soundness of Gen. Scott's? But, it seems, they wanted not a public but a private pledge, before his nomination. Gen. Scott had determined, long before the assembling of the Convention, to write no more letters, as Col. POLK, VAN BUREN and TAYLOR did, previous to their nominations. So that, if Gen. Scott was so very obstinate, he was in every respectable company. For ourselves, we regard it as "a feather in his cap," that he refused to let himself down to make written pledges, after the appliances that were brought to bear in order to coerce him to do so. First, the locofocos commenced the game of brag. They challenged, coaxed, dared him to write—attempts to goad him on by calling him the worse candidate, and this cry was caught up by a few indiscreet Whigs. But all this could not induce the old General to put himself in the trap set for him by the locofocos. Hence the real cause of grievance.

But the recusants say that Gen. Scott "has not, since his nomination, made any declaration of his approval of those measures, as a final adjustment of the issues in controversy." Is this true? If he approves his own nomination, he approves the compromise, for, in his letter of acceptance, he says, "I accept the nomination, with the resolutions annexed." But that is by no means all of the approval of the Adjustment, contained in this. He says that if elected, he will neither remain in nor appoint to office, any one "deficient in capacity, or integrity, or in devotion to the Constitution and the Union!" This language had a meaning when he wrote it, and has a meaning yet. Who are and have been called the Constitutional Party—the Union Party? Are they not those who, par excellence, supported the compromise acts, against the malignant attacks of the free-soilers and abolitionists at the North, as well as a much more honest, but equally misguided faction at the South?

Again, Gen. Scott says in his letter:—"I am convinced that harmony and good will between the different quarters of our broad country is essential to the present and future interests of the republic, and with a devotion to those interests that can know no South and no North, I should neither countenance nor tolerate any secession, disorder, faction or resistance to the laws or the Union, on any pretext, in any part of the land."

This surely looks much like "an approval, since his nomination, of those measures," which have done so much to quell this resistance to the laws and to the Union.

The recusants admit, that "the Resolutions of the Convention are as clear and as explicit upon this question, as needed." It would seem, then, that when Gen. Scott accepts the nomination, with the resolutions annexed, his position is as sound as "gold."

The recusants complain that "the only pledge and guaranty he offers for his adherence to the principles of the resolutions are the known incidents of a long public life," &c. What better pledge could they ask? Would these unhappy gentlemen have one letter, or ten, or a thousand, promising faithful adherence to the principles of the resolutions? You have them, gentlemen! written in his own blood. Words are six-penny promises are easily made. Men sometimes make them without any serious intention to keep them. But he who has, by his own strong arm and bold heart, spent forty years in protecting his native land, has promised already to save his country. His heart is in the deed and its best blood has sealed the covenant. Ask no written pledge from such a man, that he will be a patriot hereafter. He who has fought all over his country and covered himself all over with glory will surely know no North and no South, if he will be the head of that glorious country he has fought for and loved so well. His broad breast will swell, and his eye flash with exultant pride, as he looks over this great land—his own native land; his country—his whole country.

But Gen. Scott "has suffered his name to be held up before the people of several of the States as a candidate for the Presidency by the open, avowed enemies of the compromise measures." Pray what ought Gen. Scott to have done in the premises? Should he have written to these "enemies," and repudiated them, individually and collectively. They may have one sound corner in their hearts left, in which they have enthroned the greatest general of the age. Was it his business to have torn himself from that small corner, and called them names, because they, with all their faults, would love him still? His very reasonable gentlemen would put him upon practicing "winning ways to make folks hate him." But the Old Hero is not poetical like them. He has his ways; if people will like them, he can't help it.

But where are these Tertium quidnuncs going in their trepidation at the bare mention of the name of Seward? Will they lie down, side by side, with that wretched Northern malwith Southern feelings—and his son John—and Hale and Giddings, and Preston King, and Chase, and Sumner, and Rantoul—to say nothing of that brace of

THE MANIFESTO—GEN. SCOTT.

Our readers will find, in another column, the manifesto which it was some time since announced was to be put forth by Messrs. Stephens, Toombs, & Co., giving their reasons why they can not support Gen. Scott for the Presidency. A more puerile paper never emanated from the same or any other number of eminent men. Let us examine their reasons briefly:

First, they cannot support him, because "he obstinately refused, up to the time of his nomination, to give any public opinion in favor of the compromise measures." Is this true? Did he not always—on all occasions—express his approval of those measures? Did he not say often, that he labored, while acting as temporary Secretary of War, as faithfully and earnestly as any member of Congress or Officer of the Government, to procure the passage of those measures? And were not these conversations made public? What great publicity was needed, when every body knew the facts, and not one of these gentlemen, themselves, doubted the soundness of Gen. Scott's? But, it seems, they wanted not a public but a private pledge, before his nomination. Gen. Scott had determined, long before the assembling of the Convention, to write no more letters, as Col. POLK, VAN BUREN and TAYLOR did, previous to their nominations. So that, if Gen. Scott was so very obstinate, he was in every respectable company. For ourselves, we regard it as "a feather in his cap," that he refused to let himself down to make written pledges, after the appliances that were brought to bear in order to coerce him to do so. First, the locofocos commenced the game of brag. They challenged, coaxed, dared him to write—attempts to goad him on by calling him the worse candidate, and this cry was caught up by a few indiscreet Whigs. But all this could not induce the old General to put himself in the trap set for him by the locofocos. Hence the real cause of grievance.

But the recusants say that Gen. Scott "has not, since his nomination, made any declaration of his approval of those measures, as a final adjustment of the issues in controversy." Is this true? If he approves his own nomination, he approves the compromise, for, in his letter of acceptance, he says, "I accept the nomination, with the resolutions annexed." But that is by no means all of the approval of the Adjustment, contained in this. He says that if elected, he will neither remain in nor appoint to office, any one "deficient in capacity, or integrity, or in devotion to the Constitution and the Union!" This language had a meaning when he wrote it, and has a meaning yet. Who are and have been called the Constitutional Party—the Union Party? Are they not those who, par excellence, supported the compromise acts, against the malignant attacks of the free-soilers and abolitionists at the North, as well as a much more honest, but equally misguided faction at the South?

Again, Gen. Scott says in his letter:—"I am convinced that harmony and good will between the different quarters of our broad country is essential to the present and future interests of the republic, and with a devotion to those interests that can know no South and no North, I should neither countenance nor tolerate any secession, disorder, faction or resistance to the laws or the Union, on any pretext, in any part of the land."

This surely looks much like "an approval, since his nomination, of those measures," which have done so much to quell this resistance to the laws and to the Union.

The recusants admit, that "the Resolutions of the Convention are as clear and as explicit upon this question, as needed." It would seem, then, that when Gen. Scott accepts the nomination, with the resolutions annexed, his position is as sound as "gold."

The recusants complain that "the only pledge and guaranty he offers for his adherence to the principles of the resolutions are the known incidents of a long public life," &c. What better pledge could they ask? Would these unhappy gentlemen have one letter, or ten, or a thousand, promising faithful adherence to the principles of the resolutions? You have them, gentlemen! written in his own blood. Words are six-penny promises are easily made. Men sometimes make them without any serious intention to keep them. But he who has, by his own strong arm and bold heart, spent forty years in protecting his native land, has promised already to save his country. His heart is in the deed and its best blood has sealed the covenant. Ask no written pledge from such a man, that he will be a patriot hereafter. He who has fought all over his country and covered himself all over with glory will surely know no North and no South, if he will be the head of that glorious country he has fought for and loved so well. His broad breast will swell, and his eye flash with exultant pride, as he looks over this great land—his own native land; his country—his whole country.

But Gen. Scott "has suffered his name to be held up before the people of several of the States as a candidate for the Presidency by the open, avowed enemies of the compromise measures." Pray what ought Gen. Scott to have done in the premises? Should he have written to these "enemies," and repudiated them, individually and collectively. They may have one sound corner in their hearts left, in which they have enthroned the greatest general of the age. Was it his business to have torn himself from that small corner, and called them names, because they, with all their faults, would love him still? His very reasonable gentlemen would put him upon practicing "winning ways to make folks hate him." But the Old Hero is not poetical like them. He has his ways; if people will like them, he can't help it.

But where are these Tertium quidnuncs going in their trepidation at the bare mention of the name of Seward? Will they lie down, side by side, with that wretched Northern malwith Southern feelings—and his son John—and Hale and Giddings, and Preston King, and Chase, and Sumner, and Rantoul—to say nothing of that brace of

THE MANIFESTO—GEN. SCOTT.

Our readers will find, in another column, the manifesto which it was some time since announced was to be put forth by Messrs. Stephens, Toombs, & Co., giving their reasons why they can not support Gen. Scott for the Presidency. A more puerile paper never emanated from the same or any other number of eminent men. Let us examine their reasons briefly:

First, they cannot support him, because "he obstinately refused, up to the time of his nomination, to give any public opinion in favor of the compromise measures." Is this true? Did he not always—on all occasions—express his approval of those measures? Did he not say often, that he labored, while acting as temporary Secretary of War, as faithfully and earnestly as any member of Congress or Officer of the Government, to procure the passage of those measures? And were not these conversations made public? What great publicity was needed, when every body knew the facts, and not one of these gentlemen, themselves, doubted the soundness of Gen. Scott's? But, it seems, they wanted not a public but a private pledge, before his nomination. Gen. Scott had determined, long before the assembling of the Convention, to write no more letters, as Col. POLK, VAN BUREN and TAYLOR did, previous to their nominations. So that, if Gen. Scott was so very obstinate, he was in every respectable company. For ourselves, we regard it as "a feather in his cap," that he refused to let himself down to make written pledges, after the appliances that were brought to bear in order to coerce him to do so. First, the locofocos commenced the game of brag. They challenged, coaxed, dared him to write—attempts to goad him on by calling him the worse candidate, and this cry was caught up by a few indiscreet Whigs. But all this could not induce the old General to put himself in the trap set for him by the locofocos. Hence the real cause of grievance.

But the recusants say that Gen. Scott "has not, since his nomination, made any declaration of his approval of those measures, as a final adjustment of the issues in controversy." Is this true? If he approves his own nomination, he approves the compromise, for, in his letter of acceptance, he says, "I accept the nomination, with the resolutions annexed." But that is by no means all of the approval of the Adjustment, contained in this. He says that if elected, he will neither remain in nor appoint to office, any one "deficient in capacity, or integrity, or in devotion to the Constitution and the Union!" This language had a meaning when he wrote it, and has a meaning yet. Who are and have been called the Constitutional Party—the Union Party? Are they not those who, par excellence, supported the compromise acts, against the malignant attacks of the free-soilers and abolitionists at the North, as well as a much more honest, but equally misguided faction at the South?

Again, Gen. Scott says in his letter:—"I am convinced that harmony and good will between the different quarters of our broad country is essential to the present and future interests of the republic, and with a devotion to those interests that can know no South and no North, I should neither countenance nor tolerate any secession, disorder, faction or resistance to the laws or the Union, on any pretext, in any part of the land."

This surely looks much like "an approval, since his nomination, of those measures," which have done so much to quell this resistance to the laws and to the Union.

The recusants admit, that "the Resolutions of the Convention are as clear and as explicit upon this question, as needed." It would seem, then, that when Gen. Scott accepts the nomination, with the resolutions annexed, his position is as sound as "gold."

The recusants complain that "the only pledge and guaranty he offers for his adherence to the principles of the resolutions are the known incidents of a long public life," &c. What better pledge could they ask? Would these unhappy gentlemen have one letter, or ten, or a thousand, promising faithful adherence to the principles of the resolutions? You have them, gentlemen! written in his own blood. Words are six-penny promises are easily made. Men sometimes make them without any serious intention to keep them. But he who has, by his own strong arm and bold heart, spent forty years in protecting his native land, has promised already to save his country. His heart is in the deed and its best blood has sealed the covenant. Ask no written pledge from such a man, that he will be a patriot hereafter. He who has fought all over his country and covered himself all over with glory will surely know no North and no South, if he will be the head of that glorious country he has fought for and loved so well. His broad breast will swell, and his eye flash with exultant pride, as he looks over this great land—his own native land; his country—his whole country.

But Gen. Scott "has suffered his name to be held up before the people of several of the States as a candidate for the Presidency by the open, avowed enemies of the compromise measures." Pray what ought Gen. Scott to have done in the premises? Should he have written to these "enemies," and repudiated them, individually and collectively. They may have one sound corner in their hearts left, in which they have enthroned the greatest general of the age. Was it his business to have torn himself from that small corner, and called them names, because they, with all their faults, would love him still? His very reasonable gentlemen would put him upon practicing "winning ways to make folks hate him." But the Old Hero is not poetical like them. He has his ways; if people will like them, he can't help it.

But where are these Tertium quidnuncs going in their trepidation at the bare mention of the name of Seward? Will they lie down, side by side, with that wretched Northern malwith Southern feelings—and his son John—and Hale and Giddings, and Preston King, and Chase, and Sumner, and Rantoul—to say nothing of that brace of

THE MANIFESTO—GEN. SCOTT.

Our readers will find, in another column, the manifesto which it was some time since announced was to be put forth by Messrs. Stephens, Toombs, & Co., giving their reasons why they can not support Gen. Scott for the Presidency. A more puerile paper never emanated from the same or any other number of eminent men. Let us examine their reasons briefly:

First, they cannot support him, because "he obstinately refused, up to the time of his nomination, to give any public opinion in favor of the compromise measures." Is this true? Did he not always—on all occasions—express his approval of those measures? Did he not say often, that he labored, while acting as temporary Secretary of War, as faithfully and earnestly as any member of Congress or Officer of the Government, to procure the passage of those measures? And were not these conversations made public? What great publicity was needed, when every body knew the facts, and not one of these gentlemen, themselves, doubted the soundness of Gen. Scott's? But, it seems, they wanted not a public but a private pledge, before his nomination. Gen. Scott had determined, long before the assembling of the Convention, to write no more letters, as Col. POLK, VAN BUREN and TAYLOR did, previous to their nominations. So that, if Gen. Scott was so very obstinate, he was in every respectable company. For ourselves, we regard it as "a feather in his cap," that he refused to let himself down to make written pledges, after the appliances that were brought to bear in order to coerce him to do so. First, the locofocos commenced the game of brag. They challenged, coaxed, dared him to write—attempts to goad him on by calling him the worse candidate, and this cry was caught up by a few indiscreet Whigs. But all this could not induce the old General to put himself in the trap set for him by the locofocos. Hence the real cause of grievance.

But the recusants say that Gen. Scott "has not, since his nomination, made any declaration of his approval of those measures, as a final adjustment of the issues in controversy." Is this true? If he approves his own nomination, he approves the compromise, for, in his letter of acceptance, he says, "I accept the nomination, with the resolutions annexed." But that is by no means all of the approval of the Adjustment, contained in this. He says that if elected, he will neither remain in nor appoint to office, any one "deficient in capacity, or integrity, or in devotion to the Constitution and the Union!" This language had a meaning when he wrote it, and has a meaning yet. Who are and have been called the Constitutional Party—the Union Party? Are they not those who, par excellence, supported the compromise acts, against the malignant attacks of the free-soilers and abolitionists at the North, as well as a much more honest, but equally misguided faction at the South?

Again, Gen. Scott says in his letter:—"I am convinced that harmony and good will between the different quarters of our broad country is essential to the present and future interests of the republic, and with a devotion to those interests that can know no South and no North, I should neither countenance nor tolerate any secession, disorder, faction or resistance to the laws or the Union, on any pretext, in any part of the land."

This surely looks much like "an approval, since his nomination, of those measures," which have done so much to quell this resistance to the laws and to the Union.

The recusants admit, that "the Resolutions of the Convention are as clear and as explicit upon this question, as needed." It would seem, then, that when Gen. Scott accepts the nomination, with the resolutions annexed, his position is as sound as "gold."

The recusants complain that "the only pledge and guaranty he offers for his adherence to the principles of the resolutions are the known incidents of a long public life," &c. What better pledge could they ask? Would these unhappy gentlemen have one letter, or ten, or a thousand, promising faithful adherence to the principles of the resolutions? You have them, gentlemen! written in his own blood. Words are six-penny promises are easily made. Men sometimes make them without any serious intention to keep them. But he who has, by his own strong arm and bold heart, spent forty years in protecting his native land, has promised already to save his country. His heart is in the deed and its best blood has sealed the covenant. Ask no written pledge from such a man, that he will be a patriot hereafter. He who has fought all over his country and covered himself all over with glory will surely know no North and no South, if he will be the head of that glorious country he has fought for and loved so well. His broad breast will swell, and his eye flash with exultant pride, as he looks over this great land—his own native land; his country—his whole country.

But Gen. Scott "has suffered his name to be held up before the people of several of the States as a candidate for the Presidency by the open, avowed enemies of the compromise measures." Pray what ought Gen. Scott to have done in the premises? Should he have written to these "enemies," and repudiated them, individually and collectively. They may have one sound corner in their hearts left, in which they have enthroned the greatest general of the age. Was it his business to have torn himself from that small corner, and called them names, because they, with all their faults, would love him still? His very reasonable gentlemen would put him upon practicing "winning ways to make folks hate him." But the Old Hero is not poetical like them. He has his ways; if people will like them, he can't help it.

But where are these Tertium quidnuncs going in their trepidation at the bare mention of the name of Seward? Will they lie down, side by side, with that wretched Northern malwith Southern feelings—and his son John—and Hale and Giddings, and Preston King, and Chase, and Sumner, and Rantoul—to say nothing of that brace of

WILLIAMS, HAYWOOD & CO.