

and abetted the Abolitionists, while the Democratic party have opposed them.

While most of the States where the Whig party bear sway, have adopted Abolition resolutions, no Democratic State, as far as we are informed or believe, has adopted or countenanced such proceedings. And while the Democratic State of Ohio, by the action of both her Legislative and Executive Departments, has taken the most effective steps to protect the rights and property of her sister States, the State of New York, while under Whig rule, has resorted to measures of wrong and outrage toward the South of the most aggravated description.

Is any other proof wanting to show the close union between the Whigs and the Abolitionists of the North? We have it in their combined action in reference to the next Presidential election.

It is known to you that the Whigs and Democrats have each held their national conventions within the last few months, in reference to the next election of the President of the United States. The Democratic Convention held at Baltimore in May last, in which there were delegates from the non-slaveholding States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, (as well as from most of the Southern States,) regarding this as one of the most important questions of the day, did not pass it by in silence. The committee appointed "to prepare resolutions, declaratory of the principles of the Republican party of the Union," consisting of one member from each of the States represented in the convention, and the chairman of which committee was the honorable R. H. Gillet of New York, reported the following amongst other resolutions, viz:

"Resolved, That Congress has no power under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges, of every thing appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the Abolitionists or others made to induce Congress to interfere with the questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences, and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people, and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend to our political institutions."

The question was taken on this resolution, as on all the others, separately, and it was adopted unanimously—every Democrat from the non-slaveholding as well as the slaveholding States, voting for it. Can any southern man ask a stronger assurance, that the great majority of the Democratic party of the north are ready and anxious to continue to us the protection of the constitutional guarantee?

Now let us inquire, where is the resolution of corresponding character to be found in the proceedings either of the National Whig Convention held at Harrisburg, or Baltimore? We answer emphatically, *nowhere*. Neither of those Conventions adopted any resolution upon the subject, and why did they not? Can any one of you resist the conclusion, that it was to avoid giving offence to, or losing the support of the Abolition branch of their party?

Every movement of the combined party since has tended to confirm this conclusion.

Every Abolitionist and every Northern Whig in Congress, supports the nomination of General Harrison. Of the Executive Committee appointed by the concurrent action of the Whigs and Abolitionists in that body to promote his election three are pledged Abolitionists, and three Northern Whigs associated, we are sorry to say, with three Southern Whigs. The nomination of Harrison itself is well known to have been carried by a coalition between the Whigs and Abolitionists. Many of the delegates to the Harrisburg Convention had already been in their several States the leaders of Abolition movements. Such were James T. Simmons, the chairman of the committee in the Rhode Island Legislature, which reported the Abolition resolutions, Wm. Clarke, Geo. Chambers, Wm. Darlington, Jno. Dick, E. T. McDowell, James Merrill, and E. C. Riegart, who took an active part in favor of the Abolition movements in the convention to amend the Constitution of Pennsylvania.

Indeed, the results of the Harrisburg Convention were every where hailed by the Abolitionists as a signal triumph. Henry Clay, Abolition since was known to be the first choice of the convention; but he had rendered himself obnoxious to the Abolitionists by his denunciations of their mad projects in the Senate of the United States, in addition to which he was a slaveholder. For these reasons, the Abolitionists in the convention set themselves at work to defeat his nomination, and succeeded; whereupon, a shout of triumph arose from the whole of the fanatical sect.

The Liberator, their organ in Boston, said:—"We regard this as another important sign of the times, as a signal defeat of the slaveocracy power in that convention. Had it not been for Abolitionism, Henry Clay, would undoubtedly have been nominated. We have faith to believe that no slaveholder will ever again be permitted to fill the Presidential office in this Republic."

The Emancipator, their organ in New York, said: "Praise to God for a great anti-slavery victory. A man of high talents, of great distinction, of long political services, of boundless personal popularity, has been openly rejected for the Presidency of this Republic on account of his devotion to slavery. Set up a monument of progress there,"—a slaveholder is incapacitated for the Presidency of the United States," &c.

The Philanthropist, their organ at Cincinnati, declared that the Abolition Editors all regarded the "rejection of Mr. Clay, and the selection of General Harrison, as to some extent a concession to the spirit of liberty in the North."

The Oberlin (Ohio) Evangelist said: "The nomination of William Henry Harrison for President of the United States, and the rejection of Henry Clay, shows that a slaveholder can never again expect to be President of this free Republic." "It may now be regarded as a settled matter that Henry Clay, nor any other slaveholder, can ever be President of the United States, even supposing the party to which he belongs to be the majority." "For what has been gained we will render thanks to God, and for what is yet needed to be gained, we will trust in the same God, and in the faithful and diligent use of the same means which have prevented the nomination of a slaveholder for President this time."

On a subsequent day, the Liberator said: "It is needless to multiply proofs that the defeat of Henry Clay at Harrisburg, was deemed by Abolitionists generally a clear demonstration of the growth of anti-slavery in the free States."

Not only the Abolition presses, but Abolition societies and conventions, joined in the chorus of triumph at the exclusion of a slaveholder from nomination, solely because he was a slaveholder.

The Massachusetts Anti Slavery society, at their annual meeting, "Resolved, That we regard the refusal of the Harrisburg Convention to nominate Henry Clay

as a candidate for the Presidency, as a signal and glorious triumph of truth over error of liberty over slavery," &c. &c.

The Executive Committee of the National Anti-slavery society, at the late meeting of the society in New York, used in their report the following language, viz: "We declare our entire conviction that the cause itself for which the society was formed, and to which it is, therefore, merely secondary, is advancing in the public mind with great rapidity and power. The rejection of Henry Clay, a slaveholder and defender of slavery, is a way-mark in our history." This is the very first evidence they adduce of the advancement of their cause, to which they add, among others, "the peaceful delivery of that portion of the Hon. William Slade's speech which presses the Abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, with its insertion in the columns of the National Intelligencer, which," they say, "shows the beginning of a change in the feelings of slaveholders." Nor do the Committee omit to notice, as another evidence of the advance of their cause, the act of the New York Legislature to which we have referred. They say "Mr. Birney had the opportunity of speaking at length on the subject in the Representatives' hall of the State of New York, before a Committee and in the presence of a large number of the members of the State Legislature, now in session, which removed some of the misapprehensions as to the jury bill and some other measures in agitation."

The Harrison nomination is nothing more nor less than one of the boasted fruits of the coalition between the Northern Whigs and Abolitionists, which have produced their joint action in the State Legislature in passing resolutions and acts destructive to the rights and interests of the South, and dangerous to the peace and union of these States. If this coalition shall succeed in obtaining control of the Governments of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and if all these States shall pass laws similar to that passed by New York, and their Executive authority shall adopt the same course of action, what security will the slaveholding States have for their property? Every slave who can succeed in passing the limits of those States, will be practically free.—Thieves will steal your slaves and be protected with their plunder throughout all those States bordering on the slaveholding region. The Constitution of the United States and the laws of Congress for the protection of your slave property will not only be made void, but it will be a crime to execute them. The lands of the south, after the withdrawal of the hands that cultivate them, will lose more than half their value, and abject poverty, if not absolute desolation, will be the fate of vast regions of a cow productive and growing country.

What party is it which is battling in the cause of the south in Ohio and Pennsylvania? It is the Democratic party. Should they be overpowered by the coalition of Whigs and Abolitionists, what will be the consequence? The just and liberal act of Ohio will be repealed, and the plunder law of New York will be substituted in its place, while its Governors will protect the plunderers. The Stevenses, the Sergeants, the Denys, and their Abolition associates, in the convention of Pennsylvania, who were baffled by the Democracy, will use the power of the Legislature and Governor to accomplish the object heretofore unsuccessfully attempted. All barriers which protect our interests, the comity of neighbors, the obligations of compacts, every principle, every law, and every institution which obstructs this fell spirit, will be swept away, and we shall be compelled to struggle, unaided, for the preservation of our constitutional rights, if not for our existence as a nation.

Under these circumstances, can any man shut his eyes to the fact that the mass of the party which support General Harrison in the non-slaveholding States, is practically the enemy of the south, whatever may be the feelings of many of the individuals who compose it? Is any one so blind as not to perceive that the consequences which have immediately followed their entire ascendancy in the State of New York, will inevitably follow their ascendancy in every other of the non-slaveholding States? Does not every one know that the same strength which will give Harrison the vote of those States, will also throw their Executive and legislative authorities into the hands of the Abolitionists and their allies? Are not the triumphs of Harrison and of anti-slavery in those States to be achieved, by the same men, by the same presses, by the same arguments?—And is not the cause of the one, to all practical intents, the cause of the other? No intelligent man, after surveying the field of political action, can doubt it. On the other hand, is not the cause of Democracy in those States the cause of anti-slavery, the cause of the South, of justice, and the Constitution; and will not its signal triumph secure the slaveholding States in all their peculiar rights and interests?

To us it seems amazing, that under these circumstances, the South does not, as one man, declare in favor of the Northern democracy. Mr. Jefferson said, that the "Democracy of the North is the natural ally of the South," and never was the truth of the declaration or the importance of the alliance, more manifest than at this moment. We beg every Southern man, to whatever party he may belong, to answer to his own bosom the following questions:

Do you approve the resolution on the subject of Abolition adopted by the Whigs of the Northern Legislatures, and particularly the act passed by that party in the Legislature of New York, and the refusal of the Governor to surrender negro stealers upon the demand of the Executive of Virginia?

Do you desire to see the same kind of legislation and Executive action resorted to by the Legislatures and Governors of Pennsylvania and Ohio and other non-slaveholding States?

Do you not believe it to be your duty to oppose, with all your power and influence, a party, the triumph of which will inevitably lead to such fatal results?

Do you not approve the anti-slavery resolution adopted by the Democratic Legislatures of the North, and especially the act of Ohio relative to fugitive slaves?

Do you desire to see the same spirit maintained, and the same legislation prevail, throughout the non-slaveholding States?

Do you believe it to be your duty to encourage, cherish, and aid a party which evinces, not by words only, but by acts, its devotion to your interests and safety, and its fidelity to the Constitution?

Two things we certain: First, South repel and treat with scorn their friends and allies in the North, she will soon have none! And if she league her self with her enemies, she must be destroyed! Is it politic to make enemies of our fellow-citizens in Pennsylvania and Ohio, in Indiana and Illinois, when it is just as easy to have friends? And will it be convenient to live the borders of Maryland and Virginia, of Kentucky and Missouri, with our souls in arms to repel aggression, or save our property from the hands of Abolitionists and negro scoundrels, in or out of authority? These things we should think of only in the last extremity—only after resorting to all peaceful, just, and

prudent means to maintain our rights, and preserve the peace and union of the States. And is not concert of action with those in the free States, who acknowledge and stand ready to defend and maintain those rights our first practical remedy, our first and most obvious duty? If we refuse to act with them, can we expect them to act without us? We sacrifice them to their enemies, and ours, how can we hereafter expect their aid, or even sympathy? It would be as unreasonable to expect it, as it would be impossible to obtain it. Upon our heads would fall the guilt, not only of surrendering our dearest interest to our natural enemy, but also the crime of ingratitude in abandoning our "natural allies."

Is there any thing really objectionable in the candidate whom the Northern Democracy presents for our support, or any thing peculiarly attractive for a Southern man in the candidate of the Whig abolitionist? Mr. Van Buren enjoys a fair moral character, talents, of a high order, principles on every leading measure of public policy in conformity with those of the South, and is, moreover, pledged, by all legal means, even to the use of the veto, if necessary, to resist the measures of the Abolitionists. The attack made upon him are, in every instance yet disclosed, founded in utter falsehood; or upon circumstances misunderstood, or too frivolous to be brought, for a moment, in comparison with the great interests now involved in the struggle of parties. On the other hand, the candidate presented by the Whig Abolition party of the North, stands identified with all the great measures and principles which the South has opposed and resisted almost "unto blood." True it is, that at different periods he has given out indications of being on different sides of most of these great questions; and it is equally true, that he refuses to state on which side he now stands. If not an Abolitionist, he has, while refusing publicly to answer any questions on the subject written letters, and one to the Hon. George Evans, member of Congress from the State of Maine, giving an Abolition coloring to his acts and opinions, with the view of obtaining the support of those implacable enemies of the South. True it is, that at about the same period, he was writing letters to the South denying his Abolitionism, with the view of obtaining also the support of slaveholders! It appears, that most, if not all, of these letters, were written under an injunction that they should not be published. He has expressed no opinions on the subject upon which the South can rely, and stands ready to act with the one party or the other as either may have a majority in Congress. Indeed, from evidence, the truth of which we do not doubt, it appears he has recently declared, on more than one occasion, that he will not veto any bill which Congress may pass!

The nomination of Mr. Seward for Governor of New York, and the nomination of General Harrison for President of the United States, were both procured by the same means—by a coalition of Whigs and Abolitionists. In New York, they succeeded in making the Governor; and what has been the result? Concessions to the Abolitionists, which, on one subject, annihilate the Constitution and laws in that State, deprive the property of the South of the stipulated protection, and give encouragement and shelter to those who steal it. This is the natural fruit of such a coalition. Elected by Abolition votes, the Governor is able to retain his office only by the assistance of those auxiliaries, and the Constitution and the rights of the South are sacrificed to secure it. If General Harrison, after being nominated by a similar coalition, shall reach the Presidential chair, must not the same results necessarily follow? Will it not be equally necessary to secure the continued support of the Abolitionists, and will not similar concessions be reported to? Will not the party in power be compelled to concede to their allies the abolition of slavery, in the District of Columbia, the interdiction of the transportation of slaves from State to State, the withdrawal in every possible way of property guaranteed by the Constitution to slave property, and encouragement to those who steal it? A concession Harrison could not more certainly earn the South in the consequences of placing the power of the Union, in the hands of a coalition, than the example in New York! Why have the two Abolition members of the Whig Executive Committee, and their numerous associates in Congress, postponed any attempt to redeem the written pledges given to their constituents, that they would use every effort to procure the Abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and an interdiction of the slave trade between the several States and Territories? Why did they not redeem those pledges at the late session? Is it supposed that they have relinquished all intention to redeem them, or that their abolition constituents will permit them to do so? No! it is only postponed till the South should take the alarm too soon. It is postponed until they make a concession to sustain a party in power. Then, as in New York, they expect to see the Constitution and the rights of the South sacrificed to maintain a party ascendancy, and secure the offices of the Executive Government. This result is as certain as that cause produces effect. We have already seen indications of the sacrifice. The Southern Whigs in Congress have already united with Abolitionists in appointing a political committee; Southern Whigs have consented to act with pledged Abolitionists upon that committee; Southern Whigs, at the late session of Congress, were found voting with Abolitionists against propositions relative to Abolition petitions, which formerly they had unanimously supported; fearful of offending the Abolition spirit, a Whig committee of the House of Representatives refused to report a bill to prohibit the introduction of negro testimony in courts martial held in the slaveholding States or Territories; for the first time we believe a formal Abolition speech from Mr. Slade was listened to on the floor of the House; and for the first time such a speech was disseminated far and wide through the columns of the most respectable Whig newspaper in Washington. The coalition at Harrisburg has already produced union of political action between the Whigs and Abolitionists in Congress; it is but one step more to a union of legislative action; and that step will assuredly be taken as soon as a President shall have been elected with the aid of Abolition votes. Not to believe this, to close our minds to the approaches of reason, and shut our eyes to the warnings of example.

And can the South give up the security she has in the character, pledges, and conduct of Mr. Van Buren, and in the principles, declarations, and acts of the party which supports him, for the chances of justice she may have from a man without any publicly avowed principles, elevated to the Presidency by a coalition of which the sacrifice of her rights and principles is every where the necessary fruit? Such infatuation does not exist among the people of the South.

What! submit to register and approve the flag of Abolition, that "in a slaveholder is to designate a man for President"? Is there an honest man in the South who will not resist this unconstitutional proposition? Is there one among us who by bowing his neck and giving his support to the Harrisburg nomination, will degrade his State, degrade the statesman whom his duties to honor, degrade himself, and make the Southern States and Southern statesmen, not the equals, as the constitution makes them, but the provinces, inferiors and vassals of the Northern States and Northern men? Who is there among us, that, with the hope of receiving major offices at the hands of Abolition Presidents, will meanly sacrifice the dignity and honor, as well as the rights, interests and safety of his State and his people? We hope not one.

The true course for the South is to reject and repudiate all concessions, direct or indirect, with Abolition and its allies. It is to vote for no man for any office in the Government, who will not openly renounce all connection with Abolition, direct or indirect, and pledge himself to exert all the powers vested in him by the Constitution and laws, to protect the constitutional rights of the slaveholding States. It is to support such statements as are true to the Constitution and faithful to their duties as members of the great assembly. The course of conduct, steadily and sternly pursued, would subject to the South an immediate and complete protection. The Whigs themselves, presenting an indolent front, never coming from their purpose, it is to be hoped the South would find in other states, men in sufficient numbers, influenced by a sense of obligation to the Constitution, to make up a majority of the Union, secure to Southern men their constitutional equality, in southern interests their constitutional protection, and to the whole Union that limited, benign, and just Government, which the fathers of the Republic intended to establish.

It is in the hope of promoting this grand and salutary union of sentiment in the South, no less useful to the Union and encouraging to mankind, than it is essential to your own interests and safety, that we have taken the trouble to collect these facts and submit three views.

C. C. CLAY, of Ala.
R. C. NICHOLS, of La.
W. M. S. FULTON, of Ark.
FRANCIS THOMAS, of Md.
GEO. C. DRUMGOOLE, of Va.
J. J. MCKAY, of N. C.
FELIX GRUNDY, of Tenn.
WILSON LIMPKIN, of Ga.
JOHN JAMESON, of Mo.
LYNN BOYD, of Ky.
A. G. BROWN, of Miss.
T. D. SUMNER, of S. C.

rest, and judge himself to exert all the powers vested in him by the Constitution and laws, to protect the constitutional rights of the slaveholding States. It is to support such statements as are true to the Constitution and faithful to their duties as members of the great assembly. The course of conduct, steadily and sternly pursued, would subject to the South an immediate and complete protection. The Whigs themselves, presenting an indolent front, never coming from their purpose, it is to be hoped the South would find in other states, men in sufficient numbers, influenced by a sense of obligation to the Constitution, to make up a majority of the Union, secure to Southern men their constitutional equality, in southern interests their constitutional protection, and to the whole Union that limited, benign, and just Government, which the fathers of the Republic intended to establish.

It is in the hope of promoting this grand and salutary union of sentiment in the South, no less useful to the Union and encouraging to mankind, than it is essential to your own interests and safety, that we have taken the trouble to collect these facts and submit three views.

C. C. CLAY, of Ala.
R. C. NICHOLS, of La.
W. M. S. FULTON, of Ark.
FRANCIS THOMAS, of Md.
GEO. C. DRUMGOOLE, of Va.
J. J. MCKAY, of N. C.
FELIX GRUNDY, of Tenn.
WILSON LIMPKIN, of Ga.
JOHN JAMESON, of Mo.
LYNN BOYD, of Ky.
A. G. BROWN, of Miss.
T. D. SUMNER, of S. C.

COLUMBUS DEMOCRAT.

SATURDAY, SEP. 19, 1840.



Not our flag is flung to the wild wind free,
Let it float over our FATHER LAND,
And the guard of its spotless fame shall be
Columbia's chosen band.

For President,
MARTIN VAN BUREN.
Election in 1840.

FOR ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT,
ROGER BARTON, of Marshall County,
HENRY S. FOOTE, of Hinds " "
ANDREW HAYS, of Leake " "
ARTHUR FOX, of Keokuk " "

FOR GOVERNOR—ELECTION IN 1841
M. P. YERGEN, of Carroll Co.,
of Wilkinson County,
To be submitted to the decision of a State Convention.

For State Treasurer,
WILLIAM NEED.

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION.

At a meeting of the Democratic State Central Committee of Mississippi, held at the city of Jackson, on the 29th of August, 1840, the following resolvable and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, this committee have received intelligence of the decease of Gen. THOMAS HINDS, of Jefferson county, one of the candidates on the Democratic Electoral Ticket; and, whereas, the high importance to the interests of the Democracy of this State that a nomination of a candidate to fill said vacancy should be immediately made;—Therefore,
Resolved, That Gen. HENRY S. FOOTE, of Hinds county, be recommended to the Democratic Electors of Mississippi as a suitable candidate to fill said vacancy.

Resolved, That the Democratic Editors throughout the State be respectfully requested to copy the proceedings of this meeting.

UPTON MILLER, Chm.
THOMAS B. WOODWARD, Secy.

We are authorized to announce James M. DOWNS as a candidate for Treasurer of State to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Col. J. H. Williams.

We are authorized to announce Col. RALPH GRAVES, a candidate for the office of Brigadier General, 2nd Brigade, 4th Division, Miss. Militia, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Gen. M. M. Brigham.

We are authorized to announce Col. THOMAS D. WOODBRIDGE, a candidate for the office of Brigadier General, 2nd Brigade, 4th Division, Miss. Militia, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Gen. Marcus M. Brigham.

MARTIN VAN BUREN.

The principles he has not only avowed but maintained openly and firmly, are dear to the South, and what is equally important, they are the principles of his party.—Geo. M. DUFFIE.

MR. VAN BUREN'S OPINIONS ON ABOLITION.

As expressed by him at various times, compared with those of General Harrison on the same subject.—

"My opinions, on the subject of the power of Congress over slave property in the Southern States, are so well understood by my friends, that I am surprised that an attempt to impose upon the public respecting them should be hazarded. The subject is, in my opinion, exclusively under the control of the State Governments."—The charge, therefore, that I am in favor of an interference by Congress in manumitting my slave property, is without foundation. So far from it, I do not see upon what authority the General Government could interfere, without a change of the Constitution, even at the instance of either, or all of the Slaveholding States."—(Letter to Mr. Green, of Mass., dated July 13, 1834.)

"The allegations which attribute to me views and opinions that are so justly obnoxious to the slaveholding States, are made in the face of the most explicit declarations on my part, and in the face of the part of the Federal Government, which is the property of the State Governments, and which is giving the same constitution to the States."—(Letter to Gen. Seale, of Ga., dated September 10, 1835.)

"I do, therefore, believe that the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia, against the wishes of the slaveholding States, (assuming that Congress has the power to effect it,) would violate the spirit of that compromise of interests, which lies at the basis of our social compact, and I am thoroughly convinced that it could not be so done without the assent of the States. Vetoing the matter in this light, it is my clear and settled opinion, that the Federal Government, ought to abstain from doing so, and that while seized duly of their own by the people of the United States, they should be the control of this action, so to use the constitutional power

with which they are invested, as to prevent it."—(Letter to a Committee in North Carolina, dated March 6, 1836.)

"I do not hesitate to give it to you as my deliberate and well-considered opinion, that there are objections to the exercise of this power, (in the District of Columbia,) against the wishes of the slaveholding States, as imperative in their nature and magnitude, as to require the exercise of public power, as the most judicious want of constitutional power would be."—Ibid.

"I prefer that not only you, but all the people of the United States should now understand that if the desire of that portion of them which is favorable to my elevation to the Chief Magistracy should be gratified, I must go into the Presidential chair the inflexible and uncompromising opponent of any attempt, on the part of Congress, to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, against the wishes of the slaveholding States; and also with the determination, equally decided, to resist the slightest interference with the subject in the States where it exists."—Ibid.

GENERAL HARRISON.
Extract from his address, written to the Abolitionists in the State of Ohio, in 1822, while canvassing for Congress, in proof of his having joined an Abolition society in 1791, in the State of Virginia.

"TO THE PUBLIC.
Fellow-Citizens: Being called suddenly home to attend my sick family, I have but a moment to answer a few calumnies which are in circulation concerning me."

"I am accused of being friendly to slavery. From my earliest youth to the present moment, I have been the ardent friend of Human Liberty. At the age of eighteen, I BECAME A MEMBER OF AN ABOLITION SOCIETY, established at Richmond, the object of which was to ameliorate the condition of slaves, and procure their freedom by every legal means. My venerable friend, Judge Gatch, of Cleveland county, was also a member of this (Abolition) Society, and has lately given me a certificate that I was one. The obligation which I then came under, I have faithfully performed."

Here is the certificate of his "venerable friend, Judge Gatch," so often alluded to:—"More than thirty years ago, I was at a meeting of the Human Society, in the city of Richmond, Va.: This Society was formed first by the Quakers, and others joined the same. The intention of this association, was to abolish slavery, as far as possibly they could in all things. I was at the time living in Virginia, and William H. Harrison presented himself as a candidate for membership. One of the members opposed his admittance, and but one, as his father owned a great number of slaves. The Harrison family were wealthy and respectable. I was unwell, and left the meeting, but understood that Mr. Harrison was admitted a member. All were rejected that held slaves."

"PHILIP GATCH." "Eleven years thereafter, to wit, in 1833, in his speech at Cheviot, he sets forth the 'legal means' spoken of in his address in 1822, 'to ameliorate the condition of the slaves, and to procure their freedom,'—which is to raise money out of the pockets of the people, to purchase their own slaves. Hear him:—

"I ask in what way the General Government can aid the cause of emancipation, I answer that it can only be an object near my heart to see the whole surplus revenue appropriated to that object; and 'by a zealous prosecution of a plan formed upon that basis, we might look to a day not very distant, when a North American sun would not look down upon a slave.'"

In 1835, in his speech at Vincennes, Indiana, then being a candidate for the Presidency, again hear him:—

"If my vote could effect it, (the abolition of slavery) every surplus dollar in the Treasury should be appropriated to that object."

Choose ye between them, Southerners.

The communication from Macon, respecting the late Hon. Capt. Jno. Fowler of Kentucky, shall appear in our next.

THE DEMOCRATIC REVIEW for August is before us. It contains some excellent articles, among others "The Independent Treasury Reform," "American Aristocracy" being a criticism on Capt. Maryatt's late work on this country, and "The currency and the parties."

When will the Argus comply with his promise to publish Lincoln's speech in reply to Ogle? Does he want a copy of the speech? If so, we can supply him with one.

It is not true as stated in the last Argus that the whigs carried Virginia last spring by a majority of 2500. The boot is on the other leg.—The popular democratic, or Van Buren majority if you choose it, was some thousands, and we feel confident Van Buren will carry the State in November by at least 5000 majority.

We are sorry that we cannot to-day pay our debts to the whig orator who held forth at the Theatre, last Tuesday night. He was exceedingly bitter, we learn, for we were not present, in his denunciations of the democratic press and democratic Editors. If possible we will attend to him particularly in our next; and show him that he too is "made of penetrable stuff."

ADDRESS OF THE DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FROM THE SLAVE HOLDING STATES.

To the extension of almost every thing else, we present to our readers to-day, the lucid and powerful Address to the people of the slaveholding States by the democratic republican members of Congress from these States, and we would earnestly call the attention of our readers to it. We hope that its length will deter no one from giving it a careful perusal. It is a document of no ordinary interest. The array of facts which it presents must be startling to every slaveholder and southern man, to whatever party he may belong, and in the words of the Louisville Advertiser, "We ask the people of the South to read that unsophisticated production, and then decide whether they can, in justice to themselves, to say nothing of their devotion to the Union, vote for the cause of Abolitionists. At all events we intend to read it, believing that a false step now on part of the friends of Southern rights, must inevitably lead to the most fearful consequences. If, even, the Abolitionists be permitted to force the consideration of their doctrines upon Congress, it will then be vain to struggle to save the Union."

The Appendix to the Address is necessarily omitted this week for the want of room. Our readers would do well to preserve both the papers containing the Address and Appendix for future reference.

The last Mississippians filed with the Proceedings of Democratic meetings held in various counties of the state for the purpose of appointing delegates to the Jackson Convention. From one to two thousand delegates were correctly informed, have been appointed, and the Convention will be very numerously attended. To-day we give the proceedings of a meeting held in Neshoba, and all the other counties in this part of the state that have not yet spoken. The convention will assemble on the 3d. Monday of this month, the 21st inst, so there is no time for delay. The earnest hope that all of the delegates from Lowndes, who are able will attend.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

We had intended to notice, at some length, the political discussion which commenced at this place, yesterday week, and closed last Tuesday evening, but the great space of our paper, which the Address of the Democratic republican members of Congress from the Southern States, occupies, renders it impossible for us to do so, this week. We feel less regretful however, as we wish to hear what our neighbor of the Argus, who has promised to notice the discussion at some length in his next, has to say upon the subject. His party opened the debate and it was proper that his opinions respecting the news and arguments advanced by the several speakers should be given first. A few remarks, therefore, we dismiss the subject for the present, reserving to take it up in our next.

The discussion was the consequence of a challenge given by the whig party to their democratic friends to meet them in public debate, in this place. Two moderators were appointed to preside over the meeting, each speaker being limited to two hours at a time. On the part of the whigs the speakers were Messrs. Harris, Starke, Harrison, and Acee, on part of the Democrats, Col. Andrew Hays, and Messrs. Boykin of Mobile, and Tucker. The subject of the debate was the Presidential election.

William L. Harris, Esq. (and we have space and time to-day only to notice a few of his remarks) opened the discussion in an attempt to prove that Martin Van Buren was not a democratic republican, and consequently did not deserve the support of the Democrats. To establish this position, he seemed to rely principally upon Mr. Van Buren's course in the New York Convention of 1820 for amending the State Constitution. Unfortunately for H's argument on this head, he is met in the outset by the fact, which, however he found it convenient to forget, he told us he had a plenty of documents with him, which any body might examine—that the Convention was confessedly a democratic republican movement, and opposed by the federalists, that its principal object was to remove every restriction on the right of suffrage and to give the state government a more democratic character, all its departments—that Mr. Van Buren was one of the warmest and most influential advocates of the State for the call of the Convention—that he residing in Albany, he was elected a member of that body by the people of Oswego, decidedly one of the most democratic republican counties in the state—and that in the convention he was, upon nearly all important questions, found acting in opposition to Judge Spencer, and other leading federalists. These important facts, which prove beyond all question that Mr. Van Buren was with the democratic republicans of his state, in their efforts to amend the Constitution, and do away with its aristocratic features, were entirely overlooked by Mr. Harris; he drew the attention of his audience to minor points, and attempted to establish his position by a course of special pleading on the subject of universal suffrage, the election of Magistrates, Militia officers &c. all of which amounts to nothing at all, as we shall attempt to show hereafter. Col. Hays replied in a very able and impressive manner to Mr. Harris; but more of this discussion in our next.

ELECTIONS.

As we were? NORTH CAROLINA. The Whig majority in this state for Governor is 5371. The whig majority in 1836 was 4758. The Legislature at joint ballot stands 88 democrats to 102 whigs. The democratic party in the old north, though beaten, are not conquered. They are routing in all the majesty and power of freedom, and appear to have good hopes of carrying the state in November.

ILLINOIS. The democratic majority in the Legislature is 23, and in the popular vote about 7,000; a very large democratic gain.

INDIANA. The whig majority for Governor is 8,578 Harrison carried the state in 1836 by 8,863 majority, democratic gain 522.

MISSOURI. We have not the full official returns, but the democrats have carried the vote by from 7 to 9 thousand majority, and have both Houses of the Legislature.

KENTUCKY. The aggregate vote in this state for Governor stands, for Leitch, 16,913; for French (dem.), 69,188. The whig have the Legislature by a large majority.

In the above states, which have recently voted, we hold our own pretty well. We have lost in the popular vote in North Carolina and Kentucky, compared with the result in those states in 1836, and we have gained in Illinois, Indiana and Missouri.

Elections for state officers were held in Vermont on the first Tuesday, and in Maine on the second Monday in this month. Returns from the former may be expected by next mail.

LAW NOTICE.
A. F. YOUNG & O. F. BLEDSOE, Attorneys at Law, Columbus, Mississippi.
Feb 23, 1840-3471