

Letter from Gen. Scott on the annexation of Canada.

We find the following letter from the hero of Andy's Lane, in the Philadelphia News of yesterday - Balt. Sun, 10th inst.

My Dear Sir - The news from the Parliament of Great Britain, this morning, must, I think, increase the discontent of our neighbors on the other side of the St. Lawrence and the Lakes...

What may be the views of our Executive government on the subject I know absolutely nothing; but I think I cannot err in saying that two-thirds of our people would rejoice at the incorporation...

WINFIELD SCOTT.

FOOTE'S EULOGY.

Mr. SEXTON FOOTE, of Mississippi, in his eulogy which he bestowed upon Ex-President Polk and his administration in Washington, and before President Taylor and his Cabinet, had the bad taste to indulge in many flings at Whig principles and the Whig party...

The verdict of the present living, voting, generation upon Mr. Polk's administration of the government has been so signal, and so recent, that not even an eulogy from Mr. Foote, will be able to reverse it...

But let this all pass. Mr. Polk is dead and buried - and we shall cease to speak of him with any other than the proper feeling due to the memory of the dead...

It is re-established the principles of the Jefferson (Wilmot) Proviso, in the incorporation of Oregon by restricting slavery there, Mr. Polk's supporters...

Let Mr. Foote commend these facts to his Southern "democratic" constituents, and while he is doing it, let us hope that he will not forget to commend to them the principles of Democracy...

CURIOUS REMINISCENCE.

Ritchie once opposed to Slavery.

Justing, a day or two since, over an old file of the Richmond Enquirer, for the year 1830, published by the present editor of the Union, we found (says the Richmond Times) in a number which was mostly full of the debates in Congress on the Missouri question...

From the Rich. Enquirer of Feb. 20, 1830. "The same principle which this day induces us to publish an address on the Missouri question, leads us to give place to the following. Let the press be free. We confess it to be a very ingenious, elegant and forcible production. It may, too, have the good effect desired by the author, of softening down those fiery enthusiasts of the East, who cite the Bible, without reservation, as an authority on all occasions for charging the Southern people with inhumanity..."

Verily this is as bad as Gen. Cass's famous prayer for "Abolition everywhere," which had so much prominence in the canvass of 1848.

SNEERING AT GEN. TAYLOR.

The opposition press have adopted, systematically, a style of scoffing, belittling and contemptuous remark, when speaking of Gen. Taylor, which, however it suits the tastes of those who indulge it, will scarcely command the sympathies of the American people.

This is much in the manner of these same gentlemen when they heard he was surrounded by a large Mexican army on the Rio Grande. A number of noses which affect the air in complacent mockery now, were then turned up at his intellect, his good-hearted good-fortuningness, his feebleness, his unskillfulness, and such like watery cockneys, until the thunders of Palo Alto were wafted upon the wings of the press throughout the land.

THE RAIL ROAD CANVASS.

Messrs. Gilmer and Caldwell are doing yeoman's service in the cause of the Central Railroad - overcoming the opposition of some, and awakening others from that state of apathy and indifference which has become constitutional with so many North Carolinians.

The N. Y. Tribune calls the attention of the Washington Union to the fact - made manifest by its own columns - that the Whig party has not displayed a greedy rapacity for office.

RALEIGH TIMES.



Raleigh, N. C. FRIDAY, JULY 20, 1849.

Temperance Celebration.

We learn that Concord and Phoenix Divisions of the Sons of Temperance have made arrangements for a Public Celebration on Saturday, the 11th of August next, and invite their brethren throughout the State, the friends of the cause, and the public generally to be present.

Full particulars, and a Programme of the Exercises will appear in our next paper.

HIGAN W. HASTED, Esq. of this City, has received the appointment of District Attorney for North Carolina.

The preparations in a state of forwardness for this celebration, are such as will make it one of the most imposing ever witnessed in the State.

SPEECH OF MR. DANIEL.

This Candidate for Congress addressed the people of Raleigh at the Court House, on Wednesday evening last. The greater part of his speech was devoted to a defence of himself for attending the Disunion Meeting last winter at Washington City, and signing the Southern Address - no accuser being present.

POLITICAL DECENCY.

The "Union," the dead organ of the dead Government, is all the time rabid. In its No. of Wednesday week, it speaks of "the weak and perfidious administration," which is "regarded with loathing."

THIRD DISTRICT.

We copy from the Charlotte Journal the following satisfactory result of the Albemarle Convention. Our readers will receive it with pleasure.

"When it was announced that Edmund Deberry had received the nomination on the first ballot, there was evident pleasure on the countenances of a large majority of the Convention, and all seemed to breathe freer, for not one person was prepared for such a result; and although some expected a different result, we could see no trace of an unwillingness to bow to its decision."

"Before the resolution, unanimously nominating the Hon. Edmund Deberry was adopted, several gentlemen made short, but very appropriate remarks relative to the result, and the pleasure it gave them. 'Oil had been cast on the waters,' as Mr. Johnston of Charlotte remarked, 'and the storm was assuaged.'"

A member of the family of Santa Anna is said to have received his share of money and valuable presents, and to have fled from Mexico. Possibly the Ex-President will go in pursuit of him to Mexico, where, according to the last account, he is now residing.

THE SLAVERY DISCUSSION.

We do not design to weary our readers much more with this subject. The Standard having backed out from our branch of the discussion, and refused to define his position, or answer in any way, (because he does not) our interrogatories of course give up the question so far as we are concerned, and retire from the contest with us.

And yet these questions, embracing as they do all that is of practical value involved in this controversy, are plain, and easily answered. WHAT WILL YOU DO? IF THE WILMOT PROVISIO IS PASSED BY CONGRESS, ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF SUBMITTING TO THE LAW OF THE LAND, LIKE A GOOD AND PEACEABLE CITIZEN? ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF DISUNION? ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF NULLIFICATION? ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF NON-INTERCOURSE WITH THE NORTH? ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF THE CONFISCATION OF NORTHERN PROPERTY IN SOUTHERN PORTS? ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF CLOSING THE COURTS OF THE SOUTH AGAINST THE COLLECTION OF JUST DEBTS DUE BY OUR CITIZENS TO NORTHERN MEN? ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF BARRIBLONS, AND THE PROPAGATION OF SLAVERY IN NEW MEXICO AND CALIFORNIA, BY FIRE AND SWORD?

The Editor of the Standard invited us to meet him; and when we came, and picked out from the midst of three columns of exceedingly brave and sad line and high-sounding words, the real issues involved, and unfolded our views and principles, and expressed, unequivocally, our firm determination to abide by the CONSTITUTION AND LAWS OF OUR COUNTRY, and to defend and preserve to the last the UNION OF THE STATES, the Editor has no answer, and is mute as the dead.

But he still continues to write upon generalities and collaterals - and "the lame and impotent conclusion" which he finally reaches, as we gather from his last paper, is, that "Congress, in our [his] humble opinion, has no jurisdiction whatever over the subject of Slavery, whether in the States or Territories; AND ALL WE ASK OF THAT BODY IS TO LET THIS QUESTION ALONE."

To the practical effect of which the attention of our readers is briefly invited.

If this is "ALL" that the Standard ASKS, we cannot, for our life, see what it has published so many long articles about - because this gives up the question of Slavery in the Territories, and there is nothing left to quarrel for.

If Congress does nothing on the subject of Slavery in the Territories - leaves the regulation of this matter to the Territories, or to the people thereof, it is next to certain, and we have over and over demonstrated, that Slavery will never go there; - and whether the Wilmot Proviso is passed or not, can make no difference as to the result.

We have not thought proper to discuss the question whether the Wilmot Proviso is constitutional or not. On that subject, abstractedly, so far as practical operation is concerned, the long-winded essays which have been indited here have been thrown away; and those who indited them, in our opinion, have suffered themselves to be drawn from the really important points involved in this discussion, and have spent their strength for next to nothing.

Some where about the year 1837 or '38, he edited a paper, at Newport, New Hampshire, called the "Argus and Spectator," and through its columns propagated appeals to "Democratic Abolitionists." He found no fault then with those wayward disciples of Democracy for "dissenting from slavery, and desiring its removal."

Well, what does he go for now, according to his introductory? (and which we understand the Standard as endorsing and approving?) Why, for PRACTICAL ABOLITION in the new territory! Because, "non-intervention," that "noble doctrine," as the Standard calls it, will exclude slavery as effectually from New Mexico and California as the passage of the Wilmot Proviso - Leave it to the people of the Territories to regulate their internal concerns in their own way, and who does not see that they will never consent to the introduction of slavery? So that this "common ground" proposed by the Abolitionist Burke, and endorsed by the Editor of the Standard, is, in reality carrying out the principle for which the Northern Free Soilers and Abolitionists contend, only in a different way; and by it, we should escape the passage of the Wilmot Proviso, it is true, - but the object would be as effectually obtained, and slavery forever excluded from New Mexico and California.

And now, if the Standard adopts this "non-intervention doctrine," we would humbly crave to know what is left for Ed., as a Southern man, to contend for? Or can he demonstrate, if nothing further is done, and nothing said, that slavery can ever exist in the new Territory? - for such we understand to be "non-intervention." Why, clearly, until the law is changed slavery is excluded - and from the known temper of the people now there, and those who in such great crowds, a Southern man may as well settle in Massachusetts with his slaves, as in New Mexico and California.

But the extreme gravity of taking us to task for calling an Abolitionist by his name! He is an Abolitionist, even in this very ground of "non-intervention." In regard to the new Territories, which give up to Northern men all they claim, and effectually exclude the Southern slaveholder.

WHO EXCLUDED SLAVERY?

We charged in our last, that Slavery had been excluded from California by means of a Free Soil Regiment, sent out by the late Democratic Administration for that express purpose. The proof is now out, and is too positive to admit of even the shadow of contradiction.

Very well. Now apply to this case the conclusion of the Standard, that "Congress has no jurisdiction whatever over the question of Slavery whether in the States or Territories; and, all we ask of that body is to let this question alone." And what, in the name of wonder, according to the Editor's own ground, will be the inevitable result in California? Will the Southern man participate in the blessings and benefits of the public domain? Yes, if he thinks proper. But can he settle any of it, and till it with his slaves? No more than he can in Oregon, to which the Wilmot Proviso has been applied. A slaveholder never will go where there are no laws to regulate Slavery, and protect his rights of property. This decision of the people of California discriminates, both in theory and practice, against the Slave, and in favor of the Free States: Yet, upon the ground occupied by the Standard, and, as he says, "by the Democracy of the whole country, with some exceptions," it is all right - the people of the Territories have the right to decide - they have decided, as to California - the Wilmot Proviso, if passed, or not passed, cannot affect their decision, one way or another - and thus, in our view, and we submit in the view of all candid, reasonable, and intelligent men, the Standard GIVES UP THE QUESTION, and has nothing of any value left to claim or to discuss. So far as California is concerned, it is completely BANKRUPT!

BURKE, THE ABOLITIONIST.

There is one article in the Standard of the 4th of July, which we should have noticed before this, headed "Gross injustice to Mr. Burke;" in which we are taken to task, for calling that notorious Abolitionist, the associate Editor of the Union, by his proper name.

We now, therefore, take the occasion to expose the trickery and duplicity of that venal print, the Washington Union, which pretends to be very solicitous that all the States should enjoy equally the conquered territory, while proposing a "common ground," by acceding to which, the South will effectually give up everything. We quote from Mr. Burke's introductory:

"We propose the ground of non-intervention; by which we mean that Congress shall abstain from all legislation in relation to the subject of slavery in the new territories; leaving it to the people of the territories themselves to make the necessary provisions for their eventual admission into the Union, and to regulate their internal concerns in their own way."

It will be recollected, that, as soon as the coalitions of the Democracy and Free Soilers at the North were announced, Mr. Ritchie proclaimed his intention to bring into his establishment an assistant Editor "from the North or North-west." He did so, in the person of Edmund Burke, the removed Commissioner of Patents - a Slavery restrictionist and Wilmot Provisoist: Since which time the Southern Editor of the Union (old Father Ritchie,) has suppressed his known opinions on the subject of slavery, and permitted Burke to "do" all the articles in that line.

We call him an Abolitionist. When the bill "to organize a territorial government in the Territory of Oregon, and for other purposes," was under consideration in the House of Representatives, Monday, February 3, 1845, the following amendment was proposed to the 6th section:

"Provided, however, that there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said Territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted." - Globe, 2d, 28th, p. 236.

For this amendment Edmund Burke, then a member of Congress from New Hampshire, voted; and his vote shows him a Wilmot Provisoist.

Some where about the year 1837 or '38, he edited a paper, at Newport, New Hampshire, called the "Argus and Spectator," and through its columns propagated appeals to "Democratic Abolitionists." He found no fault then with those wayward disciples of Democracy for "dissenting from slavery, and desiring its removal."

Well, what does he go for now, according to his introductory? (and which we understand the Standard as endorsing and approving?) Why, for PRACTICAL ABOLITION in the new territory! Because, "non-intervention," that "noble doctrine," as the Standard calls it, will exclude slavery as effectually from New Mexico and California as the passage of the Wilmot Proviso - Leave it to the people of the Territories to regulate their internal concerns in their own way, and who does not see that they will never consent to the introduction of slavery? So that this "common ground" proposed by the Abolitionist Burke, and endorsed by the Editor of the Standard, is, in reality carrying out the principle for which the Northern Free Soilers and Abolitionists contend, only in a different way; and by it, we should escape the passage of the Wilmot Proviso, it is true, - but the object would be as effectually obtained, and slavery forever excluded from New Mexico and California.

And now, if the Standard adopts this "non-intervention doctrine," we would humbly crave to know what is left for Ed., as a Southern man, to contend for? Or can he demonstrate, if nothing further is done, and nothing said, that slavery can ever exist in the new Territory? - for such we understand to be "non-intervention." Why, clearly, until the law is changed slavery is excluded - and from the known temper of the people now there, and those who in such great crowds, a Southern man may as well settle in Massachusetts with his slaves, as in New Mexico and California.

CHARACTER OF A DEMAGOGUE.

ABRAHAM W. VENABLE is well known to be a prominent character about these times. He is now going at large throughout the Fifth Congressional District, raising the cry of Nullification and Disunion, with many other raving and heretical dogmas, all for the purpose of convincing the people that he ought to be sent to Congress to protect their rights and preserve the Union, at the rate of 8 dollars per day and mileage.

It would be a fine pass, truly, should we suffer that very party which acquired the new Territory, and brought upon us all the trouble in relation to it, to dissolve the Union on account of it!

We fear no such thing - we do not believe there is any danger of it - The UNION PARTY, in this country is the strongest, and will ever maintain the ascendancy. To that Conservative party, the Whigs of the Nation belong. Old Zack Taylor is our leader and our head - and if he knows but one thing that peculiarly fits him for his exalted and illustrious station, that one thing is our protection. He knows well how to rout, defeat and destroy the enemies of his country. Beware of that stern, unyielding, and unconquered old Warrior! He won't be driven!

DRAWN BY HIMSELF.

The resemblance is so striking that there can be no hesitation in deciding that the author drew from his own presentment. We quote from Con'l Globe, 2d Ses. 30th Con. p. 227:

"He charged no man with being a demagogue; it would be unbecoming to make such a charge; but, if there was a character on earth who deserved the unflattering epithet of demagogue, it was the character to which he referred - the filthy, filthy being who, like the snail, always left his mark in the track where he moved. If ever our beloved institutions should come to ruin, it would be when they should fall into the hands of these demagogues, whose hearts are always as filthy as their heads are empty."

Again - He reiterated his statement, that demagogues were, of all men, the most dangerous to our institutions; and the page of history would bear him out in the assertion, that, although the rights and liberties of the people were sometimes overthrown by the sword of the conqueror, and the plots of the traitor, they more frequently fell by the silent stab of the demagogue. Demagogues, in a free government, were like children who fire in the woods; they always kindled a flame which would immediately rage beyond their power to control it. He warned every gentleman, therefore, to beware how he allowed himself to fan such a flame. He had never seen a man of this character who did not always, and on all occasions, profess his deepest affection for the people, and his suffering for who had served the country. As for himself, he loved the people about as much they loved him."

Is it not a matter of course? Graphic, drawn, and true to the life! And accordingly we may behold this same demagogue, Abraham W. Venable, with his "heart" as filthy as "his head," is empty, endeavoring to bring to ruin our beloved institutions, by preaching disunion, and "filling children in the woods," striving to "fan such a flame, as will rage beyond his power to control it." But Mr. Venable, to use his own language, has no discretion too large a job to be successful; he is travelling too weary a path to get many to walk with him; he might perhaps find a great many who would be willing to start with him, who will not be willing to go with him!

But the Portrait the Portrait! It is him to whom? and the dream of him himself!