THOMAS J. LEMAY,
Propr ietor.

TERMS.

Subscription, three dollars per annum—half in advance.

☞Persons residing without the State will be required to pay the *whole* amount of the year's subscription in advance.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

For every square (not exceeding 16 lines this size type) first insertion, one dollar; each subsequent insertion, twenty-five cents.

☞ The advertisements of Clerks and Sheriffs will be charged 25 per cent. higher; and a deduction of 33⅓ per cent will be made from the regular prices for advertisers by the year.

Letters to the Editor must be post-paid

PETERS' PILLS

"The true Riches of Life is Health.

We know that health and the ability to labor constitutes the wealth of the great mass of the people in this, as in most other countries To preserve therefore, that health by natural means is a grand, moral and political scheme, to fulfil which requires our utmost attention. The unprecedented popularity and universal approbation which this medicine has achieved throughout the United States, the Canadas Texas, Mexico and the West Indies fully justify Dr. Peters in warmly and conscientiously recommending them to the special attention of the afflicted.

Dr Peters has spent much time in experimenting with different vegetable medicines, for diseases of the liver, and now offers his vegetable Pills, as the best, most convenient, and cheapest medicine that can be prepared for general use.

One great quality of his vegetable Pills is that they have the alterative principle combined with their cathartic, or operative qualities, so that they not only cleanse the stomach and bowels by purging, but they regulate the liver, change the morbid secretions, strengthen the digestive organs, purify the blood, invigorate the circulation, and give tone and energy to the nervous system.

They are mild and pleasant in their operation, and convey almost immediate conviction of their utility from their first dose. They can be taken with safety by persons of any age; and the feeble, the infirm, the nervous and the delicate, are strengthened by their operation, because they clear the system of bad humors, quiet nervous irritability, and invariably produce sound health.

The vegetable Pills are a sure remedy for jaundice, sick and nervous headache, dyspepsia, costiveness, sickness of the stomach, heartburn, all bilious complaints, fevers of all kinds, and if taken at the commencement will invariably check their progress, and save the patient from a protracted and dangerous sickness. They are invaluable in nervous and hypocondriacal affections, loss of appetite, and all complaints to which females alone are subject. They operate as a mild and speedy purge, and are a safe and certain remedy for worms in children.

Extract of a letter from Mr. Gurney of New Orleans, La., Oct. 9, 1837 —"I have received much assistance in my practice, especially in jaundice and yellow fever, from the use of Peters' Pills. I presume that, on an average, I prescribe one hundred boxes in a month."

Extract of a letter from Dr. Prichard of Hudson N. Y., June 3. 1836. "I was aware that Dr. Peters was one of the best chemists in the United States, and felt assured that he would some day (from his intimate knowledge of the properties of herbs and drugs) produce an efficient medicine. They are indeed a superior medicine, and reflect credit alike upon the chemist, the physician, and the philosopher.

Extract of a letter from Dr. Waines, of Cincinnati, Feb 2 1838 —"Your Pills are the mildest in their operations, and yet most powerful in their effects, of any that I have ever met within a practice of eight and twenty years. Their action on the chyle, and hence on the impurities of the blood, is evidently very surprising."

Extract of a letter from Dr. Scott of Baltimore, Dec. 17, 1836.- "I am in the daily habit of prescribing them, (Peters' Pills) and they in nearly all cases answered my purpose. I have discarded other medicines, some of them very good ones, in their favor."

Augusta, Ga Feb'y 10, 1839.

To Dr. Peters Sir—For upwards of fifteen months I have been cruelly afflicted with Fever and Ague; and during the time could find nothing —though I had applied to every thing, that gave me any thing like permanent relief. At length, however, your pills were recommended to me, by one of our best physicians, and I am most grateful and happy in being able to add, that I had scarcely used two boxes when I found that they had restored me to perfect health — Since then, various members of my family have used them with equal success—and consequently I feel it my duty to apprise you of the fact, and to request of you to publish this certificate, as I am anxious to add my public testimony to the almost miraculous virtues of your unrivalled medicine. Respectfully yours,

THEODORE JAMES.

Charlotte, N. C., Jan. 1, 1837.

Dear Sir—I have made frequent use of your pills in the incipient stage of bilious fever, and obstinate constipation of the bowels; also, in the enlargement of the spleen, chronic diseases of the liver, sick head-ache, general debility, and and in all cases have found them to be very effective J D BOYD M D.

Mecklenburg co, Va. Feb. 27, 1837.

Having used Dr. Peters' pills in my practice for the last 12 months, I take pleasure in giving my testimony of their good effects in cases of dyspepsia, sick head-ache, bilious fevers, and other diseases, produced by inactivity of the liver. They are a safe and mild aperient, being the best article of the kind I ever used.

GEORGE C. SCOTT, M. D.

The following is from a highly respectable Planter of Burke county, Ga. July 10, 1837.

Peters' Pills I have given them a fair trial; nearly three dozen boxes have been used on my plantation the last year—their administration in such attended with more success than any medicine I have ever used, and I take pleasure in recommending them to my friends and neighbours; they are handy, safe and efficient, and need but a trial to be approved

HENRY P JONES.

Communication received from the eminent Dr. J. H from of Florence, Ga. March 13. 1839

Dr. J P Peters My Dear Sir—On the night of the 11th instant, I was called in great haste to the house of a fellow citizen (Mr. Lee) where I found his son – a child of six years old, laboring under a most alarming attack of Cynanche Trachealis (Croup) and apparently beyond the aid of remedy. By the greatest good fortune, however, I had in my pocket a broken box of your pills—two of which I administered, with such an immediately happy effect that in a few minutes my patient was at ease, and out of danger. This case, in connection with my name is at your service—and I have the pleasure to be able to inform you that your invaluable medicine is in such great favor with the faculty here, that I believe there is not one of them who does not use it in his private practice. Yrs most resp'y

J. H IRWIN, M D

These extraordinary and justly celebrated Pills, are sold in Raleigh by Williams & Haywood and W. M. Mason & Co, and throughout the United States, the Canadas, Texas, Mexico, and the West Indies.

COACHES, BAROUCHES, &c.

HOS COBB respectfully informs his friends, and the public generally, that he has on hand, and has had, a very handsome lot of work, consisting of COACHES, BAROUCHES, and BUGGIES; all of which have been manufactured out of the best materials, and are finished in the latest fashion. He has no hesitation in recommending them as an excellent article, and the style in which they are finished, will, he thinks, bear comparison with any Carriages ever in this market,

The above work, or any part of it, will be sold very low, if applied for soon,

Raleigh, March 18, 1840.

11-4t

RALEIGH STAR,
And North Carolina Gazette.

VOL. XXXI } "North Carolina—Powerful in moral, in intellectual, and in physical resources—the land of our sires, and the home of our affections." { NO. 15.

RALEIGH, N. C WEDNSDAY, APRIL 8, 1840.

HUGH McQUEEN
THOS. J. LEMAY } Editors.

RALEIGH. APRIL 8, 1840.

THE PEOPLE'S TICKET.

FOR PRESIDENT,
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,

The invincible Hero of Tippecanoe—he incorruptible Statesman—the inflexible Republican—the patriot Farmer of Ohio.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
JOHN TYLER,

A State Rights' Republican of the school of '98, one of Virginia's noblest sons, and emphatically one of America's most sagacious, virtuous and patriotic statesmen.

☞ The broad banner of HARRISON, LIBERTY and the CONSTITUTION is now flung to the breeze, inscribed with the inspiring motto —ONE PRESIDENTIAL TERM—THE INTEGRITY OF THE PUBLIC SERVANTS —THE SAFETY OF THE PUBLIC MONEY—THE DIVISION OF THE PUBLIC LANDS—THE DOWNFALL OF ABOLITION—AND THE GENERAL GOOD OF THE PEOPLE.

FOR GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA,
JOHN M. MOREHEAD,
OF GUILFORD COUNTY,

The able statesman—the sound republican—the pure patriot—the honest man.

SPEECH OF MR. STANLY,
OF NORTH CAROLINA,
ON THE SUBJECT OF ABOLITION PETITIONS.

[Continued.]

Does the gentleman hear this? Write on, write on—but your constituents shall hear this yet. Yes, the South will hear it, and yet be true to herself; she will yet thank this great man Henry Clay, for those "extraordinary efforts" by which he protected the rights of the Southern people and tranquilized a distracted country. Well might this Van Buren abolitionist find fault with these extraordinary powers; Nature has endowed him with extraordinary gifts, and he has often used them for the good of his country. I may now speak of him without being suspected of fawning for favor; he has no patronage or power to confer: though he has not always commanded success, he has done more, he has deserved it.

[Mr. Parmenter here rose to explain. With the permission of the gentleman I wish here to interpose a word in behalf of Governor Morton. The gentleman has read his letter on the subject of slavery, but he does not draw the distinction between anti-slavery and abolitionism. One is a mere opinion—a sentiment; the other is the policy of a party who are ready to carry their measures against the Constitution. Let me also state a fact: The organ of the abolitionists in Massachusetts was opposed to Morton's election; it is therefore manifest that they had not confidence in him as an abolitionist. I wish the gentleman would define abolitionism more strictly

Mr Stanly. What is your definition of it?

Mr. Parmenter said, it is the project of a party disposed to carry abolition in the District of Columbia without reference to the welfare of the nation, and without regard to the Constitution.

Mr. Stanly asked him, are you an abolitionist?

Mr. Parmenter. No.]

Mr. Stanly. Very well. The gentleman says Mr. Morton is an anti-slavery man, but not an abolitionist! Is his colleague, (Mr. Williams,) whose letter I have read, an anti-slavery man or an abolitionist? Listen Mr. Speaker, and you, advocates of the humbug resolutions, to the language of these "anti-slavery" men.— Hear these words from one who is said not to be an abolitionist Read for yourselves the letters of H. Williams, W. Parmenter, and Marcus Morton, all true Van Buren men, and tell me what you think of this distinction. These anti-slavery men, who look upon slavery as "the greatest curse which a righteous God ever inflicted upon a nation;" who think it is the imperative duty of Congress to adopt *immediate* measures for its abolition in the District of Columbia; these men, we are to be told, are not abolitionists! Really, sir the gentleman will be famous for the clearness of his distinctions. He will deserve to have it said of him—

"He could distinguish and divide
A hair 'twixt south and south west side."

I will send these definitions to my constituents, and let them judge of their sincerity.

[Here some gentleman offered to move an djournment.] No, no; I will not go into the second day; the Globe would publish me, and get certificates, too, to prove it, as having consumed a week, and rail at my spending the public money by consumption of time.

I said, sir, I had a letter signed Abbot Lawrence, of Boston, which I will now read to the House. I am willing this letter should be contrasted with those from the same State I have just read:

Boston, October 24, 1839.

Gentlemen: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 21st, in which you ask me whether I am in favor of the "immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia," and "whether I am opposed to the admission of any new State into the Union whose Constitution may tolerate slavery."

I answer, in regard to the first question, that my vote would depend upon the circumstances, terms, and conditions under which such a bill should be presented to Congress.

An answer to the second proposition may be found upon the Journals of the Twenty-fourth Congress, and to the votes I then gave I now refer you

In regard to that part of your letter which alludes to politicians obtaining power by a non-committal policy, in the concealment of their opinions, I beg leave to avail myself of the present occasion to state that I do not entertain opinions which I wish to conceal upon any subject, especially upon those concerning the public welfare.

I have been again brought before the People for their suffrages, not with any agency of my own, but contrary to my wishes, and reluctantly consented, after strong and urgent solicitations of my personal friends, to be a candidate for Congress.

The approaching session will doubtless be one of deep interest to the country, and, should I be elected, I shall devote my humble energies to promote what I believe to be for the permanent interests of the whole People. I wish you, gentlemen, and every other individual who has the right to cast a vote in this district, to believe that I shall not give pledges of any kind whatsoever to support particular men or measures; and those of my fellow-citizens who honor me with their suffrages will understand that I must be left to pursue that course of conduct in legislation which commends itself to my judgment, and that the question of slavery, and all others upon which I may be called to act, must be open and free to me as the air we breathe

If my character is sufficient to give me a majority of the votes upon such conditions, I shall be ready to take my place in Congress and serve the people to the best of my abilities.

I thank you, gentlemen, for the expressions of respect contained in your letter, while

I remain your obedient servant,
ABBOT LAWRENCE.

To Francis Jackson, Charles Frueworth Hildreth, Thomas R. Sewall, Ellis Gray Loring, Esquires, Boston.

It was needless, sir, for the author of this manly, independent letter to say he had no opinions he wished to conceal. All who know this gentleman will acknowledge the truth of this; all who know him believe he is ready to devote his energies for the permanent interests of the whole People. You do not see here any gross denunciations of slavery. No attempt to anger of Heaven upon what abolitionists call this great evil. Such a man is worthy to represent that People, and to serve his country.

I now pass to the Gibraltar of the Union—little Rhode Island. I do not speak of her as the Gibraltar in reference to her size, but because she nobly resisted the assaults of Toryism last fall. The gentlemen who so ably represent her on this floor were pronounced abolitionists, because they voted against the dough-faced, humbug resolutions. Who was brought out to oppose one of these Whigs by the Administration? A Mr. Dorr, a thorough abolitionist, a "to be relied on" abolitionist, one of the executive committee of an anti slavery society. But the People of this gallant little State, trusting to the tried integrity and ability of her present Representatives, sent them back, and here they are, in spite of Van Buren abolitionists.

I suppose the comprehensive gentleman from Tennessee could not condescend to look upon such small spots as Massachusetts or Rhode Island.

Well, sir, the gentleman proceeded to discuss the State of abolition in Ohio.— Does he know, sir, whom the Van Buren party of Ohio have sent to the Senate of the United States? Does he know Mr. Tappan, brother to the notorious abolitionist of that name?

But, Mr. Speaker, before I speak further of Ohio, let me call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee to some other votes in the journals of the last session of Congress. I wish to do this while I think of it. I am forced to discuss this question rather discursively, as nothing was further from my thoughts than to make a speech on this subject.

By referring to the journals, the gentleman will see that on the 13th day of December, 1838, a gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Calhoun, a gentleman of superior abilities and manly excellent traits of character—I should exceedingly regret his absence, were not his place so well filled) introduced the following resolution, to which I beg leave to call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee.

On the 77th page of the journals of the last session, it will be seen that—

"Mr. Calhoun, of Kentucky, moved that the rules be suspended to enable him to move the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to report a bill making it unlawful for any person to aid fugitive slaves in escaping from their owners, and providing for the punishment in the Courts of the United States of all persons who may be guilty of such offence.

"And that they be further instructed to report a bill making it unlawful for any person in the non-slave-holding States of this Union to use any means to induce slaves from their owners, and providing for the punishment, in the Courts of the United States, of all persons who may be guilty of such offence."

Upon this motion there were, yeas 90. nays 107.

Only one Southern man voted among the nays, only one opposed so reasonable a resolution. Upon this the whole South was united. Among the 90 who voted with the South, there were 13 members from non-slaveholding States, seven of whom were whigs, and six were Van Buren men. Only six of those who profess to be devoted friends of the South, only six of these patriotic gentlemen voted for this resolution! And, sir, not one of them came from New Hampshire! Not even the gentleman whose name in my part of the world is synonymous with humbug—not even he who introduced these deceptive resolutions, which the gentleman from Tennessee commends so highly, is to be found voting with "us of the South"

This resolution, I know, meets with the approbation of the gentleman from Tennessee. But why did the friend of the gentleman from Tennessee—the gallant gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. Atherton,) the advocate general of the Secretary of the Treasury—why did not he then step forward in defence of the South? Oh, no. He was metamorphosed into a State-rights man in a minute, ranged under "the black banner." I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will look a little further into the journal before he charges all the Whigs with being abolitionists, and thanks so cordially all the Van Buren men of the North for their support of Southern rights.

I must go a little further into the journal to exhibit these humbuggers in their proper light. On the 17th of December, a petition was offered praying that Congress should "recognise, in the usual form and manner, and enter into the customary international relations with the Republic of Hayti." The reception of this petition was objected to by my friend from Virginia (Mr. Wise,) not because he was desirous to throw any obstacles in the way of commerce, but because he regarded this petition as having for its object an abolition of all distinctions on account of colour, and, upon examination, it appeared that these petitions were printed, and the same paper which requested Congress to "enter into the customary international relations with Hayti" also contained the request that Congress should abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and prevent the slave trade between the States. It was, therefore, essentially an abolition movement.

These facts were made known to the [illegible] upon this question: Shall the petition be received? The vote was: Yeas 159, Nays 32. The thirty-two were called "Southern fanatics." No Northern man of either party voted against the reception of this petition. A few of us (two gentlemen from Maryland, Messrs. Johnson and Jenifer, Mr. Pope, of Kentucky, Mr. Wise and myself) voted against the reception; for this we were denounced as "fanatics," while those of us who did not vote for the humbug resolutions were called abolitionists. Not one Van Buren man from the North voted against a petition praying us to allow a black minister to come here upon terms of equality with us! Not one of those whom the gentleman from Tennessee, in his overflowing, superabundant gratitude, so kindly thanked, would vote against such a proposition! Really, sir, when we think of this vote, and of the fate of Mr. Calhoun's resolution just referred to, we must allow that the gentleman from Tennessee is exceedingly anxious to feel gratitude, and is very thankful for very small favors.

The gentleman from Tennessee has not gone far enough into the journals, or, like the old Federalist from Kinderhook, (Mr. Vanderpool,) he is not firing off his own ammunition. I call back again upon the gentleman to "stand by his integrity." I ask him to call on his Southern-loving friend from New Hampshire to "stand by his integrity," or to take up integrity upon this subject. Will he vote for a law to punish those who would aid slaves to escape? Will he vote to enter into the customary international relations with Hayti? Or will he, like many others of his party are in the habit of doing upon this subject, dodge the question?

Now, sir, I wish to say a word relative to Ohio abolition. The gentleman referred to the proceedings of the Ohio Legislature. Does he know, sir, what Mr. Morris, a thorough devoted friend of Mr. Van Buren, said on the floor of the Senate? I am informed he said there, that, if he had been in the Legislature of Ohio when the Kentucky delegates came there, he would have tried to have them imprisoned. And if the gentleman from Tennessee thinks the Southern people ought to thank Ohio for passing an act to enable Kentucky to recover her fugitive slaves, what does he say for his friends on this floor who refused to vote for Mr. Calhoun's resolution before referred to? Not one Van Buren man from Ohio voted for that resolution; three Whigs from Ohio voted for it, and eight friends of Mr. Van Buren from Ohio (Messrs. Chenev, Duncan, Hamer, Hunter, Leadbetter, Shepler, Swearingen, and Webster) voted against it. Yet these gentlemen will be called democrats and friends of the South by the gentleman from Tennessee!

Well, sir, the Senator from Ohio, (Mr. Morris,) an avowed Van Buren abolitionist, was sent home. And whom did the Van Buren Legislature of Ohio send here in his place? Does the gentleman from Tennessee know Mr. Tappan from Ohio? Is he acquainted with his kind feelings for the South?

[Mr Weller of Ohio, rose to explain: If the gentleman from North Carolina intends to charge the new Senator from Ohio with being an abolitionist, he will find himself greatly mistaken. No man can be more opposed to modern abolition than Mr. Tappan.]

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman's explanation; but, sir, what a disgraceful system of humbuggery the Van Buren abolitionists wish to practice on the South? What does the gentleman say? That Mr. Tappan is opposed to abolition? No, sir; but he is opposed to *modern* abolition; and, sir, what is that? Here, sir, is another distinction. Now we have the old-fashioned abolition, then comes anti-slavery abolition, and last modern abolition! What wretched foolery! Let me, sir, give a specimen of the feelings of a Van Buren friend of the South, who is opposed to 'modern Abolition." A gentleman asked Mr. Tappan (the Van Buren Senator from Ohio) about the time of the Southampton insurrection, "what do you hear from Virginia?" Mr. Tappan with customary courtesy (I understand he is a very polite man) replied, "what the devil is that to either of us?" The gentleman replied to him, he felt deep interest in the fate of the Whites in Virginia, and thought it might be necessary to march to their assistance. Mr. Tappan replied, in substance, "that if his son should obey a "summons and dare to march to Virginia "on such an errand, he would disinherit "him; any man, he added, who held a fellow-creature in bondage ought to have his "damned throat cut!" Sir, I cannot find language strong enough to convey my detestation for such a creature.

[Mr Weller asked, "What is your authority for such a statement?]

Mr. Stanly. When you bring your Senator to deny it, I am ready to prove it. Does the gentleman deny it? Ohio has a strong band here of Administration men; I call upon them to deny it. Not a man, sir, will venture to do so. This is the man who is opposed to "*modern* abolition!" His abolition is old-fashioned—to abolish slavery by cutting throats seems to suit his fancy! I am informed, sir, by a gentleman near me that these facts were proved before the Senate when Mr. Tappan was nominated as a district judge, and he Buren party from Ohio have sent here a man who would disinherit his son for assisting the South at such an hour. To say he deserved to be hanged on a gallows higher than Haman's would be a compliment to him! He opposed to "*modern* abolition?" I dare say he is, because modern abolitionists endeavor to unite themselves to religious societies. His abolition has nothing to do with religion.— Is not that the reason the new Senator from Ohio is opposed to "*modern* abolition!" What a noble specimen of Van Buren friendship for the South we have here! Yet, sir, the Southern people have been told often and again that all the Whigs of the North are abolitionists because they voted against the Atherton resolutions, and all Van Buren men were friends of the South. If any little "Jim Crow" politician who professed to be a Whig, and was anxious to change sides, that he might be in the majority in his district—if he found it expedient to change sides, and turned round so fast that his clothes would not follow him, he had a sufficient excuse in saying "all the Whigs are abolitionists—the Van Buren men are the only friends of the South." I was accused of favoring abolition because I spurned these humbug resolutions. I am proud that I did so; I rejoice that I treated them as they deserved to be treated, with scorn and contempt. A parcel of Southern gentlemen, in company with anti-slavery Van Buren men from the North, assembled in the back room of some tavern, or in some dark hole in this Capitol, and, having excluded all the Whigs of the South, concocted resolutions under the advice and assistance of those who would not have assisted the people of Virginia, though they were in danger of having their throats cut! I repeat, sir, I rejoice that I did utterly reject and despise these resolutions. I was told it would ruin me; that my constituents would not understand my conduct. I was asked what I would do when I reached home? But, sir, I knew the people who sent me here. I knew they had confidence in me. I had confidence in their intelligence, and I was not disappointed They would not have forgiven me if I had done wrong, for fear they would not have understood my conduct. I went through my whole district, and denounced the abolition resolutions, as I did in the last Congress, as I do now, as hypocritical and delusive. They keep

"The word of promise to our ear,
But break it to our hope."

They were not intended—it was not desired by the caucus that prepared them—that they should allay an unholy excitement. They were not designed to secure the South, but were prepared "with the view" of benefiting a party and furnishing an excuse for unholy coalition. I told my constituents they did not even deny Congress the power to abolish slavery in this District, or in the Territories. One of these resolutions is as follows I quote part of it:

"The agitation of the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia or the Territories, *as a means and with a view of disturbing or overthrowing that institution in the several States*, is against the true spirit and meaning of the Constitution, an infringement of the rights of the States affected, and a breach of the public faith, on which they entered into this Confederacy."

My constituents agreed with me, that adopting such a resolution would be abandoning the ground we had hitherto occupied; it was calculated to encourage abolitionists to send their petitions to Congress, and say they wished slavery abolished in this District and in the Territories, without the view of disturbing or overthrowing that institution in the several States. And this was not prohibited by the Atherton resolutions. The resolutions did not forbid the abolition of slavery in this District or in the Territories, if the abolitionists would state they did not wish to interfere with slavery in the States. And these are the miserable resolutions for which the gentleman from Tennessee tenders his heartfelt thanks! I am proud in remembering that I told my constituents, if I should be defeated for refusing to vote for those resolutions, that I should glory in such a defeat. I proclaimed that I did not wish the support of any man who disapproved of my conduct upon those resolutions. After these repeated declarations, I have returned, sir, ready to devote all my energies to the advancement of the welfare and the protection of the interests, not of the South alone, but of my whole country.

Let me appeal again to Southern gentleman. Does it become them to make this subject a mere political plaything? If they are sincerely desirous to secure from danger their institutions, and the rights and property of their constituents, does it become them to attempt to delude the People by passing resolutions without meaning, and unintelligible?

A gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Pickens) maintains that abolition petitions were not received under the Atherton resolutions. There is not one Northern Administration man who will agree with him in his opinion of these resolutions.— I wrote a letter to Speaker Polk, and, after he had given me half a dozen answers, which he did not intend I should understand, and which meant nothing, he at last told me none but a sophist would say that these petitions were not received.— But, sir, a gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Cushing) put the direct question to the Speaker, and he said the petitions were received. And the gentleman from New Hampshire who offered the resolutions said in his speech: "At any rate, I may be pardoned for saying of that constituency, [his own,] that they are too intelligent to be misled by the idle and utterly unfounded pretence that the adoption of such a resolution is a denial of any right of petition!" And, after this, it was expected that these resolutions would receive

After this declaration, it was humiliating to see Southern men driven, like so many oxen, to support resolutions which admitted the reception of abolition petitions—resolutions which admitted that Congress had power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia and in the Territories! I call again upon the gentleman from Tennessee to stand by his integrity, to bring his friends from the North to reject these petitions. Let him try it, sir; he may get a few; they might offend their constituents; but they may please the party. I shall vote, sir, to reject these petitions, and, at a proper time, I shall offer a resolution to reject them. While I do this, sir, I have no hesitation in saying that I believe the furious opposition which was made some years since against these petitions has increased the flame of abolition. I believe, if they had been received, and no further notice taken of them, we should not have been troubled now.— By an opposition we have given consequence to fanatics, who have raised the cry, that "the right of petition is trampled upon." This is the watch-word which has added numbers of the petitioners.— We ought, in the first place, to have regarded their interference with with indifference. But things have changed. The Administration party wish to alarm the South with the ridiculous cry of danger. I think, therefore, the question ought to be put at rest. I think the people of the non slaveholding States have no constitutional right to petition upon this subject. It is no grievance to them. If slavery is a grievance, it is grievance to the white people of the South. If slavery is an evil, it is an evil to the whites—that it is a blessing to the negroes, in their present condition, no man acquainted with the Southern country can deny.

If you will not reject these petitions, let us see what you will do: I am ready for your action, so are my constituents.— I am sick—the country is disgusted with the disgraceful coalitions between the pretenders to chivalry and the anti-slavery resolution makers. These political jugglers have fretted their hour upon the stage; let us have no more of their farcical performances.

If we had petitions here from the Southern country praying Congress to abolish the banking system, the railroads, or the manufacturing establishments of the North, I should say, reject them. If banks and manufacturing establishments are grievances, they are so to those States in whose borders they exist.

I remember, sir, at the last session of Congress, I inquired if there were any abolitionists in New Hampshire who support the present Administration. I was uniformly answered, no; they all belong to the Whigs. It was a long time before I could procure information from that benighted region, but at last I did gather some facts, which I will give.

Although I was told that there were no Van Buren abolitionists in New Hampshire I had accidently seen a paper from there, edited by Edmund Burke, the same gentleman now a member from that State. This paper, to my surprise, contained an appeal to "democratic abolitionists," be-