

THE REPUBLICAN.

BY W. B. GULICK.

NEWBERN, N. C., WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 1847.

VOL. 1, NO. 32.

CIRCULAR:

TO THE VOTERS OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, COMPRISING THE COUNTIES OF WAYNE, PITT, GREENE, LENOIR, JONES, CARTARET, CRAVEN, BEAUFORT, HYDE, WASHINGTON, TYRREL.

FELLOW CITIZENS:

At a Convention, held at Newbern, on the 9th of June last, in which seven Counties of the District were represented, I had the honor to be designated as the candidate of the Democratic party, to represent you in the next Congress of the United States.

Having been confined at home in attendance at the sick-bed of a dear relative, much of the time since the Convention was held, I have not had it in my power to visit so much of the District as I would gladly have done; therefore I take this method to communicate to you the views I entertain on the interesting political subjects now before you, and which may be the subjects of action in our National Legislature.

In accepting the nomination so honorably conferred on me by the Convention, I was not aware of the great responsibility assumed. I have, so far, passed my life as a private farmer, viewing with deep interest the great political events of the day, as they became known to my eyes; but without a wish to aspire to office, or to become a party leader. I may truly say that I have labored without prejudice the political movements and management of the great parties, whose opinions have divided our country, and that every vote I ever gave has been given under a conscientious conviction of right.

While I feel a diffidence in my ability to sustain the principles I profess with eloquence and power, I feel confident I can make myself understood by the great body of the voters of the District, who are, like myself, plain men, patriotic and honest, and do not desire a public servant, the more, because he possesses that kind of logic and eloquence that enables him to make the worse appear the better side. I have talents enough to tell the truth, and, from me you shall have nothing but the truth.

The first subject, on which I propose to give you my views, concerns the Treasury of the United States.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL TREASURY.

You readily bring to mind the difficulties prophesied by the whig leaders, in congress and out, on this subject,—so very prolific of debate and abuse. A few words plainly and truthfully spoken, will comprise the whole history of what has been held up as such a monster by whig orators. It is unnecessary to go over the old question of the United States Bank as a fiscal agent; all, or nearly all are now, as far as I know, agreed to consider that an obsolete idea. Nor will I go into the particular history of the Pet Bank system; because it is well known, after a trial, it was found to embarrass the country. You all know that in 1837, simultaneously, every bank from Maine to Louisiana stopped payment; and that, with a plenty of public money in what was then called the Treasury, viz. the vaults of the banks, our government was left without a dollar, or the possibility of drawing a dollar for the current expenses.

Would you, fellow citizens, be willing to see your government in such a predicament again? I would not, nor will any of you, on cool dispassionate reflection. Still, because the separation of the public funds from the power of the banks had been a measure of Mr. Van Buren's, the first act of the whig Congress which came into power in 1841, was to repeal the law of separation and leave the money, *no where*; yes, no where. They quarreled with John Tyler, the President of their own choice, about fiscal agents, and such kind of schemes, until both the Whigs and their accidental President, as they were pleased to call him, became tired and Congress adjourned, leaving the treasury, as was justly said by a whig member of Congress, in John Tyler's breeches pocket. At any rate, it was left solely and wholly at the control of the President, subject only to his own individual disposal. John Tyler happened to be more honest than the whig leaders gave him credit for, and I do not know that any serious occurred, while left by the whig congress without the protection of the law. When James K. Polk came into office, in his first message to Congress in Dec. 1845, he says, "The money of the Treasury is deposited in the State Banks, but without adequate provision made by law to secure it against casual thefts, defalcations, suspensions, &c., and he recommended that a constitutional treasury be created for the safe keeping of the public money." The details of the law provide for a treasury, such as was contemplated by the framers of the Constitution, and no other. Fellow citizens, read the law coolly and calmly, and decide whether it is not a constitutional treasury, and the only one consistent with the constitution. You may have been told the money has been stolen by the officers, or that fraud has been committed by the treasurers. It is false; not a dollar has been lost to the government. You may have been told, that it increases government patronage; it is not so; it diminishes government patronage in proportion to the difference between security government officers and the thousands of officers, stockholders and dependants of the banks who might be the recipients of government favour. Fellow citizens, have you, without party prejudice, examined the subject? If you have, or if you will, I think you will say with me, it is the only constitutional manner in which the public moneys can be kept, and the safest and the best; and that the whig leaders have attempted to deceive in representing it as such a monster, and that their outcry is all humbug.

THE TARIFF.

It is necessary to be so concise in writing a circular short enough to be read by all, (and I wish every voter to know my opinions,) that I will merely state my own views, on the subject of the Tariff, without stopping to answer objections. The Tariff of 1846, although, perhaps, not perfect, is as near a fair and equal tax as could be obtained in our wide-spread country; our interests are so diversified, it would probably be impossible to lay a tax unobjectionable to all. I believe all Republicans agree in paying such tax as is necessary for the support of Government, and that tax should be raised by duties on imports. Now, fellow citizens, I cannot look upon the law which lays these duties, as anything but a law for raising so much revenue as the government requires for its economical expenses. If, in laying such duties, you lay such a tax on one article as prevents its importation, of course you lose the amount of revenue it would pay, if imported; and you enable the manufacturer to make the article here and fix his own price for it, as he can have no foreign competition. Here there is a double injury to the country: first, the loss to the revenue, and, secondly, you, the consumers, are shamed in the price. Such was the Tariff law, passed by the Whig Congress of 1842. Articles were taxed so high as entirely to preclude importation in some instances; in other instances, so as to prevent you, the farmers, receiving them at a fair value, and while every article used by the farmer (except two, which I will name by and by) paid a tax, millions of dollars in value, of articles for the use of Northern Manufacturers, came free of duty. Was this fair? Was it just?

In the first place, all the articles which the farmers use paid a tax, a high tax, for the benefit of the manufacturer, while all other nearly all the articles used by him, came in free of duty. And this tariff the whig leaders call "protection." "Protection!" Strange term to designate injustice; for every dollar so protected out of your pockets into those of the manufacturer, is, to say the least, gross injustice to you and your children, who have equal claims under the constitution with all your fellow citizens. The tariff of '42, or whig tariff, was made expressly and avowedly with the view to this protection; so gross are many of its provisions that its friends dare not come out openly and tell the people that such articles as you require for your daily use, pay taxes according to value, but they cloak some of the most egregious frauds under *larger's Latin*, called the *minimum price* cap. Thus a piece of common cotton cloth, or common calico, is not taxed according to its cost or value, but is held to cost and be valued at 3 or 4 times its actual cost, and the tax is laid on this *assumed* value, a vile cloak to render less apparent the fraud perpetrated, many of these goods, actually costing 5, 6 or 7 cents a yard, are made to pay on the assumed value of 20 cts. a yard. Articles of luxury, and such as are only in the reach of the wealthy, are thus allowed to be brought into the country, under a duty less than that paid by the articles in common use by the farmer and labouring classes.

By the tariff of '46, this odious principle has been destroyed, and all articles now pay in proportion to their actual value. All the articles of prime necessity to farmers and mechanics are introduced under much lower rates than by the tariff of '42; still Mr. Donnell opposes the Tariff of 1846.

By the tariff of '46, the list of free articles for the special benefit of the manufacturer, is reduced four-fifths; and although the duty is small on many of the articles, they pay something towards the support of the government. Under the tariff of '42, for which the Whigs contend, the article of salt was made to pay in effect about 12 cents per bushel; under the tariff of '46, salt is taxed according to value, and pays less than 3 cents per bushel. The articles of tea and coffee are free of duty under both tariffs, that of '46 as well as that of '42. These are the two articles before alluded to, as the only ones the tariff of '42 left free, which are used by the farmer. I speak of them now, because I have been misrepresented on this subject.

Mr. Donnell argues that the Tariff of '46 is too low, and will not yield sufficient revenue to pay the expenses of the Government, and to pay the debt which has been created by the Mexican War. I am of opinion that the Tariff of '46 will prove fully sufficient, and am not willing to increase the taxes one cent, unless time proves me in error, of which I am happy to say, there is now no prospect. But if, as I have said again and again, it becomes necessary to raise more revenue, the articles of Tea and Coffee are fair objects of Taxation.

A small tax on them would yield 2,000,000 of revenue, and it would be as equitable perhaps more equitable, than any tax that could be laid, inasmuch as these articles are in general use, North and South, East and West—every section using them. Should our country's necessities call for increased duties, I say as I have said before, that I would vote a small tax on tea and coffee, as a war tax, to cease with the war; for the reason, that I thought them fair objects of taxation. No complaint is made on the salt tax, an article absolutely necessary to life, both of man and beast; and yet it is well known that you the farmers of North Carolina, pay more of this tax than the State of New York; and one half of the New England States; and by restoring the whig tariff of 1842, you would pay at least four times as much tax on salt as you now pay.

plan to repel them, a position on the left bank of that river. It was the only position our army could take, consistent with the safety of the National honor. If it precipitated the war, the fault was not Mr. Polk's, nor Gen. Taylor's, but the fault of that Constitution that compelled Mr. Polk, as President, to protect our soil from foreign invasion. In Gen. Taylor he had a good adviser, and a ready, capable and willing executive officer. The war, already determined on by Mexico, was met in the way such things should ever be met by Americans. An Irishman once said, the best way, to avoid danger is to meet it full in the face. So Mr. Polk thought, and so Gen. Taylor acted.

But it has been said the left bank of the Rio Grande is not American soil, that it does not belong to the United States. This is altogether an after-thought. The Mexican Generals and government did not, either then, before, or since, think so; for they had acknowledged it as part of Texas. If the Nueces was the boundary, why did Gen. Wolf, the Mexican General, when commanding that department, order all Mexican citizens and soldiers to the other side of the Rio Grande? If the Mexicans thought the Nueces was the boundary, why have they in all their demands and proclamations, which from time to time are promulgated against the United States, never declared it? They all say, that as a condition on which they will treat for peace, the American army must be withdrawn from their soil to the left bank of the Rio Grande; never has the Nueces been named, except by their friends in the United States. If Gen. Taylor was on Mexican ground in May '46, why did not the whig Senators, when voting freely for men and money to be sent him, all vote for the resolution offered by Mr. Crittenden to restrain him from an invasion of Mexico. They knew he was defending our own soil, and it had not then occurred to them that *capital* might be made by repudiating our national honor, and declaring the army, they appeared so anxious to succor, to be already invading Mexico. But says Mr. Donnell, "How will you pay the expenses of the war and obtain indemnity for Mexican spoils?" I answer fearlessly, we will hold the ports of Mexico now in our possession, and yielding a large revenue under the judicious tariff adopted by our President, and the territory now in the possession, until the whole be paid; and I will not say like Mr. Donnell, "I'll tax the people higher to pay it, lay new taxes, and impose a new tariff; I do not believe one cent increased revenue will be required. The amount of imports now, is far greater than the amount for preceding years, and a prospect of steady increase. In two ports only in Mexico, already over a half a million is known to have been received, and we have the actual possession of the whole of new Mexico and California.—It has been asserted that the Mexican government has no national territory, no public land. The assertion is groundless. The coast of California, for a distance of about 1200 miles, is entirely public land, with the exception of some half dozen small settlements; the whole country is unsettled and almost uninhabited, with only a population of Indians and roving tribes of less than 50,000 souls. The same may be said of New Mexico.

The increased value to our immense commerce in the Pacific ocean, would be hundreds of thousands of dollars, could our sailors have those fine ports for their rest and repairs; and nothing could be better as an act of retributive justice. In these very ports, many of the robberies, piracies, and spoils of which we have so long complained, were committed—and for these very robberies, the Mexican government promised long since to indemnify our citizens.

GEN. TAYLOR.

I come now to speak of the subject on which my opponent bases his strongest hopes of success; that is, the popularity and justly acquired fame of Gen. Taylor with which he hopes so to blind men as to induce them to support those who claim to be his friends, par excellence, and thus to cover over all their own political sins and tergiversations.

If we look back to the political history of our country only a few short years, we can hardly bring ourselves to believe that the course now indicated by the whig leaders ever could be adopted.

For Gen. Taylor, I feel as much respect, love and gratitude, as any man can feel. He deserves of his country well. He has done his duty, wherever duty has called him. But of Gen. Taylor, except as a gallant and faithful officer, who has been the most active agent in prosecuting this war against Mexico, we know nothing; yes I say, we know nothing of his views of the civil polity of our country. He has taken no part in civil government, and the great Whig leader has long since declared military qualifications are not a sufficient title to the Presidency. Mr. Donnell says he goes for Gen. Taylor. He says Mr. Polk has made an unnecessary and unjust war. Has not Gen. Taylor been an efficient engine in Mr. Polk's hands to carry on this war? Mr. Donnell says, the constitutional treasury must be repealed, and the public money placed in the banks. I do not believe that a man, who like Gen. Taylor has experienced the difficulties under which the financial concerns of the country have laboured in the time of former administrations, and the regularity, ease and safety of the present, will be willing to go back to the old system, even if the Whigs held their present position.

Mr. Donnell condemns the present tariff, and insists on the restoration of the whig principles of protection and minimums, "now as effectively exploded as the obsolete idea." Will Gen. Taylor agree with him in this, and adopting his views, follow his advice? If he does, it will, in my opinion, be a complete revolution in Gen. Taylor's fixed principles, established for years. No man can say, no man dare say, Zachary Taylor is less attached to the principles of free trade than Geo. M'Duffee. The Whigs say they would show Mexico we want none of her territory, none of her indemnity; will Gen. Taylor say so? His opinion expressed in the Gaines letter is, that we should take and maintain the line we would accept as indemnity in our negotiations

Will Gen. Taylor admit he has been the willing, the active tool of Mr. Polk, in carrying on "his, Mr. Polk's, unjust, cruel, and murderous war, against an innocent and injured people?" If he does not, how can the Whigs, who have so often stigmatized this war, in such terms, support him? In short, it is the height of absurdity for men, preaching the doctrine the Whig leaders do, to pretend to expect to save themselves by clinging to the exalted fame of Gen. Taylor.

Fellow Citizens, I appeal to your patriotism—a patriotism never doubted—to save your country from the disgrace attempted to be cast on her by declaring the war in which we are now engaged as unjust, unnecessary and murderous.

I have, as briefly as possible, given you my views. If you approve them, with due respect I solicit your support.

I am your obt' Serv't,
Wm. K. LANE.

Wayne Co., July 16th 1847.

Tennessee.

It is within the knowledge of every body that the Hon. Aaron V. Brown, the present governor, and Gen. Neill S. Brown, are addressing the citizens of Tennessee on the subject of the relative claims of the two political parties to the public support and confidence. Among the able and eloquent addresses which the gubernatorial canvass has produced, the following extract from a speech of Gov. Brown, at Clarksville, is among the most prominent and powerful.—Union.

And now (said Gov. Brown,) I come to ask the question, *Who advised the march of our army to the Rio Grande?* GENERAL TAYLOR HIMSELF! In his letter of the 4th October, 1845, he says:

"For these reasons, our position thus far has, I think, been the best possible. But now that the entire force will soon be concentrated, it may well be questioned whether the views of government will be best carried out by our remaining at this point. It is with great deference that I make any suggestions on topics that may become matter of delicate negotiation; but if our government, in settling the question of boundary, makes the line of the Rio Grande an ultimatum, I cannot doubt that the settlement will be greatly facilitated and hastened by our taking possession at once of one or two suitable points on, or quite near that river. Our strength and state of preparation, should be displayed in a manner not to be mistaken. However salutary may be the effect produced upon the border people by our presence here, (Corpus Christi,) we are too far from the frontier to impress the government of Mexico with our readiness to vindicate by force of arms, if necessary, our title to the Rio Grande. * * * Our advance to the Rio Grande will itself produce a powerful effect, and it may be that the common navigation of the river will not be disputed."

Here you see (said Gov. Brown) he advised the march as well calculated not to provoke war, but to preserve peace. He advised it as necessary and proper to vindicate our title to that river, and to secure its joint navigation.—He advised it as an able general and a wise statesman. The President followed it; and now the strange spectacle is presented, that Taylor, who gave the advice, is to be exalted to the presidency, whilst the President, who followed it, is to be pulled down with dishonor from it. It is no answer to say that Taylor only advised it in the event that the government, in settling the boundary, should make the Rio Grande an ultimatum; for I have shown that the government had so settled and negotiated the boundary—in other words, that Congress had so settled it; settled it by receiving a member residing in the disputed territory—settled it by having been notified for more than a year that the American army had been located in the disputed territory. Such information had been reported to Congress, and was lying upon the table of every member of that body from day to day for months together, without complaint and without objection.—If, then, the government, and not the President, had the settlement of that question, the government had settled it—repeatedly and conclusively settled it.

In the face of these recorded and undeniable facts, my competitor still insists that the march to the Rio Grande was the cause of the war, and cites Mr. Calhoun as his authority. Mr. Calhoun did say so in one of his speeches; but I have shown my competitor several times that he was corrected the very next morning by the publication of Marks's letter. Marks was not authorized by Gen. Arista to communicate anything to Gen. Taylor. He was acting on his own individual opinions and responsibility.

So much for Mr. Calhoun's authority. What are the opinions of Mr. Benton—my competitor's favorite witness as to boundary—as to the march of the army to that river?

"In saying this, I do not consider the march to the Rio Grande to have been the cause of the war, any more than I consider the British march on Concord and Lexington to have been the cause of the American revolution, or the crossing of the Rubicon by Cæsar to have been the cause of the civil war in Rome.—The march to the Rio Grande brought on the collision of arms, but, so far from being the cause of the war, it was itself the effect of these causes."

This authority of his favorite witness throws my competitor back on the position, that after all the annexation of Texas was the true cause of this Mexican war. In assuming this position, his competitor differed with all his whig friends from Tennessee, and with Messrs. Ewing, Gentry, Crozier, and Milton Brown in particular. Governor Brown read from the speech of the latter gentleman, declaring that he took issue with any one who assumed that position. How his competitor would settle that issue, so boldly tendered by Mr. M. Brown, when he reached the western district, he did not pretend to know; but he was willing to take it, that annexation was the cause of the war, and would now demand of his competitor why he and his party friends of this State had annexed her—

When John Tyler first proposed it, they rejected it. They voted down his treaty, and said the right time had not arrived for its consummation. The following winter they came forward and declared that the right time had then come, and Mr. Milton Brown and Senator Foster offered resolutions in their respective Houses for the consummation of that great measure. In the House of Representatives, every whig from this State finally voted for them. Mr. Brown wrote to Governor Jones that his proposition was 'an original whig proposition, and received only a reluctant support from the democrats.'—He wrote, also, that what he had done was entirely consistent with the course and the doctrines of the whig party in the presidential campaign of the preceding summer, and that Texas was then free as any nation on the globe. Well does not all this show that annexation, though at first rejected by the whigs of this State, was finally adopted and sanctioned by them? I repeat (said Gov. B.) that it was generally adopted and sanctioned by them. Why, sir, did you do so? Why, if you knew that war would come of it, did you do so? You prophesied that if done in the way and at the time it was proposed by Mr. Tyler, with the sanction and approbation of General Jackson and the democratic party, that war would be the consequence. But you never did prophesy that it would produce war if done at the time and in the manner proposed by Mr. Foster and Mr. Milton Brown.—You said expressly to the contrary. Now, it was finally done in your own way, and in your own time, and still you cry out that it has produced the war. Well, I repeat, then, why did you do it? My competitor (said Gov. Brown) often says I prophesied falsely when I used to say that war would not come of it. Why, sir, you said the same thing; for no member of your party in Congress from this State ever said or believed that war would come of it, as finally adopted upon your own proposition. It was only your prophecy that it would have come if annexation had taken place at that time, and in the manner it was first proposed. But it has come, says my competitor. Ay, it has come, but not of annexation, not of the march of the army to the Rio Grande! no, it has come of the course pursued by you and your party.

Mexico had slumbered for nearly ten years over her title—she had heard all the great powers of Christendom declare that she had no title; but when she heard from my competitor and his party, in 1844, that she did have a title to Texas—that it would be downright robbery to take it away by annexation—her hopes revived, her cupidity was awakened, her thirst for power and dominion over a portion of the Anglo-Saxon race was increased; and thus this war, with all its debt and horrors, might well be laid at the door of my competitor and his party friends. They gave aid and comfort to Mexico in asserting her claim to Texas, whatever they may have done in the way of giving aid and comfort to her in maintaining it in this war. You, sir, (said Gov. Brown,) by your speeches and arguments, and your whole tribe of public speakers in 1844, substantially told Mexico to assert her title—that it was a good one—so good, that in any war which might come from her asserting it, Heaven itself would take sides with her against your own country. And now, sir, (said Gov. B.,) if war has come from annexation, it was your annexation; and if your prophecies that war would come have been fulfilled, you have wrought their fulfillment by encouraging Mexico to assert her claim. That assertion of her claim, is this very war which we are discussing.

And now, said Gov. B., I have said all that my time will allow on the justice of the war—on its being a war of self-defence, against the invasion of Mexico. Let me now ask, when was the justice of the necessity of this war first questioned in Tennessee? Not when I issued my proclamation twelve months ago for volunteers to engage in it. No, not then; for when I called for three thousand, lo! thirty thousand of the brave and hardy sons of Tennessee rushed to our standard. Whigs and democrats equally and alike rushed forward to the call. But they came not alone!—fathers and mothers, and kindred, and friends came with them to the place of rendezvous, to see their final departure. When drawn up in line, just before the orders were given to embark on board the boats, you might have seen the tall fine-looking young volunteer leaving the line and vouching his way to some group stationed on the beach. Where is he going? To shake hands with his father for the last time, or to kneel before his mother to receive her last blessing. What is it that sustains his noble heart at such a trying moment? It is the proud thought that, although parting with his nearest and best friends, he is going to fight for his country in a just cause. What is it that makes his mother willing to give up her child—perhaps her only child—to all the hardships and all the perils of so distant and so hazardous a campaign? It is because she is an American woman, and would surrender not only her child, but if necessary, would lay down her own life for the services of her country. "Go, go, my son; it is like death to part with you, but go and drive back the insolent invaders of our soil, and, if necessary, carry the war to the enemy's country." The parting is over, and the young volunteer springs back into line, and he goes, never once doubting that he is going, in the emphatic language of Mr. Clay, to avenge the wrongs of his country. So went forth our brave and gallant volunteers, and so felt and thought all of their kindred and friends who were left behind. But one sentiment then pervaded all classes and all parties in Tennessee. When did you first hear anything to the contrary of all this? It was when Congress was about to assemble, Mr. Webster came down from the north like a roaring lion, crying 'impeach the President,' for involving our country in war. The Whig members from Tennessee responding too readily to Mr. Webster's sentiment, cried out, 'This is James K. Polk's war; and my competitor, responding too readily to them, boldly cries out, in this very canvass, 'This is James K. Polk's war, waged by him to glorify his administration.'—An unnecessary war, brought about by an unconstitutional order of the President marching the army to the Rio Grande.' Sirs,

this sudden questioning of the justice, the necessity, and propriety of this war, is the work of whig politicians in Congress—not of the whig party of the country generally. No, God forbid. But the work of the whig politicians of the last Congress. They saw the old issues one by one evaporating before them. The bank was dead; distribution was dead; the protective tariff of 1842 was dead; and nothing seemed to be left to them but a new party, with new issues and new elements to compose it. I firmly and conscientiously believe that such a scheme was formed at Washington, and is now in the process of consummation in the United States. Will Tennessee now unite in the formation of any such anti-war party? Will either whigs or democrats grant such an arrangement?—You belong to no such party now. You have escaped from such a vortex as yet. Will my countrymen ever go into it, by uniting with those who denounce this war as unjust and unnecessary, or a war of aggression on a weak, helpless, and innocent nation? I appeal to the glory of the past—to the honor of the present, and to all the proud hopes of the future, to prevent it.

And why should you unite with those who declare this war to be James K. Polk's war? Did James K. Polk declare it? No, he did not; you know he did not. He advised it, and Congress declared it. So James Madison advised the war of 1812, and Congress declared it. Then it was called James Madison's war by the blue-tick federalists of the north; now it is called James K. Polk's war. Why not call it Mr. Ewing's war, Mr. Gentry's, Mr. Crozier's, or Mr. Cooke's or Mr. Milton Brown's war? They all voted for it, and declared on the face of the bill that it was brought about by the act of Mexico. Now, my competitor will have it to be James K. Polk's war, brought about, not by any wrongful act of Mexico, but by the unconstitutional order of the President. Not by any wrongful act of Mexico! Gracious God! look at this very invasion. It was to re-enslave a brave and gallant people who had achieved their independence by years of blood and suffering.—They had achieved it by the acknowledgement of nearly all the civilized nations of the earth—they had achieved it by the solemn act of our country admitting them into our glorious Union—they had achieved it, and the flag of our country, proudly waved over them for their safety and protection. To invade such a people, for the purpose of re-enslaving them, was the greatest outrage recorded in the annals of crime and of blood. Not to have resisted and prevented the foul deed, would have disgraced and dishonored this proud republic forever. You did resist; and the uniform success of your arms furnishes proof that justice and Heaven are on your side. You did resist; and the noble men who proudly bore your banners at Monterey, Vera Cruz, and Cerro Gordo, are now at home in your midst. How did you greet them, on their return? How did the old man, leaning on his staff, hobbling his way down to the river bank to receive his son, how did he receive him? Did he say to him, "Welcome back, my son; but would to God you had your hand never gone."

I have lately learned from our members of Congress, from our whig candidate for governor, and from the public papers, that you have been fighting in the war of James K. Polk against a weak and innocent nation; and I fear that all the blood you have shed will some day cry, like Abel's, from the ground against you. Oh! did he give him such a greeting as this? If he did, that son had rather have died on the bloodied field of Mexico, than to have heard such a rebuke from the lips of one whom he so much honored and loved. But no; he gave him no such salutation. You kindled bonfires and illuminated all your dwellings on their return. Honor and kindness, and everything that gratitude could bestow was theirs. Would you now pluck one proud feather from the plum of the soldier, by telling him that all his toils, and labors, and sufferings, had been, not to serve his country, but only to glorify the administration of a mere man? And what of that brave and gallant soldier who has not and will never return? He fought hard and nobly in the battle—at last he is stricken down by the enemy. There he lies—his manly form stretched upon the earth, the glaze of death is coming over his eye-balls, the last death-rattle is gurgling in his throat—he is dying in a foreign land, far from home, and kindred, and friends. What is it that supports him in this last struggle? What is it but the hope of heaven and the consolation of dying in a just cause? Oh, I would not make a speech in Congress, or anywhere else, that might rob him of that hope and consolation, or shake his confidence in the cause for which he was dying, for all this world could give or take from me. No, no; let him die with the confidence of that gallant volunteer from Illinois. He was stretched on the earth, stricken down by the enemy's balls—he was nearly gone, but his hand yet clenched the trusty sword with which he had fought so long and so valiantly. One of his comrades came by him in the midst of the fight; he reached him his sword, and said: "Take it, my friend; it can be of no more service to me now—take it, and tell our brave comrades to fight on, fight on, our cause is just." These were his last words; and oh! that they were written in letters of gold on every glorious banner that has been unfurled in this war! Tennessee is even now making arrangements to erect a monument to the gallant dead who have fallen in battle in this year. You will rear (said he) the massy column, with its lofty summit towering to the skies. You will engrave the name of Allen and Elliott, and Martin, Ewell, and Kirkpatrick, and all the rest; but with what honorable memorial of their glorious deeds? A very distinguished member of Congress from Tennessee comes forward with his inscription; "Died at Monterey, in a war of conquest and plunder." Other members from this State propose about the same thing. James K. Polk's war; and my competitor, responding too readily to them, boldly cries out, in this very canvass, 'This is James K. Polk's war, waged by him to glorify his administration.'—An unnecessary war, brought about by an unconstitutional order of the President marching the army to the Rio Grande.' Sirs,