

POLITICAL.

TEXAS AND NEW MEXICO.

The President yesterday transmitted to the Senate the following message:

WASHINGTON, June 17th, 1850.

To the Senate of the United States:

I have received a copy of the resolution of the Senate of the 11th June instant, requesting me to inform the Senate whether any orders have been issued to any military officer at Santa Fe, to hold possession against the authority of Texas, or in any way to subordinate, or prevent the exercise of her jurisdiction over that country—and to furnish the Senate with copies of any correspondence which may have taken place between the War Department and the military stationed at Santa Fe since the date of my last communication to the Senate on that subject.

In reply to that resolution I state that no such orders have been given. I herewith present to the Senate copies of all the correspondence referred to in the resolution. All the orders relating to the subject-matter of the resolution have been heretofore communicated to the Senate.

I have already, in a former message, referred to the fact that the boundary between Texas and New Mexico is disputed. I have now to state that information has been recently received, that certain Robert S. Neighbors, styling himself commissioner of the State of Texas, has proceeded to Santa Fe with a view of organizing counties in that district under the authority of Texas. While I have no power to decide the question of boundary, and no desire to interfere with it as a question of title, I have to observe that the possession of the territory into which it appears that Mr. Neighbors has thus gone was actually acquired by the United States from Mexico, and has since been held by the United States, and in my opinion ought so to remain until the question of boundary shall have been determined by some competent authority.—Meanwhile, I think there is no reason for seriously apprehending that Texas will practically interfere with the possession of the United States.

Z. TAYLOR.

Among the letters accompanying the message was the following.

JOINT.

SANTA FE, April 15, 1850.

Sir: Having seen during the day notices posted up, both in Spanish and English, inviting the citizens of this place to convene on Saturday next, to take into consideration the propriety of making a State movement, and to petition you, as the head of this Government, to call a convention, &c. I deem it my duty, as commissioner of Texas, sent here to effect an organization under her laws of this portion of her territory, to call your attention to the fact, as well as to the 3d section of the Constitution of the United States.

I deem it the more necessary thus solemnly to protest against any conference or aid being given to this movement by the present head of this Government, in consequence of the published orders which have emanated from the War Department, and the result of an interview had between us a few days since. The government which I have the honor to represent has declared her determination to maintain inviolate all the territory within her boundaries—such boundaries as were guaranteed to her by her compact of union; and I would take this opportunity to refer you to the 3d section of the "Joint Resolution for annexing Texas to the United States," and preamble of the constitution of the State of Texas, by which the terms of said "Joint Resolution" are accepted. And also, to the "Joint Resolution for the admission of the State of Texas into the Union," approved 26th December, 1845. All of which, in my opinion, would be violated by a consummation of the objects of said State movement. And further to state, that I now most solemnly protest against any movement in favor of State cause, until Texas has extended her jurisdiction over this portion of her territory, or until the will of the State of Texas can be known in this matter, as guaranteed to her by the enactments referred to above.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

ROBERT S. NEIGHBOURS,

Commissioner State of Texas.

To Col. J. MEXSON, Commanding 9th Military Division, U. S. A., Santa Fe.

A SETTLEMENT.

"X" of the Baltimore Sun has the following, in his late correspondence: "The real and only lasting compromise between the South and the North consists in the constitution, and is reaffirmed in the bill reported from the committee of thirteen.—The South want to extend slavery, the North want to restrict it; between the two, the only safety is the principle of non-intervention; that is, taking the question out of Congress and let it be settled by the people of the territories. The Missouri compromise brings the question back to Congress, by giving Congress the right to prohibit it north of 36 30, and thus reopens the whole question. Have the South thought of that? The Northern Democrats, like Cass, Dickinson, &c. have fought the free-soilers under the Constitution; declaring the principle of non-intervention as the supreme law of the land, in which every individual has most yield; the Southern ultra want them to give up the constitution and legislate for slavery, driving them head foremost into the jaws of free-soilism, or compelling them to commit suicide to satisfy an abstract principle of justice, without the slightest advantage in practice.

"I have made special inquiries, and there is not one member from Pennsylvania who will or can vote for the Missouri compromise; and if Pennsylvania will not vote for it, what other Northern States will? I defy the advocates of the Missouri line to name me three Northern members, Democratic or Whig, who will positively vote for the Missouri line. This is the true state of the case, and if the Southern ultra will make the Missouri compromise a sine qua non—36 deg. 30 m. or fight—they may have found to see whether the men who are willing to sacrifice for the line, will also sustain it as the peril of treason.

"If the Missouri line could be obtained by Northern votes, on a condition that none of the members so voting shall be returned to the next Congress, would it be generous, would it be just would it be wise for the South to insist on such a sacrifice? and for what? For a piece of parchment on paper, which the next Congress might tear to atoms.—Let the Southern ponder on it between this and Monday next.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATE.—A dispatch to the North American says that the President has directed the District Attorney at New Orleans to proceed vigorously against all persons who can be proved to have incited the expedition against Cuba. They are indicated for the offence prescribed by the laws of our country in reference to the matter in question. They have been held to bail for trial before the U. S. court.

[Correspondence of the Baltimore Sun.

Old Zack's last stroke of policy has created much admiration and much obligation. That message about New Mexico came upon Congress like a clap of thunder in a summer's day. The thing was done, too, with so much sagacity that it amazes those whom it confounds. Who wrote that message? I have heard the inquiry often. I think it is Zack's own.—What words of contempt for the professions of Texas could equal the simple notice of a certain John S. Neighbors, styling himself a "Commissioner of Texas?"

Then, after giving what is to be construed into a most important military order—the most important that he ever gave in his whole career—after deciding in two words a high political question, which would puzzle jurists, courts, statesmen, diplomats, for a year—he quietly winds up by stating that there is no reason to believe that Texas will "practically interfere with the possession of the United States." This is as much as to say, here is my decree; you know me and I know you. You will not interfere. The message is an admirable specimen of Executive order, wherein arms were to be kept out of view, until the force of law was first tried.

Some people say the message is ambiguous.—The Union regards it as inconclusive. Certainly, they never considered it, in connection with all the circumstances bearing, or they would not have thought it vague or inconclusive. If the Union will recur to it, it will find that the last sentence conveys a distinct declaration, by implication, that Texas will be restrained from any interference with the possession claimed and held by the United States.

I think the decision of the President is correct. I am very glad that he has had an opportunity to dispel the mist hanging over his policy on this subject. In common with many others, I had supposed that he had abandoned his original policy, in regard to New Mexico, and that he did not intend to promote or facilitate the creation of a State government within the limits claimed by Texas; and that he would not suffer any hindrance to be offered to the proceedings of "a certain John S. Neighbors, styling himself a commissioner of Texas."

What greater hindrance could be offered than to promote the organization of a State Government, among a people disposed to assert their rights, and only waiting a civil organization to give effect to their efforts? But does the President stop here? Oh, no. The next step will be that Major Monroe, or whoever may preside in the Convention, will do as General Riley did, in California, resign and hand over to the civil authorities his rule and command; but this is not the stopping point.—Next comes the enforcement, by the whole executive power, of an executive decree, that Texas shall not interfere with the possessions of the United States until the dispute in question shall be settled by "competent authority."

I am much mistaken if, after all, old Zack is not sometimes the President—aye, every inch the President—or even here does the President's decree stop—by giving up the military government to the State government, he does decide, as far as he is concerned, the question in dispute; and fixes the Southern boundary of New Mexico, where Mexican law fixed it—by a line crossing the Rio Grande, east and west, one league north of El Paso.

JOH.

WASHINGTON, June 23, 1850.

The prosecution of Gen'l Foote, by Col Thomas H. Benton, before the Grand Jury of this District, terminated, as every reasonable man expected, in that body ignoring the case. The Senate committee continues its sessions at the pressing instance of Col. Benton, but without progressing any inch. Meanwhile Col. Benton has pretty well succeeded in directing public attention to Mr. Foote's pistol, and away from the furious manner in which he himself approached Mr. Foote in the Senate, and which made the latter, in common with half the spectators, believe that Col. Benton intended to commit an assault upon him. This swearing one's life against a man, and that man so feeble in health as Gen'l Foote, and the man swearing so stout a man as Col. Benton, is, after all, not entirely *comme il faut*.

Gen'l Twiggs arrived here yesterday, from Florida, without any of the Seminole Indians, which have won for that State such an enviable notoriety. They have been graciously permitted to remain another year in the Peninsula, in order that Senator Yulee may ask for another appropriation for them next year, if, in the mean time, he does not think proper to dissolve the Union.

The Editor of the Wilmington Aurora disavows the publication of the following article: but some body wrote it, though it may have been published by mistake. We call it curious:

"WE MUST FIGHT.—To that complexion it must come at last. The chance of a compromise is hopeless. Suppose that there was room for hope, it can be found only in further rendition. What have we left to give up? Nothing, not even one constitutional principle! Mr. Polk sacrificed us upon the Wilmot Proviso on the Oregon question. But surrender had been made long before. Washington yielded the Bank and Tariff questions. We do not dispute his honesty or his general greatness. He was the first President, and was skilled in public affairs; he gave to his administration a tone which is now well nigh ruining the Republic.—But let that pass now. The present is demonstrating and the future will more clearly demonstrate our obligation. Mr. Calhoun said to us once, 'he never understood the Government and Constitution.' The fact was not *vide* at the time. Hamilton knew it, Adams knew it; all of that time knew it. I am against canonizing saints or politicians, and if I die before you do, don't let me be put in calendar." As usual, the editor can remember the foregoing in *verbal* and *literary*.

NEW ORLEANS, June 21

True Bill Passed against General Lopez and other Cuba Incubers

The grand jury, today, sitting as a grand inquest for the United States, found a true bill against Gen. Lopez; Mr. Sizor, of Delaware; Governor Quintan; Judge C. Pinckney; Mr. Smith, of Mississippi; Ex-senator Henderson; Mr. O'Sullivan, former editor of the Democratic Review, and ten others of the expeditionists against Cuba. They are indicated for the offence prescribed by the laws of our country in reference to the matter in question. They have been held to bail for trial before the U. S. court.

THE RALEIGH TIMES.

Taylor, Manly, and the Union!



RALEIGH, N. C.

Friday Morning, June 23, 1850.

IF THE RALEIGH TIMES will be furnished during the gubernatorial campaign, say till 15th of August, for 50 cents. Will our friends make up clubs for us at that price?

TREASONABLE CALL ON GOV. MANLY.

On the 22d of January last, the Democratic organ, the Raleigh Standard, issued the following Manifesto to Gov. MANLY. Mark the majesty of the language—as though to this Editor were committed, in special charge, the destinies of North Carolina, and all power over the Governor, "the Legislature or his Council,"—to convene either at his command—or to issue his Proclamation to the people to appoint Delegates to the Nashville Convention:

"WE suggested last week, as our readers may remember, that one Delegate be appointed to Nashville by one party and another by the other party; and that the people should then choose nine more—one from each Congressional District. If we cannot do better, we are still in favor of this plan;—but it strikes us most forcibly that it is injurious to the character of the Commonwealth, for various reasons, that we should have, if at all practicable, authoritative State action on the subject. WE therefore CALL upon Gov. Manly either to convene the Legislature, or a Council, or to issue his Proclamation to the people, advising them of the dangers which impend over them, and suggesting to them the propriety and importance of appointing Delegates to the Nashville Convention. WE should prefer to see the Legislature assembled; but if serious objections should exist to that in the Governor's mind, or if he should think that any portion of the people would object to the expense to be incurred, LET HIM call his Council together, and LET that body take such steps as he and they may judge proper. And if neither the Legislature nor his Council, LET HIM issue his Proclamation to the people, ABOVE REFERRED TO."

Reader—have you kept your gravity until you got through with it? Have you noticed the bombastic style, (if it does not approach the *lucubrations*) of this grave and solemn requisition on the Governor of North Carolina? And what do you think of the pompous vanity which prompted it?

GOVERNOR MANLY takes no counsel from those who would plunge North Carolina into sectional agitation, or commit her to a convulse of plotters against the Union of the States. He took his stand at once for the Union, and against the Nashville Convention and all its advocates. No respect for party schemes—no fear of party denunciation or hostility—could shake for one moment his fidelity to the duty he owed North Carolina, whose Chief Magistrate he is—and all the threats of traitors and fanatics passed by him like the idle wind. His duty, he needed no Loco-foco partizan to tell him—he would allow none to be the interpreter of his oath to support the Constitution of the United States. Congress was in session—North Carolina had her Representatives there; and her rights were confided to their hands for the present.

The people, for the Governor, have rebuked the impudence of the partizans and agitators, and taken most excellent care of the Nashville Convention!

REID—AND THE WILMOT PROVISIO.

David S. Reid, the Loco-foco candidate for Governor of North Carolina, while in Congress, in 1845 and 1847, VOTED TWICE for the Oregon bill, with the WILMOT PROVISIO in it. The establishment of the truth of this charge ought to kill him politically in this State; and surely entitles him to the execration of every southern man. What insult, therefore, to the people of North Carolina, for the Democratic Convention to nominate such a man for the highest Executive Office.

And now for the proof. The first time the Wilmot Proviso occurred was on the passage of the bill organizing the Territory of Oregon, on the 3d of February, 1845. The bill contained a provision that slavery should never exist in that country, and thereby excluded citizens of the South from going there with their negroes! The bill, with this objectionable and unjust feature, was passed—Yeas 140, Nays 60. Among those who voted for its passage were forty-seven Southern Democrats, (David S. Reid, A. H. Arrington, J. R. J. Daniel, and James J. McKay, from North Carolina among them,) while every Southern Whig voted against its passage. Had these Southern Democrats been true to the South, they might have defeated the bill—might have checked Northern aggression upon Southern rights, and thus secured those rights. But no—the object was to make the Democratic party popular at the North, and hence Southern Democrats betrayed their constituents.—Now had these forty-seven Southern Democrats voted NAY, the true would have stood, Yeas 93 Nays 107, and the bill would have been deservedly rejected. Can we hope to obtain our rights, when Southern Democrats thus turn against us?—David S. Reid betrayed North Carolina, and surrendered the rights of the South when he gave that vote, and ought to have no office bestowed upon him by North Carolina Freemen. (See House Jour. 2d Sess. 28th Cong. Feb. 2d 1846, page 221. The Senate rejected the bill.

BUT THAT IS NOT ALL.

Again—David S. Reid voted for this abominable THE SECOND time, in the House of Representatives, the 19th Jan. 1847. [See Cong. Globe, 2d Sess. 29th Cong. page 198.] The same bill containing also same Wilmot Proviso again was put upon its passage, and it passed, Yeas 138, Nays 26. Two-thirds of the Southern Democrats again voted NAY, while Southern Whigs again opposed it.—To prevent mistakes we give the names of those Democrats—and mark you! David S. Reid is again among them! Here they are: James B. Howell, Lynn Boyd, W. G. Brown, L. B. Chase, Hovan, Cobb, Alva J. Cullout, John R.

J. David, Geo. S. Houston, Joseph Johnston, Andrew Johnson, Gen. W. Jones, Sebastian Jones, Jun. Lumpkin, Jas. J. McKay, Barclay Martin, Timothy P. Miller, DAVID S. REID, V. P. Stanton, Jno. W. Tibbatts, John S. Phelps, Leon. H. Sims, and Jacob Thompson.

The Senate again rejected this bill; but in 1849, the same bill was offered in Congress, and then passed both Houses, and was approved by President Polk. In the Senate there was a tie between the North and the South—but two Democratic Senators, Thomas H. Benton and Samuel Houston betrayed the South (as it had become usual for Democrats to do,) supported the bill, and it passed,—which it never could have done but for Democratic votes. Every Southern Whig voted against the bill.

And now North Carolinians are asked to cast their votes for a man for Governor, who has VOTED TWICE for the odious and abominable Wilmot Proviso in the Oregon Bill—and who is *for*—scorn him a Representative, if he did not believe that Congress had the power to prohibit Slavery!

Look at it people of North Carolina! He has twice betrayed the South—and how can you trust him?

BETRAYAL OF SOUTHERN RIGHTS.

We informed our readers last week, that the Democratic Convention of North Carolina, following the example of the Disunion Nashville Convention, oppose the compromise of Mr. Clay now before the United States Senate, and which will soon pass that body, and are in favor of the Missouri Compromise; which is absolutely a prohibition of Slavery in part of the new Territories, while Mr. Clay's plan leaves slavery to go there if the people desire it.

That the Missouri Compromise prohibits slavery should have been a sufficient reason why Democrats, who deny the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery at all, should be opposed to it, even by way of compromise—but they are absolutely willing to have the constitution of the United States, as they understand it, violated, rather than go for the compromise of Mr. Clay, which preserves the constitution, and leaves the people of the Southern States as free to carry their slaves into one part of the Territory acquired from Mexico as the other—which, at any rate, prohibits slavery nowhere!

How hypocritical must the leaders of that party be, who attempt to deceive the people by a show of desiring the settlement of the slavery question, when they propose a plan which they well know can never be attained; and thus prove to the world that they desire no settlement at all—for if the Missouri Compromise were obtained, according to Mr. Cass, the Great High Priest of "the party," it would be no settlement—because it has no validity, and is denied by him, in common with the Wilmot proviso, to be constitutional.

See the attitude our Democratic friends assume, then, in going for a measure which they declare to be unconstitutional. But see what they propose when they advocate the Missouri Compromise—to exclude expressly the Southern people with their slaves from the Territories North of 36 deg. 30 min., while it allows slavery, only by implication, South of it. And are these the same men who have all the time contended that the whole of the new Territories should remain open to settlement by the whole people, because they were obtained by the common blood and treasure! These men—Democrats, as they call themselves—who were ready to dissolve the Union, unless slavery was allowed to go to California, New Mexico, and Utah, come before the people of North Carolina with nothing better to offer than the Missouri Compromise, which, when all is done and said, prohibits slavery; and which they themselves believe to be unconstitutional! For party schemes, they are willing the constitution should be violated, and the rights of the South in half the new Territories forever surrendered! Comment is unnecessary. It is only sufficient to state their position to cover the whole party with shame and contempt.

To prevent mistakes, we subjoin the Missouri Compromise. See Third vol. U. S. Statutes at large, p. 548, Act of Congress, March 6, 1820, "to authorize the people of Missouri to form a constitution and State Government," &c.

"Sec. 8. And be it further enacted, That in all that Territory ceded by France to the United States under the name of Louisiana, which lies North of 36 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, no included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be, and is hereby, forever prohibited."

That's the Missouri Compromise! What is it but the Wilmot proviso? And that's what the Democratic Convention of North Carolina and the Nashville Convention propose in preference to Mr. Clay's compromise, which extends the Constitution of the United States over the Territories, and contains no prohibition of slavery whatever, but provides for non-intervention on the subject of slavery in the whole Territories.

THE NASHVILLE CONVENTION—NO DODGING!

It is well known that the Democratic Presses of North Carolina were all in favor of the Nashville Convention—and the Democratic party, as such, are chargeable with the attempts in this State to get it up. Who called upon Gov. Manly, with the most brazen-faced impudence, to convene the Legislature for the purpose of carrying out the disunion movement? "The North Carolina Standard," the central organ and mouth-piece of the Democratic party, operated upon by the leaders of that party, and carrying out their wishes and purposes. It was their design to intimidate the Governor of the State, if by possibility they could get him committed to a treasonable scheme against the integrity of the Union of the States. They found him as firm and immovable as the mountain of his native land, and resolved to stand by the honor and true interests of North Carolina.

But why did the Loco-foco party demand session upon this subject in such hot haste by our State Legislature? The period for the settlement of the questions growing out of slavery in the Territories had not arrived until the meeting of the present Congress; and why was there so much necessity for our being represented at Nashville, when we already had our members of Congress at Washington? The letter was the body which had the settlement of all the difficulties in its hands—and

what was any body to do at Nashville, that the Governor should act so hastily and inconsiderately in calling the Legislature together without authority of law?

The Democratic mind was satisfied that a crisis had arrived—and the call was made upon the Governor in the nature of a *presumptive demand*, eight or ten days only being allowed him to consider of it, with the purpose of denouncing him if he failed to obey the orders of the Loco-foco party, issued through their known and accredited organ?

The whole tone of that organ tended to Disunion. Professions of attachment to the Union, were profusely made, but the direct aim of all its appeals and arguments, as a supporter of the Nashville Convention, was to irritate and inflame the public mind; to render the people dissatisfied with their Government and hostile to its continuance; to exasperate their feelings, and excite their prejudices against the people of another section of our common country, and prepare their minds to expect the catastrophe of dissolution. It was the constant aim of the Standard, not only editorially, but in what its columns were filled with, to depreciate the value of the Union, and exaggerate the benefits of Disunion. Comparisons were drawn between our present situation and what it would be in case of dissolution; in which it was made to appear that the South would gain greatly by a separation and the establishment of a Southern Confederacy. Calculations in dollars and cents were paraded for the consideration and contemplation of the people; and doctrines were maintained which are calculated to overthrow the Government, and place the several States in a worse condition than they were before the Revolution.

We know that many respectable members of the Democratic party were not prepared to connect themselves with any scheme that could by possibility be converted into an engine of treason to the Union. Hence the scheme of the Nashville Convention did not succeed in North Carolina, notwithstanding the united voice of the Loco-foco press in its favor. The Whig party opposed it almost to a man, and all their presses but one or two, and it died a most shameful and ignominious death!—Since then, everybody has been trying to crawl out of it; and we suppose the day will come when an advocate of it will hardly be found on the earth.

But the Standard, the central organ of the Democracy is fully committed. We have him on the record. Through him the leaders and the Democracy in general are also fully committed—and we shall permit no dodging upon the question.

REID'S POSITION.

And now we want to understand David S. Reid's position! He has been put up as the Democratic candidate for Governor by a Democratic Convention, presided over by a Nashville Conventionist, and Delegate to that body, which opposes the settlement of the Slavery question, and goes for the impracticable Missouri Compromise. We want to know how David S. Reid is to get off from the odium of the Nashville Convention. 'Tis not do as he's not committed—that he had nothing to do with it. The President of the Convention which nominated him was for it. The Standard was for it—the organ of the Party, and the organ of Reid himself; and his friends who patronize the paper, were either all for it, or have shown no opposition to his course. Reid selected Holden to publish his letter of withdrawal—He directs to him his letter of acceptance;—The Democracy make Holden a prominent officer of their Convention; and expressed, when assembled as a party, no disapprobation of his course—but on the contrary their confidence in, and approval of him and his doings, by the election paid him and the office which he held.—Reid was the nominee of that Convention; and accepts its nomination. Surely, the distinguished members of a party are always held politically responsible for the repeated distinctive opinions and course of their official organ. Reid, therefore, is a Standard man, and of course a Nashville Convention man, and so far disaffected to the Union!

The other Democratic Editors who were present in the Convention, agreed with and upheld Holden in his course; and they all are still supported and trusted by the party. But this is not all. The Convention which nominated Reid passed a resolution of toleration towards all men who were Disunionists in the State, and held out to them the olive branch of peace as still members of the party. See Saunders's resolution—which speaks of their abominable treason as "error of opinion!" Thus all the Democratic presses of the State went for the Nashville Convention; the State Convention supports and countenances them; the Democrats are responsible for and bound by their course; a resolution of toleration was adopted by the Convention which nominated Reid; and how can David S. Reid, by any subterfuge, escape from the damning conclusion that he is a Nashville Conventionist, fully tainted with all the sins and heresies of his party?

We charge it upon him and hold him to it! The Standard dares not deny it, and claim as a merit for Mr. Reid that he was opposed to the Nashville Convention—for the Standard would repudiate his course, as a true Democrat, when he was abusing the Whigs and everybody else who did not go for that famous scheme. He called them traitors and Tories—he can't say Mr. Reid opposed it; for that would be to make a traitor and Tory of him! How does Davy stand? We want to know! Will he dodge—or can he fess! We call the gentleman impudent!

SAUNDERS AT OXFORD.

When the would-be Disunion meeting was held at Oxford, which was addressed by General Saunders, the account of the proceedings furnished us by a friend, and published in this paper, did not appear to go far enough to suit the Democracy, to which party General Saunders at that time was understood to be slightly attached, even if it suited General Saunders himself—and our account was called in question, because it did not represent him as fully committed to the Nashville Convention. The Standard therefore informed us on the 20th March, that General Saunders advocated the propriety of sending Delegates to the Nashville Convention—and the terms of "traitor" in the same paper, applied to those who denounced that Convention. And in the Standard of April 2, appeared an article signed "W. S. McClanahan," in which we are informed that "Gen. Saunders took ground in favor of representation to the Nashville Convention."

This confessed Nashville Conventionist is now a candidate for the House of Commons in Wake County—and we want to know what the true friends of the Union think of him? Can they trust him? We seriously doubt whether it is best for the people of North Carolina, who repudiated and condemned the Nashville Convention with so much patriotic unanimity, to bestow their confidence upon any one of its active supporters. The leaders of the Nashville Convention movement are strongly suspected of having got up that famous project for ulterior purposes of great mischief; and had the Southern people generally favored the measure as a Convention of Sovereign States, which was originally intended, God only knows what might have been the disastrous consequences. We know no harm was done—but that was because the Convention was a failure—instead of being the representatives of Sovereign States, the Delegates there represented nobody but themselves—and no weight has been attached to their acts anywhere.

We throw these hints out for the consideration of the people. For ourselves, we shall vote for no man, be he whom he may, now and henceforth, who favored the Nashville Convention—but we shall denounce him as unfit to be trusted by the Union-loving and law-abiding people of North Carolina. In the language of Judge Mangum, we shall "put a mark upon him;" or as Judge Saunders himself has it, after Mr. Jefferson, we shall let him "stand as a monument," not of "error of opinion," but of *Jolly and fanaticism!*

THE ROLESVILLE MEETING.

An Anti-Railroad Convention was held at Rolesville on Saturday last, over which the Rev. Burwell Temple presided. It was called for the purpose of nominating candidates for the Legislature opposed to the Raleigh Railroad, because it was thought by many Democrats that the former Convention which nominated Jones, Saunders & Co. was unfair, and not entitled to the credit usually attached to such bodies; and because it elected Mr. Shepard's resolution, which is regarded of vital importance to the best interests of the Democratic party; in other words, because it refused to make Internal Improvements a party matter, and nominated candidates friendly to the Central Railroad.

The resolution of Mr. Shepard, rejected by the Raleigh Convention, but adopted by the Rolesville meeting, requires a pledge from the Democratic candidates (if elected), to act in strict accordance with the people of Wake, in Convention, should any attempt be made in the next Legislature to appropriate money from the Public Treasury to commence any new plan of Internal Improvements, or to enlarge the subscription on the State's behalf to the Central Railroad. This Convention also resolved that they would support no candidate who does not endorse the above resolution; but should Jones, Saunders, Newson and Rollins refuse to do so, the views of this Convention would be carried out at a meeting on the 3d of July, namely, candidates opposed to the Railroad nominated.

We learn further, that Mr. James B. Shepard attended this meeting, at the request of General Saunders, and gave "direct and positive evidence" that Gen. Saunders does endorse the foregoing resolution—and in view of all that has come to our knowledge, it may be assumed that he will "endorse and adopt" it in the Standard, as directed by the meeting. If he does, of course he repudiates and rejects the action of the Convention which nominated him, and carries out the treachery and double-dealing with which we charged him in our last paper. Which faction are to be galled? These are the two wings of the "progressive Democracy" in Wake County. The Whigs have already been deceived by General Saunders—by his promises of no-party devotion to Internal Improvements. They fraternized with him cordially on that subject—gave him, in company with a few of his Democratic friends, a public Dinner; toasted him, praised him—were delighted to have his aid and co-operation in the patriotic work of improving the State. He won their confidence by his hypocrisy, and many of them have pledged him their votes. But now are they fully absolved. If he is elected to the Legislature, he goes there bound hand and foot; and though his vote may be necessary to preserve the faith and credit of the State, and to advance the Central Railroad, he is to sit still in his seat, chained and manacled, awaiting the instructions of a part of the people of Wake in Convention assembled—that part of the Democracy opposed to Internal Improvement on principle, and notoriously a minority of the people of Wake County. This is but a beginning.

WHO ELSE IS GULLED?

The people of Newbern and Eastern Carolina will open their eyes wide when they see the resolution which Mr. Shepard pledged Gen. Saunders to "adopt and endorse." They had no direct interest in the Central Railroad, if it were to stop at Goldsboro'—except that some of them were the true friends of State improvement, and were anxious to see the work going on for the benefit of the whole State. But they were led to believe, mainly from Gen. Saunders' promises and speeches, that the plan of extending the Central Railroad to Newbern would meet his support and that of all the friends of improvement in the State. He attended and addressed the meeting in Newbern in favor of such extension; and, during his stay there from 55 to 870,000 were subscribed for that purpose. Why did Gen. Saunders tell them plainly, the faith of the State is pledged to the Central Railroad—and that is passed—but hereafter I shall go for no more improvements in which the State is to be interested? Not so—he had become a party man then—but was a patriot, and went for the liberties of North Carolina. We ask the Newbern people if they did not count upon his aid and support? Let them see the resolution which Mr. Shepard engages Gen. Saunders to "adopt and endorse," and answer—Are they not gulled?

The foregoing will suffice to prove how the red hot patriot has cooled into the mere attorney of faction, ready to obey the dictation of a party wing and then the ally of the party whose secret he has become. Which of them he means to decide is not very clear as yet, though it is said Mr. Shepard is very proud of his *triumph*. As we mentioned, let us ask the Whigs and Loco-foco Democrats of the County, how can you vote for such a man, but if it is a wing of a candidate? Must a man lose his independence when he becomes a Democrat? To the party we are, to the party we are.