

The Carolina Watchman.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY, BY HAMILTON C. JONES, EDITOR & PROPRIETOR.

VOL. VII.—NO. 32.

SALISBURY, MARCH 9, 1839.

WHOLE NO. 344.

NEW TERMS

Carolina Watchman.
The Watchman may hereafter be had for one dollar and fifty cents per year. A class of four new subscribers who will pay in advance the whole sum at one payment, will have the paper for one year at two dollars. As long as the same class shall continue to pay in advance the sum of one dollar and fifty cents, the same terms shall continue, otherwise they will be charged as other subscribers.

Subscribers who do not pay during the year will be charged three dollars in all cases. No subscription will be received for less than one year. No paper will be discontinued but at the option of the publisher, and all arrears are paid in advance.

All letters to the Editor must be post paid, otherwise they will certainly not be attended to.

Terms of Advertising.

One dollar per square for the first insertion and twenty-five cents per square for each insertion afterwards.
Court notices will be charged 25 per cent, higher than the above rates. A deduction of 50 per cent from the regular prices will be made for those that advertise by the year. No advertisement will be inserted for less than one dollar.
Advertisements will be continued until orders are received to stop them, where no directions are previously given.

SALISBURY.

Quint.	Cents.
Beacon, 1/2 a 10	Molasses, 58 a 60
Brandy, 85 a 90	Nails, 8 a 9
Peas, 85 a 90	Oats, 25 a 30
Pork, 19 a 21	Sugar, br. 10 a 12
Cotton in seed none	leaf, 18 a 20
eleant, 7 a 9	Salt, 10 a 12
Coffee, 14 a 17	Tallow, 10 a 12
Corn, 8 a 10	Tobacco, 8 a 20
Peas, 85 a 90	Tow-linen, 16 a 20
Flour, 66 a 70	Wheat, (bushel) 61
Faxseed, 75	Whiskey, 45 a 50
Iron, per lb. 6 1/2	Wool, (clean) 40
Lined Oil, pr. gal. \$1 1/2	

FAYETTEVILLE.

Brandy, 85 a 90	Molasses, 58 a 60
Dr. Apple, 80	Nails, cut, 7 a
Bacon, 11 a 12	Sugar brown, 8 a 12
Beeswax, 25	Lump, 16
Clare, 12 a 13	Leaf, 18 a 20
Cotton, 10 a 11	Salt, 10 a 12
Corn, 8 a 10	Sack, 85
Corn, 75 a 80	Tallow, 10 a 12
Corn, 18 a 20	Tobacco, 8 a 20
Flour, 66 a 70	Tow-linen, 16 a 20
Flour, 66 a 70	Wheat, 135 a 140
Flour, 66 a 70	Whiskey, 45 a 50
Flour, 66 a 70	Wool, 20 a 25

CHERAW.

4 a 6 Nails cut assor. 7 1/2 a 9
10 a 14 wrought 16 a 18
15 a 20 Oats bushel 50
40 a 22 Oil gal 75 a 81
18 a 23 lamp 125
12 a 13 linned 110 a 125
12 a 15 Rice 100lbs 6 a 8
12 a 15 Sugar lb 10 a 12
12 a 15 Steel sack 33 a 35
40 a 45 bush 31 a 32
100lbs 5 a 6 Steel Amer. 10 a 12
22 a 25 English 14
45 a 50 German 12 a 14
10 a 12 Tea imp. \$1 a \$1 3/4

RUNAWAY.

\$50 REWARD.

ABSCONDED about the last of October, from the subscriber, at that time residing in Stokes County, N. Carolina, my Negro man

COLEMAN.

of 23 years of age, and of a very bright complexion. He is a Shoemaker by trade, has a bushy head of hair, a thin visage, is about 5 feet 6 inches high, weighs from 135 to 140 pounds. He has a very large ear on one of his legs, which he wears as a mark. He is dressed in a blue coat, a white shirt, and blue trousers. He is a very cunning fellow, and is believed to be in the neighborhood of the subscriber. If any person has any information of his whereabouts, or if he is seen, please to inform the subscriber at once, and a reward of fifty dollars will be given to any one who will bring him to the subscriber's residence, or who will deliver him to the nearest justice of the peace. The subscriber's name is RICHARD OVERSTREET, of the town of Campbell, Va. J. 1838.

RICHARD OVERSTREET.

of the town of Campbell, Va. J. 1838.

JACK

FOR SALE.

THE celebrated JACK PULASKI is now offered for sale on moderate terms, and if not sold by the 1st of March next, he will then be advertised for sale during the spring season at such places as may be deemed proper. The JACK can be found previous to the 1st of March, at his Stable on my plantation, between the Salisbury and Statesville road, 8 miles from the latter place. J. CHAMBERS. Salisbury, Feb. 21, 1839. } 5w28.

BLANK SUBPENAS

for sale at this Office.

TWENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS. THIRD SESSION.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

REMARKS OF MR. STANLY,

On the motion for an inquiry in the late Defalcation of Public Officers.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1839.

Immediately after Mr. DUNCAN (of Ohio) concluded his remarks. Mr. PETRIKIN moved the Previous Question, but at Mr. STANLY's solicitation withdrew it, upon Mr. STANLY's promising to renew it before he sat down.

Mr. STANLY then rose and said he was not able to detain the House as long as the Representative from Ohio had done.

It is now 20 minutes past 4 o'clock (said he.) We have been consuming time by listening to remarks upon all sorts of subjects. We have had much upon extravagance and economy—a most extravagant oration upon matters and things in general, from the battles of Cæsar and Pompey down to the recent democratic disturbance in Pennsylvania. Yesterday the House adjourned for the gratification of the Representative who has just finished his oration against 'Henry Clay,' 'corporations,' 'associated wealth,' and what in his elegant language he calls 'whigery.' The House has listened to all this with commendable patience, to the abuse of Whigs, and to the high praises upon the new Senator from Ohio (Mr. Tappan,) Mr. Van Buren, and Mr. Woodbury. I claim the right for a few minutes to reply to part of the speech just delivered. In the remarks I shall make, I will not attempt to answer the arguments of this defender of the Administration upon all the matters he referred to; I should consume too much time, and could not avail myself of the same helps. He is so great a favorite at the Treasury Department, he can call on his 'Dear Sir,' Mr. Woodbury, and get all the information he wishes. If a Whig should apply, as one did at the last session, he would meet with a refusal.

Sir, he has had the utmost liberty, the most unlimited indulgence, yesterday and to-day. I cannot, in courtesy or justice, be denied the right to say a few words upon one subject to which he has alluded; I mean abolition. I shall not discuss this subject, but I wish to call attention to some part of the gentleman's language in reference to this, and to a celebrated letter written by him when he was a candidate a few months ago.

It will be recollected, Mr. Speaker, that when I called the gentleman to order for irrelevancy when he was reading letters from his 'dear' Amos and his 'dear' Levi, showing how many Whigs and how many Democrats were in office in the Departments, the Chair decided (Mr. CONNOR, of North Carolina, was occupying the chair at the time) that the gentleman was in order. I submitted most cheerfully to this; and I took the liberty of interrupting the gentleman, and asking him how many abolitionists there were among the democrats in office. To which he replied, with a pompous elevation of tone, and with a confidence which evidently defied contradiction, that they (abolitionists) did not 'belong to that family.' They were all among the 'Federal Whigs,' as he calls them. Well, sir, I was glad to hear the assertion made on this floor, and I witnessed with a smile the self-satisfactory whimpers of some slaveholding democrats at this declaration from the Sampson of locofocoism.

But I have the evidence in my possession to drive away this pleasing delusion. This declaration but affords additional evidence of the attempt which the administration party are making to impose upon the Southern People.

But, sir, as far as I can, I will awaken the attention of the people of my district and my State to the danger of their self-constituted democratic friends.

But to the letter, the letter. I hold in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a letter dated at Montgomery, Hamilton county Ohio, signed 'A. Duncan,' in which the writer gives his views of slavery. I wish to read some extracts to the House, and I respectfully solicit the attention of the slaveholding democrats—to the opinions of their trusty and well beloved brother in democracy upon the subject of slavery. I want to show them what a democrat in Ohio, who is no abolitionist, thinks of their country and their constituents Towards the latter part of the letter the writer says:

'There is no man living, perhaps, who is more deadly hostile to slavery than I am. My feelings, my education, the circumstances that have surrounded me through life, together with my principles of what I believe to constitute the natural and political rights of man—all conspire to make me abhor it as one of the greatest evils that exists on the face of the earth.'

[Mr. DUNCAN here rose and asked to explain.]

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I will hear him explain, said Mr. S.

Mr. DUNCAN then said, that when he was asked the question, whether there were any abolition democrats, he meant to say, they

did not belong to the Democratic party, particularly in his district and State. The letter was in answer to interrogatories put to him before the election. I can read it, said he. (Cries of Not now!) I will then briefly state the contents.

Here Mr. STANLY said: Mr. Speaker, I cannot consent to yield the floor to allow the gentleman to state the contents. I will do that for him, sir. I only gave way for explanation. The short extract I have read, sir, ought not to make the gentleman uneasy. It is mild, compared with what follows. But listen attentively, ye exclusively guardians of the South, ye only good democrats, to the declaration, that slavery is one of the greatest evils on the face of the earth, and that this democrat is 'deadly hostile' to slavery. The gentleman's eagerness, I presume, is on account of his Southern friends. They, in North Carolina, as I was told by one of them, denied the authenticity of this letter: yes, sir, they pronounced it a forgery! The People had been taught to believe that Mr. Van Buren had no abolition friends—no friends opposed to slavery. But here, sir, we have, from the pen of the Representative from Hamilton county, O-hi-O, the outpourings of more abuse, more hellish slander, deliberately concocted, on slave owners, than it has ever been my lot to hear from any avowed abolitionist.

Yet, sir, this same abhorrer of slavery, so 'deadly hostile' to it, is, of all other democrats, the chosen advocate of the Globe—the chosen champion of this Southern-loving Administration. Another extract I want to give my constituents some information of the opinions of this person and political friend of Martin Van Buren. The letter says, in continuation:

'Yes, greater in its moral effects and corrupting tendencies than all other human evils put together. It is not only a moral and political evil within itself, or intrinsically so, of the darkest and most damning character, but in all its bearings and effects calculated to produce the most fatal effects on both the moral and the political institutions of our country.'

[Here Mr. DUNCAN asked leave to explain again.] Mr. STANLY yielded for explanation; and Mr. DUNCAN said he was not an abolitionist; and any individual or any newspaper that flouts on the breeze, that said he was an abolitionist, was a vile calumniator.]

[Here Mr. THOMPSON, of South Carolina, rose, and called on the Speaker to enforce the rules, and see that a gentleman who was occupying the floor should not be thus frequently interrupted.]

Mr. STANLY continued. I have yielded the floor with pleasure to hear any explanations, but not to hear speeches of defiance. I must insist upon my right to the floor, and will not again be interrupted for speeches of this character.

Sir, I am not acquainted with the kind of newspapers to which the gentleman refers. I have never seen any that flouted on the breeze that charged him with being an abolitionist. Sir, it would better become the assumed gallantry of the distinguished democrat from Hamilton county Ohio—who carries a rifle for personal defence, to wait until he is charged with being an abolitionist, before he throws out such bold denunciations. I have not charged him, and do not now charge him, with being an abolitionist. I am willing to admit that he and his newly elected Senator (Mr. Tappan) whom he has betrayed as sound a democrat, and as pure a patriot, as ever honored the name; and, of the most unexceptionable deportment! are neither of them abolitionists. I am willing to admit that they are both as good friends of the South as any Van Buren caucus democrats who voted on the resolutions of the 12th of December last.

I will take this letter as proof of their affection for the South; or, if he pleases, I will take the reputed declaration of this 'democrat and patriot,' (Mr. Tappan,) about the time the Southampton insurrection, as proof of this 'sound democracy and pure patriotism.'

I am willing, I say, sir, to believe they are not abolitionists. I do not know what signification they attach to the words 'democrat' and 'abolitionist.' But, sir, I charge him with being the author of this letter, and he cannot deny that. I charge it in the presence and hearing of my democratic or Van Buren colleagues, and wish them no longer to consider this a forgery.

But to the letter. The gentleman told us that he dealt in figures, and from this letter I can prove that he does deal so largely in figures of imagination as any member on this floor. Hear a little more from this patient democrat, this herald of anti-abolition, of Tappan democracy. Hear a little more of what he says about slavery.

'It is an evil that has, does now, and will in all time to come while it exists, involve in it, as well in its present possession as in its future operations, crime, fraud, theft, robbery, murder, and death. For the truth of what I say, as to its present effects upon

the institutions of our country, I have only to refer you to a view of the slave States in our Union, and a comparison between the relative condition of the improvements of them and the free States. You see the free States happy and flourishing, to the admiration and astonishment of all who see them. Public improvements and private prosperity are swift and head and head in the race, while, on the other hand, poverty, lean and hungry sterility, and squalid wretchedness, seem to cover the face of the land in many parts where slave institutions have a residence.'

'Would to God, sir, that those who entertain such opinions could go into my district, or into yours! How different would be their opinions could they visit the western part of our own North Carolina—one of the most beautiful and prosperous, though almost unknown, parts of the world; that good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths, that spring out of valleys and hills; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass? Would to God, sir, that some reasonable creature, if any such there be, who entertains such sentiments, could visit my district! Instead of lean and hungry sterility and squalid wretchedness, which this democrat says 'covers the face of the land,' he would find a happy, independent, and intelligent People; he would pray Heaven to make the laboring classes in other parts of the world as free from want, as contented as our slaves. Instead of barren deserts, perplexed with thorn, he would see countless thousands of acres in a high state of cultivation. He would see fields of beautiful green, in spots which, a few years since, were untraced save by the wild beasts of the forest, who roamed in undisturbed away. He could find cultivated fields on the borders of lakes, in my district, yielding as abundant crops as the choicest lands on the borders of the mighty Father of rivers, and vying in beauty with the most enchanting scenery on the Island of Calypso. And all this, too, was brought about by slave labor. Yes, sir, there he would see in our negroes, the happiest population on the earth—well fed, well clothed, and well treated. Content, and careless of to-morrow's fare, they perform their labor with cheerfulness—labor

'Made the pledge of cheerful days, and nights without a groan. Instead of finding a country upon which the 'anger of God and the vengeance of Heaven seem to rest,' as this democrat says is the case where 'slave institutions have a residence,' instead of seeing men who are cruel murderers, robbers and pirates, (as abolitionists sometimes call slaveholders,) he would find (in the language of the sacred volume I just now quoted) 'a land of wheat and barley, and vines and fig trees, and pomegranates; a land in which we eat bread without scarceness, inhabited by men remarkable for hospitality, plain, unassuming habits, and indomitable attachment to republican institutions.'

But, sir, remember, I beseech you, this slander comes from a democrat, who is no abolitionist! Yes, sir, from one of the friends of those who go into a midnight caucus, and prepare Janus-faced resolutions for the protection of the South; this man is from a Van Buren protector of the South—a whole Van Buren democrat. A little more of this democratic letter.

[Here Mr. GALLUP, of New York, rose to a point of order, but the Speaker decided that Mr. Stanly was not out of order.]

Mr. Stanly continued. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am inflicting pain upon any member of the party, but the gentleman from New York must bear it. Sir, he cannot save his friend from Ohio from having this shameful letter published to the world. I am rejoiced, sir, that the rules of order this time are construed as liberally for me as for the representative from Hamilton county, Ohio—rules, sir, which, like the inscriptions on the sables of Vathek, hold another language to-day from that they yesterday held, and, like those sables, can only be deciphered by one man—the usual occupant of that chair.

Another extract, sir, from this letter:

'Cross the line that separates the free from the slave State, or stand upon it and look across the former; you will see comparatively all life, all happiness, all prosperity, both public and private; but turn your eyes upon the latter & survey it: every thing material, (except a few of the wealthy proprietors,) bears the impress of poverty and dilapidation; all look as if pestilence and famine had been making their sad innovation.'

Now sir, all this is from one of our patient democrats, one of Levi Woodbury's 'dear sirs,' one of the select friends of Martin Van Buren, and one of the friends of the South! and no abolitionist! Sir, let me ask the gentleman how he can be other than an abolitionist with these sentiments? If he believes that 'slavery is an evil that has, does now, and will in all time to come, while it exists, involve in it, as well in its present possession as in its future operations, crime, fraud, theft, robbery, murder, and death!' I ask him how, with a clear conscience, and as an honest man, who feels for what he calls 'violated humanity,' he can be other than an abolitionist? If sir, he is 'so deadly hostile to slavery,' if he 'abhors it as one of the greatest evils that exists on the face of the

earth,' if he thinks that the 'anger of God and the vengeance of Heaven seem to rest' upon the slave States, if he believes that slavery has such 'corrupting and corroding effects,' if, sir, I ask, he is sincere in saying, but 'the curse be on the head of those who sustain such an institution,' how can he be other than an abolitionist? Is it because, as he says in the latter part of his letter, 'the effects would be more fatal to the unhappy and unfortunate African than even slavery itself?' Or can it be that he wishes the 'anger of God and the vengeance of Heaven, and the frowns and disapprobation of avenging justice,' still to rest upon the Southern country? Now, sir, this democrat is in daily social intercourse with the Southern men who support Mr. Van Buren, and it is all right and proper; he goes no doubt, into caucus with them, strongly advocates the sub-Treasury, and they are, or would be, the exclusive friends of the South; while I, sir, am accused of acting with abolitionists if I vote with any of them on a motion to adjourn!

The representative from Hamilton county, Ohio, said there were no abolitionists in the democratic family. Has he ever seen the letter of the democratic sub-Treasury candidate for Governor, in Massachusetts, in which he says, 'I deem slavery to be the greatest curse and the most portentous evil which a righteous God ever inflicted upon a nation?' and, like this good democrat, he is opposed to the admission of any new State whose Constitution tolerates slavery; for he says:

'In relation to the admission of new States with the power to hold slaves, I need do no more than to refer you to my recorded votes against the admission of Missouri with this power. That opposition, which required some firmness to persevere in, would doubtless have proved successful but for the extraordinary influence and extraordinary efforts of one man, (Henry Clay,) who was supposed by some to have resorted to extraordinary means to accomplish his purpose.'

It is amusing to see how well these abolitionists agree with the gentleman from Ohio in abusing all slaveholders, and the distinguished statesman (H. Clay,) to whose extraordinary efforts, we are indebted for the admission of Missouri. The Southern People, sir, will heed these things; they shall know how the abolition democrats, and the anti-abolition abhorers of slaveholders, such as this democrat from Hamilton county, Ohio, abuse this great man. Sir, I have no compliments to bestow, no eulogium to pronounce upon his (H. Clay's) character. He needs none. The whole country appreciates his merits. I am not skilled to paint the lily. I shall not attempt to add another hue unto the rainbow. I will not enter into competition with the Representative from Ohio, either in plastering the characters of those I admire with false eulogy, or in vilifying those with whom I differ in opinion. Sir, he is a well-selected instrument to bespatter with praise Mr. Van Buren; his newly elected Senator, the pure patriot and good democrat, (Mr. Tappan) Mr. Kendall, and his dear sir at the head of the Treasury Department, and to vitiate the favorites of the South.

If I had time I could give him many instances of democratic abolitionism. Only one more now, sir: You know, sir—for there are many things you know, Mr. Speaker, there was an election recently held in Massachusetts, in which a brother of Mr. Woodbury received the votes of the Abolitionists; they refusing to vote for either of the other candidates. Now sir, the Globe, (which never departs from the truth, you know sir) in the paper of Thursday night, December 27th, 1838, has the following article:

'ANOTHER ABOLITION MISREPRESENTATION.—In mentioning the result of the late election for Congress in Mr. Parmenter's district, where the choice was presented by abolition votes, several of the Federal papers, and among them that model of candor, the Intelligencer, have remarked that a great part of the abolition votes were thrown for James T. Woodbury, a brother of the Secretary of the Treasury.

'We regard this transaction, upon the facts which have been communicated to us, as one of the most palpable illustrations of intrigues and management between whigery and abolitionism that we have heard of. While they unite in opposing the Administration on account of the unfinished support it accords to the rights of property guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, they have sought out the name of a person who is the brother of a member of the Administration, well known throughout his whole political life to be totally opposed to their disorganizing schemes, and this brother, a clergyman, settled in an obscure parish, and have cast enough of their votes for him, undoubtedly against his consent for the double purpose of defeating an election, and, at the same time, affording some possible ground for suspicion and prejudice against the sincerity of the Administration! This scheme, in refinement, even exceeds the joint management of the abolition whigs in New York and may afford a beneficial lesson to the public.'

It is not often, sir, I see that paper, and the article might have passed without no-

tice, but that I soon after saw the letter of Mr. Woodbury, the brother of the 'Dear Sir' of the Representative of Hamilton county, Ohio. I want this editorial article and this letter to appear together in my speech.

ACTOR, Dec. 13, 1838.

'Brother Phelps: The resolution of our late anti-slavery meeting at Concord, as they ultimately passed, pleased me, particularly those about questioning the candidates. I could not well stay to meet you in committee on the same, as I desired and designed. On reflection, I see the propriety and necessity of holding the candidate to the first answer. If that answer be doubtful or defective, I think it must be designedly so; for the interrogatories are few and ambiguous, and simple.

'I believe 'We the People' of the North are beginning to find out what we have to do with slavery, and, what is far better, are beginning faithfully and consistently to do it. I believe that this carrying out abolition to the ballot box may, with great propriety, be made a test question. What is the amount of all our talk, if we refuse sufficiently to act for the slave? The Richmond Enquirer man just begins to tremble about abolition. What! go to the polls and vote for a man as Representative to the United States Congress who will not declare himself in favor of immediately abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia and the United States Territories, and the internal, or, if you please, internal slave trade? I could, with my present views no more do it than I could be a slaveholder or a slave-dealer in the District of Columbia, or own one of those slave ships that ply between Alexandria and New Orleans; for the one, in effect, enacts the law under which the other carries on the bloody business. And any man who slighted these things, must see this. I am confident that all true abolitionists will very soon come up to the mark on this point, and let all this would see our consistency.

'Yours in labor and sacrifice for the slave'

'JAMES T. WOODBURY.'

I hope this will satisfy the gentleman that a democrat, a friend of this Administration, may be an abolitionist.

But let us return to the letter.

Every thing, the writer said in the last extract (except a few of the wealthy proprietors, 'looks as if pestilence and famine had been making their sad innovation.' It is remarkable how fond all these followers of Mr. Van Buren are of railing against wealth. In this sentence we have a little of it. The gentleman's speech repeatedly referred to the 'anti-republican tendencies of associated wealth.' He railed against the 'moneyed associations' of our country. The letter continues, sir,—(and I hope you will remember that this coarse, horrible abuse is applied to North Carolina as one of the slaveholding States.)—

'The anger of God and the vengeance of Heaven seem to rest upon every thing upon which you can cast your eyes. Every prospect seems to be withered and withered by the frown and disapprobation of avenging justice and violated humanity. In short, almost every institution, every prosperity, public and private, seems to be sickening and dying from the corrupting and corroding effects of slavery. But the curse be on the head of those who sustain such an institution.'

Now, sir, I ask if you have ever heard or read from any avowed abolitionist a more horrible, shameful, miserable, malicious slander upon slaveholders and the slaveholding country than I have here read in this letter from this defender of the Administration? Did the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) in all his intemperate, unjustifiable remarks about slavery, ever assert any thing half as abusive? Has the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. Slade, who is regarded as the great leader of the abolitionists in this House, has he ever used expressions unworthy a man of feeling, so unbecoming a Representative on this floor? No, sir; no, sir; neither one of them, or any other abolitionist, has ever given expressions to such detestable opinions. No abolitionist ever uttered sentiments more venomous, malignity. And yet, sir, this man who says slavery 'involves in it, as well in its present possession as in its future operations, crime, fraud, theft, robbery, murder and death'—who says 'but the curse be on the head of those who sustain such an institution'—this individual is—Who, sir? Who is he, Mr. Speaker? Why, sir, he is the representative from Hamilton county, O-hi-O. A locofoco democrat—the very personification of locofoco democracy—the 'dear sir' of Amos Kendall and Levi Woodbury—the beloved defender of the measures of Martin Van Buren! And has he, sir, lost any of the love or confidence of the President or his friends since he wrote this letter? No, sir; far from it. At the last session he published a speech, 'by authority,' which was never spoken; and now, sir, we find him addressing letters to the heads of the Departments, asking information for the purpose of enabling him to make some reply in favor of the Administration and the Democratic party! He tells us in his speech to day that he had 'information furnished him,' and he has shown us, by the letters he read, from whom the information came. Mr. Van Buren is a great friend of the South, but he loves those who abhor slavery, and the abhorers love him. Does not this strengthen the already strong evidence before the world, that the President is but

'A hovering temporizer that can't with three eyes at once see good and evil, inclining to them both?'

Sir, the gentleman who deals so largely in figures, (and I again give him the credit of dealing in figures, and I believe he can take as many strong points in a case as any democrat on this floor)—the gentleman surely never has been in a country where slavery was tolerated. Are there any evidences of the 'anger of God, and the vengeance of Heaven' to be seen here, except what locofoco democracy has inflicted upon us? Did he see the evidence of the 'blighting effects' of slavery in Kentucky? The Ken-