

THE REPUBLICAN.

W. B. GULICK.

NEWBERN, N. C. WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1848.

VOL. 2, NO. 37.

READ, READ.

THE TREE KNOWN BY ITS FRUIT.
A STATEMENT
PROVING
Millard Fillmore,
candidate of the Whig party for the office
of Vice President,
TO BE AN ABOLITIONIST,
in review of his course in the 25th, 26th, and
27th Congresses:
ALSO,
the course of Gen. Taylor to be in favor of ex-
tending the Ordinance of 1787 over the
Continent beyond the Rio Grande;
and in other words, to be in favor of
the Wilmot Proviso.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—25th Congress,
1st Session.
TUESDAY, Dec. 11, 1838.

RIGHTS OF THE SOUTH.

Mr. AHERTON rose and asked leave to sub-
mit the following resolutions:
Resolved, That this Government is a Govern-
ment of limited powers, and that, by the
Constitution of the United States, Congress
has no jurisdiction whatever over the institu-
tion of slavery in the several States of the
Confederacy.

Resolved, That petitions for the abolition
of slavery in the District of Columbia and the
Territories of the United States, and against
the removal of slaves from one State to another,
are a part of a plan of operations set on
foot to affect the institution of slavery in the
several States, and thus indirectly to destroy
the Constitution within their limits.

Resolved, That Congress has no right to do
indirectly which it cannot do directly;
that the agitation of the subject of slav-
ery in the District of Columbia, or the Terri-
tories, as a means, and with the view, of dis-
torting or overthrowing that institution in the
several States, is against the true spirit and
meaning of the Constitution, an infringement
of the rights of the States affected, and a
violation of the public faith upon which they
were entered into the Confederacy.

Resolved, That the Constitution rests on
the broad principle of equality among the
members of this Confederacy, and that Con-
gress, in the exercise of its acknowledged powers,
has no right to discriminate between the
institutions of one portion of the States and
another with a view of abolishing the one
and promoting the other.

Resolved, Therefore, That all attempts on the
part of Congress to abolish slavery in the
District of Columbia or the Territories or to
prohibit the removal of slaves from State to
State, or to discriminate between the institu-
tions of one portion of the Confederacy and
another, with the views aforesaid, are in viola-
tion of the Constitution, destructive of the
fundamental principle on which the Union of
these States rests, and beyond the jurisdiction
of Congress; and that every petition, memo-
rial, resolution, proposition, or paper, touch-
ing or relating in any way, or to any extent
whatever, to slavery as aforesaid, or to aboli-
tion thereof, shall, on the presentation thereof,
without any further action thereon, be laid
on the table, without being debated, printed,
or referred.

The introduction of the resolutions being
objected to at this time—
Mr. AHERTON thereupon moved a suspension
of the rules.

Mr. ADAMS and Mr. CRISHMAN simultane-
ously demanded the yeas and nays; which,
being ordered, were—yeas 137, nays 66, as
follows:

Yeas.—Messrs. Anderson, Andrews, Atherton,
Banks, Beatty, Beers, Beirne, Bell, Bick-
nell, Birdsall, Broadhead, Buchanan, Bynum,
John Calhoun, Cambreleng, Wm. B. Camp-
bell, John Campbell, Carter, Chambers, Chap-
man, Cheatham, Clowney, Coles, Conner,
Cobb, Craig, Gray, Crockett, Cushman,
Cawson, Deberry, De Graff, Dromgoole, El-
more, Farrington, Fairfield, Foster, Fry, Gal-
lop, James Garland, Rice Garland, Glascock,
James Graham, Grantland, Grant, Gray, Grif-
fin, Hammond, Hanes, Harlan, Harrison,
Lawes, Hawkins, Haynes, Hol, Hopkins,—
Edward Hubley, Wm. H. Hunter, Robert
M. T. Hunter, Thomas B. Jackson, Jabez
Kempner, Henry Johnson, Joseph Johnson,
Wm. Cost Johnson, Nathaniel Jones, John W.
Jones, Keim, Kemble, Klingensmith, Lewis,
Morgan, Loomis, Lyon, Mallory, Martin, May,
McKay, Robert McClellan, Abiahm Mc-
Clellan, McClure, McKennan, Menefee, Mer-
yer, Miller, Montgomery, Moore, Morgan,
Samuel W. Morris, Murray, Noble, Palmer,
Parker, Paynter, Pearce, Pennybacker, Pe-
terson, Phelps, Pickens, Plumer, Pope, Pratt,
Reilly, Rencher, Rhett, Rivers, Robertson,
Russell, Augustine H. Sheppard, Charles
Sheppard, Shields, Shepler, Snyder, South-
gate, Spencer, Stanley, Stuart, Stone, Swear-
sen, Talfierro, Taylor, Thomas, Titus,
Toucey, Towns, Turney, Underwood, Vail,
Vagener, Webster, Weeks, John White,
Whitsey, Sherrod Williams, Jared W. Wil-
liams, Joseph L. Williams, Christopher H.
Williams, Wise, Word, and Yell—137.

Nays.—Messrs. Adams, Alexander, Heman
Allen, John W. Allen, Ayerigg, Bouldin,
Biggs, William B. Calhoun, Casey, Childs,
Clark, Coffin, Corwin, Cranston, Custis, Cush-
ing, Darlington, Davee, Davies, Dunn, Ed-
wards, Evans, Everett, Ewing, Richard Flet-
cher, Isaac Fletcher, FILLMORE, Giddings,
Goode, Wm. Graham, Grennell, Haley, Hall,
Harper, Hastings, Herod, Ingham, Lincoln,
Marvin, Samson, Mitchell, Calvary Morris,
Taylor, Parmenter, Peck, Potts, Putnam,
Sarriden, Randolph, Reed, Ridgway, Robin-
son, Russell, Saltstall, Sergeant, Sibley,
Sedgwick, Smith, Stratton, Tillinghast, Toland,
Wade, S. White, and York—66.

So the rules were suspended.
The question was taken on the first resolu-
tion, and it was adopted—yeas 193, nays 6.
The question on the second resolution was
then taken, and it was adopted—yeas 136,
nays 65—Fillmore voting in the negative.

The third resolution was then read; when
Mr. BOND called for a division of the ques-
tion, so as to take the vote first on the follow-
ing branch only:
Resolved, That Congress has no right to do

that indirectly which it cannot do directly.
The vote being so taken resulted in the af-
firmative—yeas 173, nays 30—Fillmore in
the negative.

So the first branch of the third resolution
was adopted.
The second branch being read,
The question was then taken, and resulted
also in the affirmative—yeas 164, nays 40—
Fillmore again in the negative.

So the third resolution was adopted, and the
fourth was taken up.
Mr. LINCOLN called for a division of the
question on this resolution, so as to take it first
on the following branch:
Resolved, That the Constitution rests on the
broad principle of equality among the mem-
bers of this confederacy.

Such a division being accordingly ordered,
the vote thereon resulted affirmatively—yeas
180, nays 26—Fillmore in the affirmative.
The second branch of this resolution was
also agreed to—yeas 174, nays 24—Fillmore
in the negative.

Mr. RANDOLPH called for a division at the
word "Congress" in the fifth line of the fifth
resolution; which was ordered.
The first branch of the proposition was
adopted—yeas 146, nays 52—Fillmore in the
negative.

Mr. POTTS moved to lay the second branch
on the table; on which motion.
Mr. CRAIG demanded the yeas and nays;
which being ordered, were—yeas 85, nays
129—Fillmore in the affirmative.

So the motion to lay on the table was de-
cided in the negative.
The second branch of the last proposition
was then agreed to—yeas 126, nays 78—
Fillmore in the negative. See Congressional
Globe, pages 27, 28; House Journal, page
51 to 54 inclusive.

Mr. BYNUM, the champion of democracy
from North Carolina, in defending the above
resolutions, said, "I pray every Southern
man to examine these resolutions; read them
over and over again, one by one, and to say
if they were not sufficiently strong to secure
every Southern interest, while they particu-
larly forebore to encroach on the rights of
any other portion of the Union." Yet Mr.
Fillmore voted against all these resolutions
except the first, and the first branch of the
fourth.

On the 13th December Mr. WISE asked
leave to submit the following resolutions, and
what he believed to be the real sentiments of
the whole South.

1. Resolved, That Congress has no power
to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia,
or in the Territories of the United States;
whether such power in the said District or Terri-
tories be exercised "as a means, or with the
view, of disturbing and overthrowing slavery
in the States" or not.

2. Resolved, That Congress has no power
to abolish the slave trade, or prohibit the re-
moval of slaves between the States, or be-
tween the States and the District of Columbia
or Territories of the U. States.

3. Resolved, That Congress cannot receive
or consider petitions for the exercise of any
powers whatever over the subject of slavery
which Congress does not possess.

4. Resolved, That the laws of Congress
alone govern in prescribing and regulating
the mode and manner in which fugitive
slaves shall be apprehended, and their rights
to freedom held in the non-slaveholding States,
District of Columbia and Territories; and the
mode and manner in which they shall be re-
stored or delivered to their owners in the slave
States.

5. Resolved, That Congress has no power
to impose upon any State the abolition of
slavery in its limits, as a condition of admis-
sion into this Union.

6. Resolved, That the citizens of the slave-
holding States of this Union have the constitu-
tional right, voluntarily to take their slaves to
or through a non-slaveholding State, and to
sojourn or remain temporarily with such
slaves in the same, and the slaves are not
thereby ipso facto emancipated; and the
General Government is constitutionally bound
to protect the rights of slaveholding States;
and that laws of non-slaveholding States in
conflict with the laws of Congress providing
for such protection, are null and void.

Several members said, "object to them."
Mr. KIVES did so, and Mr. WISE moved a
suspension of the rules, calling for the yeas
and nays; which, being ordered, were—yeas
113, nays 96—Fillmore in the negative.—
See Congressional Globe, page 33, House
Journal, 74.

So the motion to suspend was decided in
the negative.
On the same day, Mr. SLADE asked leave
to submit the following:

Whereas there exists, and is carried on
between the ports in the District of Columbia
and other parts of the United States, and
under the sanction of the laws thereof, a trade
in human beings, whereby thousands of them
are annually sold and transported from said
District to distant parts of the country, in ves-
sels belonging to citizens of the United States;
and whereas, such trade involves an out-
rageous violation of human rights, is a disgrace
to the country by whose laws it is sanctioned,
and calls for the immediate interposition
of legislative authority for its suppression; there-
fore, to the end that all obstacles to the con-
sideration of this subject may be removed, and
a remedy for the evil speedily provided.

Resolved, That so much of the fifth resolu-
tion on the subject of slavery, passed by this
House on the 11th and 12th of the present
month, as relates to the "removal of slaves
from State to State," and prohibits the action
of this House on "every petition, memorial,
resolution, proposition, or paper touching" the
same, be, and hereby is rescinded.

Objections being made, Mr. S. moved a
suspension of the rules; and demanded the
yeas and nays; which, being ordered, were—
yeas 55, nays 157—Fillmore voting in the
affirmative.

So the House refused to suspend the rules.
See Congressional Globe, page 33; House
Journal, page 75.
On the 31st December, 1839, first session
26th Congress, Mr. COLES moved a suspen-

sion of the rules, for the purpose of offering
the following resolution:
Resolved, That every petition, memorial,
resolution, proposition, or paper, touching or
relating in any way, or to any extent what-
ever, to the abolition of slavery in the States
of this Union, or either of them, or in the
District of Columbia, or in the Territories of
the U. States, or either of them, or the re-
moval of slaves from one State to another, shall,
on the presentation thereof, without any fur-
ther action thereon, be laid upon the table
without being debated, printed or referred.

Upon which the yeas and nays were called;
and were—yeas 87, nays 84—Mr. Fillmore
in the negative.—See Cong. Globe page 93;
House Jr. page 153.

On the 13th January, 1840, Mr. LINCOLN,
of Massachusetts, presented petitions praying
for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade
in the District of Columbia, and in the Terri-
tories of the United States.

Mr. CAVE JOHNSON moved to lay the ques-
tion of reception on the table; which was
decided in the affirmative—yeas 131, nays
68—Mr. Fillmore voting in the negative.—
See Congressional Globe, page 119; House
Journal, page 204.

In relation to the presentation of such peti-
tions, Mr. BYNUM, of North Carolina, in a
speech made by him, referred the Southern
men to the source from whence those Aboli-
tion petitions came; nine-tenths of which, by
reference to the Clerk's files, had been pre-
sented to that House by Whigs of the
North.

Mr. B. said, if there was any doubts in
the minds of the Southern people as to who
were and who were not Abolitionists in that
House, they need only refer to the speeches
and the votes of its members. If they wanted
further evidence, he would refer them to the
remarks of a certain member of this House
who characterised the Northern Democrats—
who usually vote for preserving the constitu-
tional obligations imposed on them, and who
are opposed to an interference with the rights
of the South—as "Southern slaves." He
would refer them to the remark made by a
certain Abolitionist of the House, [Mr. LEWIS,
] when the vote was about being taken on
laying Mr. COLES' resolution on the table,
"now come up you Southern slaves, and show
yourselves." Yes, sir, this was the language
applied to these patriotic, high-minded men,
who regard their constitutional obligations to
the South, who are for giving quiet to the
North on this exciting subject, and for pre-
venting a servile and desolating war.

On all occasions upon this subject, we find
Mr. Fillmore voting with Mr. PECK.

On the 14th, Mr. THOMPSON, of South
Carolina, moved a suspension of the rules, to
enable him to offer the following resolution:
Resolved, That upon the presentation of
any memorial or petition praying for the aboli-
tion of slavery or the slave trade in any
District, Territory, or State of the Union, and
upon the presentation of any resolution or
other paper touching that subject, the recep-
tion of such memorial, petition, resolution, or
paper, shall be considered as objected to, and
the question of its reception shall be laid upon
the table, without debate, or further action
thereon.

The question was taken on the motion to
suspend the rules, and decided in the negative
—yeas 128, nays 77—there not being two-
thirds voting in the affirmative. Fillmore
in the negative. See Cong. Globe, page 121,
House Journal, page 206.

On the 28th, the famous 21st rule was
adopted, as follows:
"That no petition, memorial, resolution, or
other paper praying the abolition of slavery
in the District of Columbia, or any State or
Territory, or the slave trade between the
States or Territories of the United States in
which it now exists, shall be received by this
House, or entertained in any way whatever."

During the discussion upon it, the Hon. Mr.
VANDERPOEL, of Kinderhook, N. York, (Mr.
VAN BUREN'S residence,) made the following
eloquent and highly patriotic remarks, at the
conclusion of which the question was taken
on its adoption and decided in the affirmative
—yeas 114, nays 108—Fillmore in the nega-
tive.—See Congressional Globe, page 151,
House Journal, page 241.

"Mr. VANDERPOEL said it was 'not his talent
to conceal his thoughts,' and his bold and
early expression of them here and at home,
had, at a very early period, brought him into
marked disfavor with the Abolitionists. He
had never wooed them; he had never won
them, as many Northern politicians had done.
To show the estimation in which they had
held him, he need only say, that though he
had always had Abolitionists in his district,
they had never sent him one of their peti-
tions; had never trusted him with the presen-
tation of them here. It had fallen to the lot
of other gentlemen, his colleagues, who were
in greater favor with them, to present their
petitions. He well recollected that his 'Whig'
colleague [Mr. Granger,] who some days
since eulogized the Abolitionists, by telling
that so many of them had poured out their
blood at Lundy's Lane and Chippewa, and
here, some three or four years ago, presented
an Abolition petition from his (Mr. V.'s) dis-
trict. He (Mr. V.) had always been well
understood by them. He had always believ-
ed, and always so expressed himself, that all
their movements were mischievous incendiary,
insulting to our Southern brethren, and
against the letter and spirit of the solemn
compact into which we had entered with
them. He had here always voted to receive
their petitions; but the moment they were
presented, he had voted, and would again
vote, for the strongest possible measure to
reject their prayer, nail them to the table,
mingle them with the rubbish of your garret,
and in the strongest mode mark our disapprobation
of their object. He would not vote for
the proposition that the petitions should not
be received, because he believed that it would
be creating a new issue, if we adopted such
a proposition—an issue which would have the
effect of re-enforcing the Abolitionists. He
had always risen, he trusted he would ever
rise, above the miserable attempts that had
here been made to connect this great and
partial question with the pitiful, ephemeral
party conflicts of the day. He had also risen,

and would ever rise above the idea of oppos-
ing the mad schemes of Northern Abolition-
ists from the narrow consideration of sustain-
ing 'Southern interests and Southern institu-
tions.' He had taken this stand against them,
for higher and holier purposes. It was to
maintain the interests of the Union, to fulfil
our part of the compact, which formed this
confederacy of States. No, it was not as a
Northern man, or as a Southern man, that
he had so long, here and at home, struggled
to defeat the mad efforts of Northern Aboli-
tionists. It was as an American citizen, de-
termined, at all hazards, to discharge a great
and paramount duty. As I once before re-
marked on this floor, I tell you, my Southern
brethren, the great mass of the North will
fulfil the compact to the letter and spirit.—
We recognized your property in slaves when
we entered into solemn covenant and union
with you. We solemnly agreed that they
should form part of the basis of representation
on this floor; and until we become wretches,
and wholly insensible to the obligations of con-
sent and duty, we will faithfully fulfil the
compact."

Early after the meeting of the 2d Session,
26th Congress, December 9, 1840, Mr. ADAMS
offered the following resolution:
Resolved, That the standing rule of this
House, No. 21, adopted on the 28th January
last, be and the same is hereby rescinded.

Mr. JENNER of Maryland, moved to lay
the resolution on the table.
After some conversation on the subject, the
yeas and nays on the motion to lay on the
table were then ordered, and being taken
resulted as follows—yeas 82

Nays—Messrs. Adams, Baker, Barnard,
Beatty, Boardman, Brewster, Briggs, Cal-
houn, Casey, Crittenden, Clark, James Cooper,
Cranston, Edward Davies, Doe, Drig, Ever-
ett, FILLMORE, Fletcher, Gates, Goode,
Granger, Hillard, Hall, Augustus C. Hand,
Thomas Henry, Hopkins, Jackson, Charles
Johnson, Lane, Lincoln, McCulloch, Malla-
ry, Marvin, Mason, Mitchell, Calvary Morris,
Naylor, Osborne, Parmenter, Peck, Randall,
Randolph, Rariden, Ridgway, Edward Rog-
ers, Russell, Sergeant, Simonton, Slade, John
Smith, Truman Smith, Tillinghast, Toland,
Trumbull, Underwood, P. J. Wagener,
Henry, Williams, and Winthrop—58.

So the resolution was laid on the table.—
See Cong. Globe; page 12, House Journal,
page 8.

On the 21st January, 1841, Mr. ADAMS
presented and moved the reference of a petition,
asking the abolition of slavery in the District
of Columbia, and in the Territories; also,
that no new Territory tolerating slavery, may
be admitted into the Union.

Mr. CONNER moved to lay that portion of
the petition which came under the standing
rule on the table.
Mr. ADAMS asked how that was to be done,
for the petition must necessarily be cut in two.

Mr. WARREN of Georgia observed that, if
the petitioners thought proper to attach objec-
tionable matter, not conceivable by the House,
to their petition, they ought not to complain
if the whole was rejected. He therefore moved
the rejection of the whole.

That portion of the petition coming under
the rule, having been laid on the table sub
silently.

Mr. BLACK of Georgia moved to reconsider
the vote, for the purpose, in case it should
be reconsidered, of moving the rejection of
the whole, as he contended that no part of it
ought to have been received.

Mr. ADAMS demanded the yeas and nays
which were ordered, and decided by yeas and
nays as follows: yeas 103, nays 51. Fillmore
in the negative. See Cong. Globe, page 116;
House Journal, page 202.

So the vote was reconsidered. After some
further conversation, the hour having expired,
the house proceeded to the orders of the day.

On the 7th January, 1842, 2d Session, 27th
Congress, Mr. GIDDINGS of Ohio presented a
memorial from certain legal voters of Lenox,
in the county of Ashtabula, and State of Ohio,
praying Congress to repeal the laws regulat-
ing or sanctioning the holding or transporta-
tion of persons as slaves in vessels of the U.
States sailing coastwise from one State to an-
other; and to pass laws protecting the rights
of all persons claimed or held as slaves who
may be constitutionally entitled to their free-
dom by going to sea, with the consent of their
masters, beyond the jurisdiction of the State
in which they are legally held to be slaves.

Mr. W. COST JOHNSON objected to the
reception of the petition, as prohibited by a
rule of the House in relation to petitions for
the abolition of slavery.

Mr. WISE supported the objection, strenu-
ously insisting that the memorial amounted to a
prayer for the abolition of slavery on board
any American vessel, whether public or pri-
vate, in which a slave was carried three
leagues out to sea—a new shape of the Aboli-
tion question, and one that went beyond
anything heretofore attempted. He held
that the deck of an American ship was a por-
tion of the territory of the United States, let
her be in what part of the world she might.

Mr. CAMPBELL of S. C. moved to lay the
question of reception, raised by Mr. Johnson,
on the table, which also carried the petition
with it.

On this motion the yeas and nays were
taken, and resulted as follows—yeas 104, nays
86. FILLMORE in the negative.—See Con-
gressional Globe, page 105; House Journal,
134.

On the 21st January, Mr. ADAMS presented
a petition from a number of citizens of Mas-
sachusetts, stating, that by law no foreigner
of color can now become a citizen of the United
States, and hold real estate therein; and
praying that the naturalization laws may be
so amended as to permit free colored foreign-
ers to become citizens of the United States,
and to hold real estate.

Mr. WISE raised the question of reception
on the above petition, and moved to lay that
question on the table.
Mr. CALHOUN of Massachusetts asked the
yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being
taken, resulted as follows: yeas 115, nays
68. FILLMORE in the negative. See Con-
gressional Globe, page 158, House Journal,
250.

On the 12th December, '42, 3d Session,
27th Congress, Mr. ADAMS called up his resolu-
tion, rescinding the 21st rule.
Mr. W. COST JOHNSON said, if the resolu-
tion of the gentleman from Massachusetts
was thus to obstruct the public business, he
would move that it be laid upon the table.
The yeas and nays being ordered, result-
ed as follows: yeas 106, nays 102. FILL-
MORE in the negative. See Congressional
Globe, page 42; House Journal, page 38.

On the 3rd January 1843, Mr. MORGAN
presented a resolution instructing the Com-
mittee on the Territories to inquire into the
expediency of repealing an act passed by the
Territorial Legislature of Florida, entitled
"An act to prevent the future migration or
emigration of free negroes and mulattoes in-
to said territory;" or so much thereof as im-
poses a capitation tax on such of them as may
enter said Territory, and authorizes their sale
for ninety-nine years for non-payment of said
tax.

Mr. BLACK moved to lay the resolution on
the table.
Mr. JAMES called for the yeas and nays,
which were ordered, and being taken, result-
ed in yeas 113, nays 80. FILLMORE in the
negative.—See Congressional Globe, page
107; House Journal, page 131.

On the 23d February, Mr. BRIGGS of Mas-
sachusetts asked leave to submit the follow-
ing resolution:
Whereas, all laws passed by the Governor
and Legislature Council of Florida are in full
force, until disapproved by Congress: there-
fore,
Resolved, That the Committee on the Judi-
ciary be instructed, forthwith, to report the
following bill:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of
Representatives of the United States in Con-
gress assembled, That an act passed by the
Governor and Legislature Council of the Terri-
tory of Florida, approved by the said Gov-
ernor on the 5th day of March, 1842, entitled
"An act to prevent the future migration of
free negroes or mulattoes to this Territory,
and for other purposes," be and the same is
hereby disapproved, and shall henceforth be
of no force.

Mr. MERIWETHER, of Georgia, objected to
the reception of the resolution.
Mr. BRIGGS moved a suspension of the
rules.

Mr. FILLMORE believed that the subject had
been referred to the Committee on the Judi-
ciary; and he wished to know whether they
had reported on it.

The SPEAKER said they had not. This resolu-
tion was to direct them to report forthwith.
The yeas and nays were ordered on the
suspension of the rules.

The question was then taken on the mo-
tion of Mr. BRIGGS to suspend the rules; and
it was decided in the negative—yeas 66, nays
104.

Yeas—Messrs. Adams, Allen, Sherlock J.
Andrews, Baker, Barnard, Birdseye, Blair,
Boardman, Borden, Brewster, Briggs, Brock-
way, Bronson, Jeremiah Brown, Childs, Crit-
tenden, Stanley N. Clarke, Cowen, Cranston,
Cravens, FILLMORE, D. Davis, John Edwards,
Everett, FILLMORE, Gates, Patrick G.
Goode, Hall, Hallstead, Henry, Hudson,
Hunt, Joseph R. Ingersoll, James Irvin, James
Andrew Kennedy, Linn, McKennan, Mar-
chand, Mathiot, Mattocks, Maxwell, May-
nard, Morris, Osborne, Ramsey, Benjamin
Randall, Randolph, Read, Ridgway, Wm.
Russell, James M. Russell, Saltstall, San-
ford, Slade, Stokely, Stratton, Tillinghast, To-
land, Tomison, Trumbull, Wallace, Joseph
L. White, Thomas W. Williams, Winthrop,
Yoke, and Augustus Young—66.—See Con-
gressional Globe, page 337, House Journal,
page 439.

By an examination of the above record, it
must be admitted by every candid and unpre-
judiced mind, that MILLARD FILLMORE, the
candidate of the Whig party, for the Vice
Presidency, is an Abolitionist of the strictest
sect, and an enemy to the domestic institu-
tions of the South, and to the dearest rights
of the Southern people. And what is to be
expected from their Candidate for the Presi-
dency, should he unfortunately be elected. Read
with care the following extract taken from
the Signal's editorial, an Abolition paper pub-
lished in Cincinnati, Ohio.

"The old political issues may be postponed
under the pressure of circumstances; and as
for the new—those coming events which cast
their shadows before—let it be understood
that the only path of safety for those who
may hereafter fill the presidential office is to
rest in the discharge of executive functions,
and let the legislative will of the people find
utterance in an enactment. The American
people are about to assume the responsibility
of framing the institutions of the Pacific States.
We have no fears for the issue, if the high
debate in the assemblies of the people and their
representative halls." The extension over the
continent beyond the Rio Grande of the or-
dinance of 1787 is an object too high and im-
portant to be baffled by presidential veto.—
All that we ask of the incumbent of the high-
est office under the constitution, is to hold his
hand, to bow to the will of the people as
promulgated in legislative forms, and restrain
the executive action in its appropriate chan-
nels! Give us an honest administration of the
government, and an end to all cabals of a cabi-
net—all interference from the White House
—designed to sway or thwart the action of
the American people."

In answer to the above editorial General
Taylor addressed to the editor the following
letter. Mark well the words, "high opinion
and decided approval."
HEADQUARTERS, ARMY OF OCCUPATION,
"Camp near Monterey, May 18, 1847.

"SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of your letter, with the enclosure
of your editorial, extracted from the 'Signal'
of the 13th April.

"At this time the public duties command
so fully my attention, that it is impossible to
answer your letter in the terms demanded by
its courtesy, and the importance of the senti-
ments to which it alludes; neither, indeed,
have I the time, should I feel myself at liber-
ty, to enter into the few and most general sub-
jects of public policy suggested by the article
in question. My own personal views were de-

clined. I withheld till the end of the war, when my
usefulness as a military chief, serving in the
field against the common enemy, shall no longer
be compromised by their expression or discus-
sion in any manner.

"From many sources I have been address-
ed on the subject of the presidency; and I do
violence neither to myself, nor to my position
as an officer of the army, by acknowledging to
you, as I have done to all who have alluded
to the use of my name in this exalted con-
nexion, that my services are ever at the will
and call of the country, and that I am not pre-
pared to say that I shall refuse if the country
calls me to the presidential office, but that I can
and shall yield to no call that does not come
from the spontaneous action and free will of
the nation at large, and void of the slightest
agency of my own.

"For the high honor and responsibilities of
such an office, I take this occasion to say, that
I have not the slightest aspiration; a much
more tranquil and satisfactory life, after the
termination of my present duties, awaits me I
trust, in the society of my family and particu-
lar friends, and in the occupations most con-
genial to my wishes. In no case can I permit
myself to be the candidate of any party, or yield
myself to party schemes.

"With these remarks, I trust you will par-
don me, for thus briefly replying to you, which
I do with a high opinion and decided approval
of the sentiments and views embraced in your
editorial.

"With many wishes for your prosperity in
life, and great usefulness in the sphere in
which your talents and exertions are embark-
ed, I beg to acknowledge myself, most truly
and respectfully, your obedient servant,
"Z. TAYLOR,
Major General, U. S. A.

"Jas. W. Taylor, Esq., Cincinnati, Ohio."
Now read what he says in his Allison let-
ter, on the subject of "the veto power."
"The veto power. The power given by
the constitution to the Executive to interpose
his veto, is a high conservative power; but,
in my opinion, should never be exercised ex-
cept in cases of clear violation of the constitu-
tion, or manifest haste and want of considera-
tion by Congress. Indeed, I have thought
that, for many years past, the known opinions
and wishes of the Executive have exercised
undue and injurious influence upon the legis-
lative department of the government and for
this cause I have thought our system was in
danger of undergoing a great change from its
true theory. The personal opinions of the in-
dividual who may happen to