

From the "National Intelligencer."

THE DUTY OF THE WHIGS.

It is now a subject of grave importance for the Whigs to decide what course they shall pursue during this Presidential campaign. The Democrats, fully aware of the great influence which we will exercise, are endeavoring every where to create the impression that the coming election will be entirely an issue between Democracy and "Republicanism." They would persuade us that Mr. Fillmore will receive so small a support that every vote given to him will either be thrown away, or else will indirectly contribute to the election of Mr. Fremont.

Is this a proper view of the case? It seems to be that the question for every one to decide is, not whose chance for election are best, but which of the candidates now before the people represent the principles that he should best like to see prevail in the administration of the Government. It is evident that the great question now before the people is, *How can we put an end to the dangerous agitation of the subject of slavery?*

This question threatens to destroy the Government. No subject can be touched upon in Congress, no public meeting can anywhere be held, but slavery is made the prominent subject of discussion. We even find it invading the legislative assemblies of our churches, and tending there, as in politics, to produce division and destruction.

Shall these things continue? This is the great question for every lover of his country. This appeals to every Christian in the land, and calls upon him to exert his whole influence to prevent this fell spirit from bringing back our people, if possible, to harmony and brotherly love. How can this be done? To accomplish this what candidate must we sustain? In this latitude, of course, "Republicanism" is out of the question. But even in the North it seems to me that no lover of his country should sustain any party whose very existence depends upon slavery agitation. "Republicanism" presents no other issue. Deprive it of this, and the party must sink. Hence, put an end to slavery agitation and "Republicanism" disappears; sustain "Republicanism" and agitation must and will continue. Such being the alternative, it seems to me that no Conservative of any party, and especially no Whig, either North or South, can hesitate as to his duty. He cannot sustain the "Republican" nomination.

But, say the Democrats, "vote for Mr. Buchanan, and thus put an end to agitation." But can Mr. Buchanan be sustained for any such reason? Will his elevation to the Presidency accomplish any such end? His friends, it is true, say so; but where is the proof of any such position? We need not refer to his antecedents, for he himself has repeatedly said that he would not be elected if he were to do so. He is not a man who is so ready to contradict to avoid truth as to avoid anything except a most immoderate want of firmness and consistency. In his speech to the "Keynote Club" he says: "Now, since I am the representative of the great Democratic party, I am no longer simply James Buchanan, but must square my conduct by the platform upon which I have been placed; a platform which I have solemnly approved, and which I will not change it in the slightest degree; he will neither add nor subtract to it, nor take one from it." The plain English of all which is, that whatever opinions he may hereafter have entertained, he now renounces them all, and adopts and means (if elected) to carry out to the fullest extent every principle and doctrine of the Cincinnati platform. He means to be sincere in this pledge; otherwise he makes a pledge which he means never to fulfill. We are thus forced to believe that he really is sincere, and intends to carry out the platform upon which he has thus solemnly placed himself.

Can, then, a Whig, can any Conservative, support a man who is pledged to that platform? It seems to me that there has never been presented to the American people a platform so pregnant with evil, so dangerous to the honor and welfare of our country. It is the essence of *filibusterism*—looking evidently to the acquisition of more territory in the Gulf of Mexico; determined at all hazards to assert and maintain the *Monroe doctrine*, as the erosion of which must inevitably involve us continually in war. Is the country ready to sustain any such policy? Can the Whigs hazard the peace and prosperity of the country upon any such issue? If not, how can we sustain, either directly or indirectly, the party that advocates such doctrines? And especially, how can we support Mr. Buchanan, whose celebrated *Outland manifesto* has committed him to an extent beyond the limits of the Cincinnati platform. In that manifesto he does not hesitate to say that he will not be elected if he is to do so. He has even offered to purchase it, and if Spain should refuse to sell, then take it by force. Such is Mr. Buchanan's position.

Can he be trusted with the administration of our foreign affairs? It is vain for his friends to speak of his conservatism; here are his own words, which he has solemnly approved, and which he has solemnly pledged to carry out. Can he be trusted with the administration of our domestic affairs? His antecedents (see his Lancaster resolutions, speeches in Congress, &c.) show him to be a Freesoiler. As such, he was evidently supported by the North in the Cincinnati Convention. Reference to the record will show that during many ballots he received more votes from the South, save those of Virginia and Louisiana. The South preferred Mr. Pierce or Mr. Douglas. But, as Mr. Buchanan has repudiated his own antecedents, we perhaps ought to do so too; and shall only inquire, what is his present position on that question? In his letter of acceptance he fully endorses the Cincinnati platform of the Democratic party as represented by Mr. Pierce. Thus Mr. Buchanan assumes the responsibilities of the action of the Democratic party during the last three years. Let us consider:—

In March, 1853, Mr. Fillmore retired from the Government, and left the country in the enjoyment of the most profound quiet; nowhere was there the sound of discord; all was peace and harmony. Men of all parties acknowledged and applauded the firmness and ability of Mr. Fillmore, which had accomplished so happy a result; all parties pledged themselves to sustain it; and Mr. Pierce was elected by the influence of the following resolution, adopted in the Democratic platform of 1852:

"Resolved, That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the question of slavery, whether by shape or color the attempt may be made."

Such was their language in 1852? Could it be stronger? Could a party be more fully pledged? And was not this pledge repeated over and over again, on the stump, in Congress, and even in the President's inaugural? But what was their action? They were hardly in power before they proposed and effected the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and created a storm of agitation greater than has ever before swept over this country!

I do not stop here to inquire whether the Missouri Compromise was constitutional or not, nor whether the rights of any section demanded its repeal. It is sufficient to know that it had been in quiet, peaceful operation for more than thirty years, and that the Democrats deliberately and without qualms effected its repeal, and put down all agitation of the question, from whatever quarter it might come. Under such pledges

they were bound to maintain it under all circumstances. Why did they not do it? What advantage has been gained that is at all commensurate with the injury that has been inflicted upon the country? So far its only fruits have been discord, contention, yes, even civil war. How appalling the idea, much less the reality of civil war! A strife brought on by the insane ultramas of the South and the fanaticism of the North; the one as dangerous to our peace and happiness as the other; the one just as necessary to be quieted as the other; for both alike entail nothing but distraction and blood.

Here again I ask, how can this disastrous condition be remedied? Certainly not by retaining in power the party which has brought it upon us. Certainly not by retaining in power a party that has violated its every pledge on this subject, however solemnly made; which has sacrificed every thing to party ends and party triumph; which has forced upon us a storm of agitation of which no man can now see the result. Has not all this been done by the Democratic party? And does not Mr. Buchanan endorse it to the fullest extent? Is he, then, fit to represent the conservation of the country? Can the conservatives support any such man or any such party? If, then, they cannot support Mr. Fremont or Mr. Buchanan, what can they do? It certainly will not do to nominate another candidate; for this will only contribute to the success of the Democrats. There only remains Mr. Fillmore. Can the conservatives of the country support him? It seems to me that no conservative can hesitate in the present position of parties. Whatever may be said by Democratic politicians, the fact remains the same, viz. that Mr. Fillmore occupies a position intermediate between each extreme North and South. As such he is necessary, and I trust will receive the support of every one that is desirous to see peace and harmony once more shed their happy influence throughout the land. What matters it though his chances for success are not at present so certain as his friends would like to see? The question, as said above, is not what policy dictates, but what is our duty. Is Mr. Fillmore qualified by his experience and principles to administer the Government? Does he maintain those principles which we desire to see prevail? If so, he is entitled to the support of every true patriot, and should receive it, despite every obstacle. Let us discharge our duty irrespective of consequences. Let us do what is right, and leave the result in the hands of Providence. If we thus act, will we not succeed? Is there not conservatism and patriotism enough in the land to put down all the excitement which reckless partisans have forced upon us? I feel confident that there is. We have the power; we need only exert it, and every thing is safe.

Come, then, all ye lovers of your country!—Resolve that you will assert and maintain your rights at all hazards; that you will preserve intact the glorious inheritance that we have received from the fathers of the Constitution; that *disunion to law shall be enforced*; that justice shall be meted to all of every section. Thus, and thus alone, can we restore and maintain that harmony and good will which should ever prevail among us, but I fear is now rapidly departing from us. Something must be done. This is the end let us rally around MILLARD FILLMORE. His is a position that none can assail. He has been fully tried, and found equal to every emergency. He has proved able to pilot us through a storm, and can he not steer us safely through the one that now threatens to overwhelm us? Shall we throw him aside and trust ourselves to the fickleness and timidity of Mr. Buchanan; or can we risk the youth and inexperience of Mr. Fremont? No! But let us turn to him who, having experience of past service in the administration of the Government, may be permitted to refer to that as the exponent of the future, and to say that should the choice of the American Convention be sanctioned by the people, he shall, with the same scrupulous regard for the rights of every section of the Union which then influenced his conduct, endeavor to perform every duty confided by the Constitution and laws to the Executive."

P. C. W.

CONGRESSIONAL.

WASHINGTON, June 30.—Senate.—A bill authorizing the issue of additional arms for the use of the State of California was passed.

Mr. Douglas, from the committee on Territories, to which was referred various bills relative to affairs in Kansas, made a voluminous report. The Committee reported a new bill for the appointment of 15 Commissioners selected from different sections of the Union, to take the census of Kansas, and provide for a fair election of delegates to a convention to form a State Constitution. No test save three months residence being required to vote.

Mr. Douglas gave notice that he would ask a vote on the bill on Wednesday.

The Senate then adjourned.

House.—Mr. Groves, of Pa., made the closing speech in favor of the admission of Kansas, proposing all substitutes for the measure under consideration.

Mr. Stephens, of Ga., moved to re-commit the bill, with instructions to report a substitute therefor, providing for the appointment, by the President, of 5 persons, to take the census, with a view to a Convention—formation of State constitution.

Mr. Dunn moved an amendment to Mr. Stephens' motion, restoring the Missouri Compromise, which was adopted by 7 majority.

Mr. Stephens ineffectually attempted to withdraw his motion, being opposed to Mr. Dunn's amendment.

The House voted down Mr. Stephens' motion.

The resolution to commit without the instructions was rejected by a vote of 106, yeas 109.

Mr. Jones, of Tenn., moved to table the bill, which was lost by one majority.

The vote was taken, and the bill for the admission of Kansas with a free State constitution was rejected—yeas 106, yeas 107.

The result was hailed with clapping of hands and other demonstrations of joy, by the enemies of the bill, while its friends exhibited signs of mortification and disappointment.

The House then adjourned amid much confusion.

WASHINGTON, July 1.—SENATE.—The Senate adopted a resolution calling on the President for information relative to the proclamation of martial law and the arrest of the Judge of the District Court of Washington Territory by Gov. Stevens.

Mr. Collamer submitted a minority report on the Committee on Territories in regard to Kansas affairs. It was read and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Thompson, of Kentucky, spoke against the bill in favor of the bill reported yesterday. Mr. Bigler also.

Mr. Hale opposed it.

Mr. Adams moved to amend the bill by striking out the part which gives suffrage to all persons who shall have filed a declaration of the intention to become citizens of the United States, in compliance with the naturalization laws.

Mr. Crittenden favored the amendment.

Adjourned.

Horne.—Mr. Barclay moved a reconsideration of the vote rejecting the Kansas bill.

Mr. Houston moved to table the motion, but nothing further was done with the subject, it being superseded by the report of the Kansas Investigating Committee, which was read.

they were bound to maintain it under all circumstances. Why did they not do it? What advantage has been gained that is at all commensurate with the injury that has been inflicted upon the country? So far its only fruits have been discord, contention, yes, even civil war. How appalling the idea, much less the reality of civil war! A strife brought on by the insane ultramas of the South and the fanaticism of the North; the one as dangerous to our peace and happiness as the other; the one just as necessary to be quieted as the other; for both alike entail nothing but distraction and blood.

Here again I ask, how can this disastrous condition be remedied? Certainly not by retaining in power the party which has brought it upon us. Certainly not by retaining in power a party that has violated its every pledge on this subject, however solemnly made; which has sacrificed every thing to party ends and party triumph; which has forced upon us a storm of agitation of which no man can now see the result. Has not all this been done by the Democratic party? And does not Mr. Buchanan endorse it to the fullest extent? Is he, then, fit to represent the conservation of the country? Can the conservatives support any such man or any such party? If, then, they cannot support Mr. Fremont or Mr. Buchanan, what can they do? It certainly will not do to nominate another candidate; for this will only contribute to the success of the Democrats. There only remains Mr. Fillmore. Can the conservatives of the country support him? It seems to me that no conservative can hesitate in the present position of parties. Whatever may be said by Democratic politicians, the fact remains the same, viz. that Mr. Fillmore occupies a position intermediate between each extreme North and South. As such he is necessary, and I trust will receive the support of every one that is desirous to see peace and harmony once more shed their happy influence throughout the land. What matters it though his chances for success are not at present so certain as his friends would like to see? The question, as said above, is not what policy dictates, but what is our duty. Is Mr. Fillmore qualified by his experience and principles to administer the Government? Does he maintain those principles which we desire to see prevail? If so, he is entitled to the support of every true patriot, and should receive it, despite every obstacle. Let us discharge our duty irrespective of consequences. Let us do what is right, and leave the result in the hands of Providence. If we thus act, will we not succeed? Is there not conservatism and patriotism enough in the land to put down all the excitement which reckless partisans have forced upon us? I feel confident that there is. We have the power; we need only exert it, and every thing is safe.

Come, then, all ye lovers of your country!—Resolve that you will assert and maintain your rights at all hazards; that you will preserve intact the glorious inheritance that we have received from the fathers of the Constitution; that *disunion to law shall be enforced*; that justice shall be meted to all of every section. Thus, and thus alone, can we restore and maintain that harmony and good will which should ever prevail among us, but I fear is now rapidly departing from us. Something must be done. This is the end let us rally around MILLARD FILLMORE. His is a position that none can assail. He has been fully tried, and found equal to every emergency. He has proved able to pilot us through a storm, and can he not steer us safely through the one that now threatens to overwhelm us? Shall we throw him aside and trust ourselves to the fickleness and timidity of Mr. Buchanan; or can we risk the youth and inexperience of Mr. Fremont? No! But let us turn to him who, having experience of past service in the administration of the Government, may be permitted to refer to that as the exponent of the future, and to say that should the choice of the American Convention be sanctioned by the people, he shall, with the same scrupulous regard for the rights of every section of the Union which then influenced his conduct, endeavor to perform every duty confided by the Constitution and laws to the Executive."

P. C. W.

THE RALEIGH REGISTER.

PUBLISHED BY
SEATON GALES,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.
AT \$2 50 IN ADVANCE; OR, \$3 00 AT
THE END OF THE YEAR.

"Ours are the plans of fair, delightful peace,
Unwarped by party rage to live like brothers."

RALEIGH, N. C.

SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 6, 1856.

NATIONAL AMERICAN TICKET!

FOR PRESIDENT,

MILLARD FILLMORE.

OF NEW YORK.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,

ANDREW J. DONELSON.

OF TENNESSEE.

AMERICAN ELECTORAL TICKET,

FOR THE STATE AT LARGE.

L. B. CARMICHAEL, of Wilkes.

JOHN W. CAMERON, of Cumberland.

1st District, Lewis Thompson, of Bertie.

2d " O. P. Meares, of New Hanover.

3d " Jas. T. Littlejohn, of Granville.

4th " J. S. Stearns, of Chatham.

5th " Gen. J. M. Leach, of Davidson.

6th " J. A. Dargatz, of Anson.

7th " Geo. D. Hyman, of Buncombe.

8th " Geo. D. Hyman, of Buncombe.

FOR GOVERNOR,

JOHN A. GILMER,

OF GUILFORD COUNTY.

1. Resolved, That we reaffirm and approve the platform of principles laid down by the American Convention which assembled in Philadelphia in February last.

2. Resolved, That we are in favor of a progressive system of Internal Improvement, such as will ultimately develop the resources of the State, and such as will not burden the people with oppressive taxation.

3. Resolved, That we are opposed to the policy of the General Government in squandering the public lands to provide homesteads for foreign paupers and convicts.

4. Resolved, That we are in favor of a protective system of tariff, such as will protect the industry of the State, and such as will not burden the people with oppressive taxation.

5. Resolved, That in order that the paramount principles of Americanism may not be trampled in the ensuing contest by the selfishness of party, we, the undersigned, do hereby pledge ourselves to maintain the Union, and to support the Government, and to sustain the representative body of the people.

6. Resolved, That we are in favor of the platform adopted by the American Convention, and to support the Government, and to sustain the representative body of the people.

7. Resolved, That we are in favor of the platform adopted by the American Convention, and to support the Government, and to sustain the representative body of the people.

8. Resolved, That we are in favor of the platform adopted by the American Convention, and to support the Government, and to sustain the representative body of the people.

MR. GILMER'S APPOINTMENTS.

The following additional appointments have been made for Mr. Gilmer. Gov. Bragg will speak at Tarboro' on the 7th, and at Warsaw on the 9th. The friends of Mr. Gilmer have left him without appointment for the 9th, giving him the privilege of resting that day, or of meeting Gov. Bragg at Warsaw, as he shall see fit.

Kenansville, - - - July 7th.
Clinton, - - - July 8th.
Wilmington, - - - July 10th.
Upper Town Creek Bridge, - - - July 11th.
Whiteville, - - - July 12th.
Elizabethtown, - - - July 14th.
Fayetteville, - - - July 16th.

FOURTH OF JULY.

We put our paper to press considerably in advance of the usual time of publication, in order to afford the hands in our office an opportunity of participating in the celebration of the Anniversary of our National Independence.

Upon such a day we would like to see party feeling buried in oblivion for the time, and the true people of all sections of the country offer to Heaven their thanks to God for the blessings bestowed upon them, and a prayer for the continuance of His gracious favor. The present is a very appropriate time for an outburst of patriotic enthusiasm, when fanaticism is working treason in our land, and the torch of civil war has been lighted in our primitive forests—when fierce animosity and bitter rancor run rampant in our national councils—when the hideous form of Disunion sits enthroned in our national capital, and casts its ghastly, frightful gaze upon the trembling patriots—when discord is about to gain the way over peace and harmony, and make our fair land one desolate waste—when a deep doom of woe comes surging up from the depths of the great and now muddy political ocean—and the wayward passions of misguided statesmen are stifling in the great heart of the nation that love of law and order which is the best and most precious ornament of a free people.

We believe that celebrations of Anniversaries of this kind have a good effect in moulding the minds of rising generations. They are the semblance of departed momentous events, which, when presented to the minds of youth, "dwell on remembrance through the mist of time." They give an exalted opinion of the events celebrated, and tend to induce the mind to inquire after history. Besides, they tend to instill into the hearts of our youth that intense and undying love of country which is essential to the perpetuation of her existence.

Bitter things are being said by his party of the present incumbent of the White House, now that his day of power are drawing to a close. The Michigan Democracy gravely thanked Gov. by resolution, that his administration is nearly ended. A delegate to the Cincinnati Convention said that he was selected in '55 because he was unknown, and rejected in '56 because he was known. Old Bullion says he came into power almost unanimously and goes out the same way. Locofocoism imitates the Persian habit of keeping the face to the rising, and the back to the setting, sun.

P. H. Winston, Esq., has declined being a candidate for the Legislature in Bertie, and John Wilson has been nominated in his stead. Mr. Wilson is said to be very popular. Mr. Winston declines on account of his private and professional engagements.

ANOTHER TELLING SPEECH FROM MILLARD FILLMORE—RECEPTION AT ROCHESTER.

The arrangements for receiving Mr. Fillmore at Rochester were entirely of an impromptu character. It was not known before the forenoon, when Mr. Fillmore would arrive, and little more than a mere notice of the fact could be given. The result demonstrates anew that the mere announcement of Mr. Fillmore's presence is sufficient to call the people together, as no man has done since Henry Clay's last days. The People were on hand; and they came because they wanted to—because they meant it, and desired to signify their approbation of a man they knew to be safe and equal to the crisis.

To an Address of welcome from the Mayor, Mr. Fillmore replied in the following noble and patriotic language:—

"After returning his thanks for the manner in which he had been received, and for the flattering terms in which the Chairman had been pleased to speak of his administration, Mr. Fillmore said that he had no reason to disguise his sentiments on the subject of the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, which seemed to be the chief source of the unfortunate agitation that now disturbed the peace of the country. He said that it would be recollected, that when he came into the Administration, the country was agitated from centre to circumference with the exciting subject of slavery. This question was then forced upon the country by the acquisition of new territory; and he feared that the eloquent address of the Chairman had given him more credit for the settlement of that question than he was entitled to—not more, however, than he would have deserved, had his power equalled his desires. But the truth was, that many noble patriots, Whigs and Democrats, in both houses of Congress, rallied around, and sustained the Administration in this trying time, and to them was chiefly due the merit of settling this exciting controversy. Those measures, usually called the Compromise Measures of 1850, were not in all respects what I could have desired, but they were the best that could be obtained after a protracted discussion that shook the Republic to its very foundation, and I felt bound to give them my official approval. Not only this, but perceiving there was a disposition to renew the agitation at the next session, I took the responsibility of declaring, in substance, in my annual message, that I regarded these measures as a 'final settlement' of this question, and that the laws thus passed were to be maintained until rule and time and experience should demonstrate the necessity of modification or repeal."

I then thought that this exciting subject was at an end, and there would be no further occasion to introduce it into the legislation of Congress. Territorial governments had been provided for all the territory except that covered by the Missouri Compromise, and I had no suspicion that that was to be disturbed. I have no hesitation in saying, what most of you know already, that I was decidedly opposed to the disturbance of that Compromise. Good faith, as well as the peace of the country, seemed to require, that a Compromise which had stood for more than thirty years should not be wantonly disturbed—expressed, verbally and in writing to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time selecting its candidates for President and Vice President exclusively from the Northern States, with the avowed intention of speeding them, to govern the Missouri question, and to write to all my friends, North and South, who solicited my opinion. This repeal seems to have been a Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the political evils that now afflict the country, scarcely leaving a hope behind, and many, I perceive, are ready to attribute all these to our Southern brethren. But is this just? (No, no.) It must be borne in mind, that this measure originated with a Northern Senator, and was not sanctioned by a Northern President. I do not recollect that ever a petition from a Southern State solicited this repeal; and it must be remembered that when a Northern administration, with large numbers of Northern Senators and Northern members, offered the Southern States the Missouri Compromise, they were met with a refusal. The friends of the measure, therefore, are chiefly chargeable to those who originated this measure; and however we may deplore the act, it affords just ground for controversy with our Southern brethren—certainly none by which they should be deprived of their political rights. But, we now see a party organized in the North, and for the first time