

TERMS OF PUBLICATION.
For one year, if paid in advance, \$2 00
If not paid before the close of the year, 3 00

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.
One Square of 12 lines, or less, one dollar for
the first 50 cents for each subsequent insertion.
Business and Professional Cards inserted at 10
per annum.

To Merchants and business men, who advertise
by the year, liberal deductions will be made.
JOB PRINTING,
Of every description, executed with neatness and
despatch, and on the most reasonable terms.

JUSTICES' BLANKS
Handsome printed, kept constantly on hand, and for
sale low.
Messrs. Wm. D. Malone and N. B. Coates,
are our authorized Agents, at Huntsville.

TAKE NOTICE.
Cheaper Still.
BEING desirous to close all my business in
Fayette during the present year, I have de-
termined to commence now, selling my present
stock of goods for cash, at greatly reduced prices
and many articles for cost. My goods having
been purchased in the east for cash, by a gen-
tleman well acquainted with the business, warrants
me in saying, that they are desirable in quality,
style and price, and am determined to do what I
say, and am ready to demonstrate it to all who
will give me a call, advising those wishing cheap
goods to give me a call at least, before purchasing
else where. This stock consists of staple dry
goods, bro. and ble. domestics, bed tickings, drill-
ings, tweeds, broadcloth, casimeres, casinetts,
prints all styles, gingham, lawns, silks, satins,
bonnets, ribbands, fur and palm leaf hats, cotton
and silk handkerchiefs, hardware and cutlery, cas-
tings, queensware, sugar, coffee, nails, glass, dye-
stuffs, spice, &c., &c.
JAS. B. O'TOOLE.
Fayette, May 27, 1848.

JNO. W. HENRY,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
FAYETTE, MO.
WILL attend to any business entrusted to him
in the Courts of Howard, and the coun-
ties adjoining. He may be found at the Receiv-
er's office, when not absent on professional busi-
ness. [Fayette, Nov. 6th, 1847. 35-5m.]

Joseph D. Smith,
SURGEON, PHYSICIAN, &c.
HAVING located 5 miles East of Fayette, on
his road leading to Petersburg, respectfully
offers his services to the citizens of Howard.
He may always be found at the residence of
Dr. Samuel Crews, except when professionally ab-
sent. March 19, '48.-2-6m.

Doct. A. S. Dinwiddie,
GRATEFUL for past patronage, still continues
to offer his MEDICAL SERVICES to the
citizens of Howard County.
Office on the South East side of the public
square, where he can usually be found in the day;
at night—at his residence, 34 door below the Bank
Fayette, April 10th, 1847.

I. D. Brewer,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
WILL attend to any business entrusted to
him—in the Second Judicial District.
REFERENCES.
BROWNING & BUSNELL, Quincy, Illinois.
A. W. MONROE, Esq., Fayette.
COL. J. DAVIS.
W. PUCKETT, Benton, Miss.
COL. P. H. FOUNTAIN, Pontotock, Miss.
McCANNELL & COATES, Huntsville, Mo.
Office—McCANNELL'S Buildings, Huntsville,
Mo. [Randolph co., Dec. 12th, '46. 40-1y]

Rich Dress Goods.
The attention of the Ladies is particularly in-
vited to a remarkably fine and extensive variety
of Rich dress goods and trimmings.
All descriptions of Bonnets
Parasols of all styles and quality
Laces and lace goods
Shawls and scarfs, &c. &c.
my10 BOON, TALBOT & SMITH.

James W. Harris,
Commission and Forwarding Merchant, and
Produce Dealer,
WATER STREET, GLASGOW, MO.
LIBERAL Cash advances made on all ship-
ments of Produce, &c. for the Southern and
Eastern markets.
Glasgow, January 22, 1848.—46 6m.

Medical Card.
DOCT. J. C. PARRISH AND A. PATISON,
Botanic Physicians,
GRATEFUL for past patronage, still continue
to offer their Medical Services to the citi-
zens of Howard County.
Dr. A. Patison with continuous office at his
residence, one quarter of a mile east of Mr. Wil-
loughby Williams.
Dr. J. C. Parrish may be found at his residence,
formerly occupied by James Owens, one quarter
of a mile east of Salt Creek Meeting house.
Dr. N. B. J. C. Parrish will practice Dental
Surgery.
March 4th, 1848. 52-1f

EMANUEL DERON,
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL
Druggist and Apothecary,
No. 48 N. Main Street,
AND
Corner of Eighth Street and Franklin Avenue,
KEEPS CONSTANTLY ON HAND
Fresh Drugs, Medicines, Paints, Oils, Dye-Staffs,
Window Glass, Glassware, Soap,
PERFUMERY, AND PATENT MEDICINES.
Cheap for Cash.
St. Louis, October 16th, 1847. 32-1y

Jones & Curd.
**PRODUCE, COMMISSION AND FOR-
WARDING MERCHANTS,**
No. 5, COMMERCIAL ST.,
SAINT LOUIS, MO.
May 20.—3m.

HANENKAMP, G. A. HUMBICKHOUSE.
HANENKAMP & CO.,
GROCERS,
**Commission and Forwarding
MERCHANTS,**
NO. 59, WATER STREET,
SAINT LOUIS, MO.
(11)

Doct. Winthrop H. Hopson,
HAVING located permanently in Fayette, ten-
ders his professional services to the citizens
of the place and vicinity, and respectfully solicits a
share of their patronage. During the day, ex-
cept when professionally absent, he can be at all
times be found at his office, (the same occupied by
Gen. Clark as a law office) and at night at Ori-
ginal's Tavern. [March 25.—5-6m]

BOON'S LICK TIMES.

"ERROR CEASES TO BE DANGEROUS, WHEN REASON IS LEFT FREE TO COMBAT IT.—JEFFERSON.

Vol. 9.

FAYETTE, MISSOURI, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1848.

No. 28.

I CAN'T MAKE UP MY MIND.

I can't make up my mind, mamma,
In such unceasing haste;
Nor pick from all my dying swains
A husband to my taste.
There's gay Sir Charles, a charming man,
Most affable and kind,
Who loves me so devoutly, but—
I can't make up my mind.
And, next, there's frank Sir Harry West,
So fond, so true, so clever,
Who, though I scold him all the day,
Adores me more than ever.
There's Roger Snipe, the pink of beaux,
Or else your daughter's blind,
And yet when Snipe grows serious, I—
I can't make up my mind.
There's lawyer Keen, and poet Good,
Exemplars of their sort;
Still, still, I can't make up my mind—
There's no accounting for't!
"Yes, yes there is," stern Truth replied;
"Your vanity imparts
That false delight in flattering tongues,
Which forfeits loving hearts."
On purpose to make up her mind,
So long this fair one tarried,
Her lovers, loath to hang themselves,
Sought other maids—and married!
And, though mamma is growing old,
Her daughter looks much older,
E'er since her coquetry and pridd
In the Old-Maid's Corps enrolled her.

MR. VAN BUREN'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE.

LINDENWOLD, Aug. 22, 1848.
GENTLEMEN: I have had the honor to re-
ceive your letter, giving me official in-
formation of the proceedings of the Buffalo
Convention. The composition, character
and proceedings of that body, as described
by you, and the concessions of feeling, and
to some extent, of opinions also, on the
part of its members, which enabled them
to unite their exertions upon a common, and
to the country, a vitally important ques-
tion, show it to have been governed by a
pure and lofty patriotism, and demanded
from me a grateful acknowledgement, for
the expression of confidence you have ac-
cumulated.

My position, in regard to the Presi-
dential election, is a peculiar one; and it is
due to me, that the knowledge of it, should
be co-extensive with that of every material
step I take in the canvass. In 1844, I an-
nounced my determination to continue in
retirement for the rest of my life; and my
earnest desire to do so has been undiminished
and invariable, from that moment to
the present. I declined, respectfully but
explicitly, numerous offers from friends in
other States, to promote my nomination at
the late Baltimore Convention; and in the
same spirit, refused permission to the New
York delegation to present my name to that
body, under any circumstances whatsoever.

The refusal would have been equally de-
cisive, if it had been certain, that they would
have had it in their power to carry their
friendly wishes into effect. The New York
delegation to the Utica Convention requested
my opinions, in regard to the obliga-
tions imposed upon them by the Baltimore
nominations, and the constitutionality and
expediency of a prohibition, by Congress,
of the introduction of slavery into territories
now free from it. They also asked my
consent to the use of my name, by the Con-
vention, as its candidate for the presiden-
cy. I cheerfully gave them the opinions
they desired, but declined the last request
absolutely. That they sincerely desired to
respect my wishes in this regard, I have
never doubted. But the convention were
of opinion, that the use of my name was
necessary, as well to enable the democracy
of New York to carry forward, with a rea-
sonable prospect of ultimate success, the
great principle for which they contended,
as to sustain themselves in the extraordinary
position to which they had been driven by
the injustice of others; and that the relations
which had so long existed between us, gave
them a right so to use it, not only, without
my consent, but against my known wishes.

Entertaining these views, they decided to
nominate me, and omitted to give me the
usual notice of their proceedings.
The reasons why I did not feel myself at
liberty to interpose any further obstacles
to their wishes, have been given to the pub-
lic, and need not be repeated.
It is in this form that my name, as a can-
didate for the Presidency, has been brought
before the people. Occupying this position
I shall feel myself honored by the support
of an assemblage so enlightened and patri-
otic, and so devoted to the maintenance of
the great principle we contend for, as that
in whose behalf you have addressed me.
I have examined and considered the plat-
form adopted by the Buffalo Convention, as
defining the political creed of the "Free
Democracy," with the attention due to the
grave subjects which it embraces, and the
interesting circumstances under which it is
presented. It breathes the right spirit, and
presents a political chart which, with the
explanations I am about to make, I can, in
good faith, adopt and sustain.
In regard to the chief topic of the resolu-
tions, it is not to be doubted, that the pre-
sented unprecedented movement of the public
mind in the non-slaveholding States upon
the subject of slavery, is caused mainly by
an earnest desire to uphold and enforce the
policy in regard to it, established by the
founders of the Republic. That policy, in
addition to the prospective prohibition of
the foreign slave trade, was—
1st. Adequate, efficient, and certain se-

curity against the extension of slavery into
territories where it did not practically exist.

2d. That in the language of your own
condensed and excellent resolution, "Slavery
in the several States of the Union which
recognize its existence, should depend upon
State laws, which cannot be repealed or
modified by the Federal Government;"—
and—

3d. A spirit of considerable forbearance
towards the institution, in localities where
it was placed under the control of Congress.

By a wise observance of this policy, we
have, until recently been enabled to neutral-
ize the injurious tendencies of an element
of discord, more difficult to deal with than
any to which our free institutions are ex-
posed. But unhappily for the present har-
mony, and possibly for the future welfare,
of our beloved country, a pretension has
been recently set up by our brethren of the
slaveholding States, in regard to the first
branch of this policy, so inadmissible upon
principle, and so revolting to our feelings,
as to produce a rush or public sentiment to-
wards the point of resistance, which, with
a population so considerate and so staid as
ours, is never seen, except when a conviction
exists that the honor and safety of the
country are at stake, and then always. A
train of occurrences, all tending to the same
general end, which have, for a few years
past, followed each other in rapid suc-
cession, has raised this feeling to an elevation
hitherto unknown, and produced resolves
which it is not in the power of individuals
to induce the people to recede from. The
constitutionality, the justice, the humanity
and the expediency of the ground they have
taken, are all so clear as to preclude the pos-
sibility of a continued diversity of opinion
or action in the non-slaveholding States.

The consequences that may result from
this conflict of opinion between us and those
who are, unhappily, our opponents—if their
pretensions are persisted in—are known
only to that omniscient and kind Providence
which has hitherto protected our country
and its institutions from the dangers which
have threatened them.

The claim set up by our southern breth-
ren, is a departure from the platform raised
by our common ancestors, at a period when
the claim of our Union was the brightest
and the fraternal feeling between the States
that composed it, the stronger. It comes
upon the back of a series of events well
calculated to awaken at the north, that deep
and, as it respects ourselves, overwhelming
sensation in the public mind, to which I
have referred. A brief review of them, at
a moment so critical, cannot fail to be use-
ful.

The future condition of the respective
States, in regard to probable continuance or
abolition of slavery, were correctly fore-
seen at the formation of the government.—
Those of the old thirteen which are now
exempt from it, acted under a confident an-
ticipation that they would soon become so;
whilst those of the number where slavery
still exists, could not look forward to an
equally favorable result in regard to them-
selves. It was, therefore, well understood,
at the adoption of the Constitution, that all
though a large and highly respectable por-
tion of the members of the confederacy
would probably for a long, certainly for an
indefinite period, remain slaveholding States
a majority of the States would be non-slave-
holding; and that a constitutional prepon-
derance in the federal government would be
thus secured to the latter.

To make assurances of this result doubly
sure, the slaveholding States themselves
were prominently active in a measure—the
ordinance of 1787, by which six new States
were first designed to be, and five actually
were, arrayed on the same side. These
added to the seven in which slavery had
been, or was expected to be, abolished,
would make the division in this regard 12
to 6. The evidence we possess of the cir-
cumstances and dispositions of the times,
warrants us in assuming that no one, at
that day, anticipated that this difference in
the respective conditions of the States, in
regard to slavery, would ever be overcome
or neutralized, by the accession to the con-
federacy, of new slaveholding States. Yet
in the brief period, which has elapsed—
we may well say brief, when viewed in con-
nection with such great results—we have wit-
nessed the addition of nine slaveholding,
and only three non-slaveholding States, to
the confederacy, beyond those which were
provided for before the adoption of the
Constitution, making them to stand fifteen
to fifteen. The preponderance originally
secured to the non-slaveholding States, and
with the knowledge of which they assisted
in investing the institution of slavery in the
States, with the privileges and guarantees
of the Constitution, has thus been annihila-
ted. These facts cannot be controverted
or concealed, and when once fully under-
stood, and appreciated by the people of the
non-slaveholding States, they must have a
controlling influence over their future
course. The emotions they have already
excited, ought not to surprise intelligent
and ingenious minds in any quarter.

But this is not the only, nor even the most
repulsive view which we are compelled to
take of the present pretensions of our breth-
ren of the slaveholding States. Slavery is
now presented in a livery which it never
wore before. On every previous occasion
when there has been a conflict of opinion
in regard to it, the question has only been
how far the policy of 1787 should be car-
ried out by prohibiting or restricting the
extension of slavery in territory which was
at the time, subject to its introduction. Most
of the territory of the United States which
was thus situated, save the State of Iowa,
which was excepted by the Missouri Com-
promise, has been converted into Slave

states, and admitted into the Union as such.

Now, for the first time, the attempt is made
to permit the introduction of slavery into
territories which are now free from it—
territories from which it was expelled, with-
in the last fifteen or twenty years, by the
express and solemn act of their former gov-
ernment and people—a government and
people with whom, in respect to the attri-
butes of freedom, ours would not brook a
comparison.

Nor is this its only, or its worst feature.
In annexing to our Union Texas, an exten-
sive slave State; covering an area capable
of being formed into many more such States
we became involved in a war with Mex-
ico, which claimed continued dominion over
that State. The territories in regard to
which the question is now made, are among
the conquests of this war: It is, therefore,
in effect, whatever may have been the origi-
nal objects of the war, an appeal to the in-
habitants of the non-slaveholding States, to
sanction the extension, through our instru-
mentality, of slavery into territories which
the United States have, in fact, acquired by
the sword, but which others had relieved
from that great evil. Such a proposition
need only be stated to ensure its prompt re-
jection by the non-slaveholding States.

Upon what grounds is it attempted to
sustain principles, so repugnant to our feel-
ings, so destructive in our view, to our na-
tional character and so well calculated, if
successful, to cloud the glory of this great
Republic? That there should be diversities
of opinion and feeling upon the subject of
slavery between us and our southern breth-
ren, is certainly natural.

The strength of northern aversion to the
institution, has been recently very truly
stated on the floor of the Senate, by a very
distinguished southern statesman. The peo-
ple of the north could not overcome this
aversion; if they would; and they cannot
desire to do so, because they religiously be-
lieve that the highest earthly interests of
man are based on its permanency and ulti-
mate universality. At the south the feeling
is very different, because the culture of their
minds and dispositions and the force of
habit have had an opposite tendency. This
known, and for a season, at least, incurable
diversity of opinion and feeling should beget
a spirit of conciliation and inculcate mutual
forbearance in speech and action. This
duty has doubtless been occasionally lost
sight of, on both sides; but it cannot be de-
nied that the departure from it has been
greatest on the part of our southern breth-
ren.

No one will venture to insist that it is,
at this day, either expedient or right to origi-
nate slavery in territories that are free from
it, if it can be properly prevented. But it
is insisted that this cannot be done in the
case under consideration, and in the form
proposed. First, because the constitution
does not give Congress the power to pro-
hibit slavery in the territories; and that con-
sequently, the great number of acts for the
purpose which have been passed for the
last sixty years, with general assent, were
but so many infractions of the constitution.
All will remember the solemnity and rapid-
ity with which State after State, at the
south, in succession announced this doctrine
and the arduousness of the political proscrip-
tion in the form of exclusion from the
offices of President and Vice President, of
all which refused to adopt it. But it is al-
ready apparent that difference of opinion
upon this important subject cannot be set-
tled by vehement assumptions, nor concilia-
tion in regard to it, promoted by denuncia-
tion. In our country such difficulties
must be solved by appeals to the tests pro-
vided by the Constitution. For the recti-
tude of our motives and the correctness of
our conduct, we are responsible, on earth,
to the opinion of the civilized world, and
hereafter to a power that is greater and
wiser than all.

The question of constitutionality, the
gravest of all objections that can be made
against the public measure has just passed
through the ordeal of public discussion, and
the doctrine in question has been so thor-
oughly rejected, and condemned by the
voice of the nation that it is no longer neces-
sary to spend words in refuting it.

Two circumstances have, however, oc-
curred, which though not necessary to its
overthrow, give to that overthrow a sanc-
tion that entitles them to notice. It now
appears, that twenty-eight years since, at
the time of the Missouri compromise, Mr.
Monroe, then President, a slaveholder and
elected from a slaveholding State, sub-
mitted this very question, save only that it
was then applied to slave territory, to a cabi-
net composed, among other great men, of
such giant intellects from the slaveholding
States as Crawford, Calhoun, and Wirt,
the latter the law officer of the Govern-
ment; that they were unanimously of op-
inion that Congress did possess the power in
question; and that the then President, a
man who was on the scene of action when
the Constitution was formed, concurring in
that opinion, approved the bill. The docu-
ments which attest these interesting cir-
cumstances are before the country, and every
one will judge for himself of their
claims to credence, considered in connec-
tion with what has been said upon the sub-
ject by the survivor of the Cabinet referred
to.

To bring the matter nearer to our own
times, within a few days, upon the very
heel of the recent discussions upon this
point, a bill containing this restriction—the
very bill which has, in part, produced this
discussion—has passed both branches of
the national legislature, and received the
constitutional approval of the present ex-
ecutive—an approval which it was his

sworn duty to withhold, if he had not been

satisfied that all the provisions of the bill
were in conformity to the constitution.—
The present President, also a slaveholder,
elected from a slaveholding State, with a
large portion of his cabinet in the same sit-
uation, has given the highest sanction to the
doctrine we contend for that is known to
our institutions; and although he felt him-
self called upon to make an extra message,
setting forth his reasons for believing that
the restrictions ought not to be applied to
our Mexican territories, he does not take
the slightest notice of the constitutional
objection on which so many Southern
States had based their opposition to the
general measure. This branch of the sub-
ject has been thus, and we hope forever,
disposed of.

It is further contended that slaves are
so far to be regarded as property as to au-
thorize their owners to carry them into any
of the territories, and to hold them there,
notwithstanding any act which Congress
may pass upon the subject. If Congress
have the constitutional power to prohibit
slavery in the territories, its laws place the
subject on the same footing there, as the
State laws do in the States. As well, there-
fore, might the slaveholder contend that he
can bring his slaves into territories, where
slavery is prohibited by Congress. If his
slave runs away, and enters one of the non-
slaveholding States, he does not thereby
become free, but shall be delivered up upon
the claim of the person entitled to his
services. But this is not in consequence of
the recognition of the right of property in
such person, notwithstanding the State
laws; but in virtue of an express article of
the constitution, which constitutes one of
its compromises upon the subject of slave-
ry. This view of the matter was placed in
a clear light in the recent debates, by
one of the oldest and most distinguished
members of the Senate, when he insisted
that the claim, on the part of the slave-
holders, though nominally to remove their
property, was in reality, to transport their
laws into the territories. One has, there-
fore, only to imagine a territory governed
by the various and conflicting laws of thirty
independent States, to appreciate the ab-
surdity of the pretension.

But it is insisted that the prohibition car-
ries with it a reproach to the slavehold-
ing States, and that submission to it would
degrade them. This is obviously the prin-
cipal if not the material, ground of oppo-
sition to the measure that is persisted in;
and most assuredly, if it were well found-
ed, we would have no just ground to take
exception to the earnestness with which it
is sustained. Let the objection, therefore,
be fairly and dispassionately considered.
Very erroneous opinions of the disposi-
tions of the northern people are entertained
by those who think them capable of desir-
ing the degradation of any of the States
of the confederacy, whether they be slave-
holding or otherwise. They entertain too
enlightened a sense of their own interests;
they have a just conception of the true glo-
ry of the confederacy, and of the extent
to which the humiliation of a part would
tarnish the lustre of the whole; and they
are, above all, too national in their feel-
ings, not to cherish a deep solicitude
for the honor and welfare of all its mem-
bers. If they could, therefore, believe that
the success of this measure would draw
after it such grave consequences they
would be among the last to uphold it. If
it could have such a tendency, it will cer-
tainly not be owing to any want of gen-
erality in its application.

The restriction will, of course, be oblig-
atory on all who settle in the territories,
from whatever State or country they may
have emigrated. They will all, in this re-
spect stand upon an equal footing. If any
inhabitant of any of the non-slaveholding
States, who removes to the territories has
his capital invested in business transactions
which are not permitted by the laws of the
territory, he must change the investment.
If a slaveholder desires to remove there,
he must dispose of his slaves, and employ
free labor as his countrymen and neighbors
did, when they removed to different por-
tions of the north-western territory, and
in doing so made themselves prosperous,
contented and happy.

Let us look for a moment at the charac-
ter of this measure, and compare it with
others that have gone before it. It is a re-
enactment of the ordinance of 1787, which
prohibited the introduction of slavery into
territories which had been ceded by sev-
eral of the States to the United States.—
The difference between the effects of the
two measures, consists only in the fact,
that the territory to which the ordinance
of '87 was applied, was, previous to its ses-
sion, subject to the introduction of slavery;
whilst the territory to which it is now
sought to be applied, had at the time of the
cession to us, been already exempted from
it by law. Who first proclaimed the prin-
ciple which triumphed in the enactment of
the ordinance of 1787? Thomas Jefferson.
Who promoted and secured its passage
through the Continental Congress? All
the distinguished and patriotic men who
that year represented the slaveholding
States in that body, without a solitary ex-
ception. Who gave to the measure his of-
ficial sanction, by approving a bill to car-
ry it into effect, under the new Govern-
ment? George Washington. Within the
last sixty years, and down to 1838, the
same enactment has been again and again
repeated, with the general concurrence
of the southern members, and often through
their particular instrumentality. A full
fifth of the States of the Union has been
organized as territories under its restric-
tions. In respect to Ohio, the oldest of

them, conformity to this principle in the
ordinance of '87, was required, even in the
State Constitution and government, and
the bill giving to the ordinance this applica-
tion, was reported by a committee of which
William B. Giles, of Virginia, was chair-
man, and John Rutledge, of South Caroli-
na, a member. It was passed in the Sen-
ate by a vote of sixteen to five, and among
the votes will be found the respected names
of Baldwin and Jackson, of Georgia;
Breckenridge and Brown, of Kentucky;
Franklin and Stone, of North Carolina;
Stevens, Thompson, Mason and Wilson
Cary Nicholas, of Virginia; Sumpter, of
South Carolina, and Wright, of Maryland.
The States which have grown up under
and in conformity to that ordinance; have,
in a very great degree, been settled by em-
igrants from the slaveholding States.—
Thousands of these hardy and enterprising
pioneers, many of them among the most
respectable of their fellow-citizens, for a
series of years in succession, left their
friends and neighbors in the slaveholding
States for what was then the far west, ac-
companied by their prayers and benedic-
tions; it never entering into the imagina-
tion of either that in doing so they sub-
mitted to any personal or sectional reproach
or degradation. Prosperous and happy in
their new abode, they and their associates
and the great enterprise they accomplished,
have been honored and admired by all who
have witnessed their success. One of those
very settlers, after assuming and for many
years discharging the responsibility of en-
forcing the ordinance of 1787, and after
enjoying a large share of his country's con-
fidence and respect in other forms, was
finally elevated to the Presidency, and died
in that exalted station. Another highly
distinguished inhabitant of one of the ter-
ritories, subject to the same restriction, af-
ter having also, for a long series of years,
borne the responsibility of seeing to the
execution of this now derided ordinance,
as Governor of the territory, is, at present,
the favored candidate for the same high of-
fice, of portions of the citizens of the
slaveholding as well as of the other States.

In the face of facts like these, is it pos-
sible that the application of this restric-
tion to New Mexico and California, can
operate to the disparagement of our breth-
ren of the slaveholding States? No im-
partial mind can, I think, regard it in this
light; and if there be any other objections
insisted on that are worthy of notice, I am
not apprised of them. None that are ten-
able, can, in my judgement, be offered.—
The measure is right in itself; and what is
right may always be done with ultimate
safety. The present generation stand in
the same relation towards these very ex-
tensive territories, in which the sages of
1787 stood towards the north-western ter-
ritory. If we act as wisely as they did,
results not less glorious than those which
reflect such undying honor on the policy of
that day, will follow the labors and perpet-
uate the memories of those by whom it is
now upheld.

The sixth resolution embraces the sub-
ject of slavery in the District of Colum-
bia; and I observe in it a generality of ex-
pression, in respect to the time when, and
the circumstances under which, it was the
opinion of the convention that it should be
abolished, which has not been usual on the
part of the friends in immediate action.—
Most reflecting and philanthropic minds
live in the hope, that they will one day see
slavery abolished, not only in that District,
but in the States also, in the latter through
the agency of the State governments, to
whom the constitution wisely leaves exclu-
sive power in the latter, and in the former
by Congress. I may be mistaken, but I
think I see in the guarded language of the
resolution, evidence of an apprehension,
on the part of the Convention, that a differ-
ence in opinion, to some extent at least,
existed among its members, upon the point
referred to, and of an enlightened and truly
patriotic resolve, not to suffer that cir-
cumstance, if it existed, to weaken the
great power of their unanimity on the
moral question which had brought them to-
gether.

My opinion in favor of the power of
Congress to abolish slavery in the District
of Columbia, has been repeatedly avowed,
as well when a candidate, as whilst Presi-
dent; and every day's reflection has but
served to confirm my conviction of its cor-
rectness. I at the same time, express my-
self strongly against the expediency of ex-
ercising it; and in a recent letter to the
New York delegation at Utica, I referred
to my continued opposition to that meas-
ure. The subject was only incidentally in-
troduced, and there was, consequently, but
little care taken, in regard to the terms, in
which the suggestion was made.

The form of expression which I em-
ployed has, it appears, led many honest
and intelligent men to assume that the re-
mark related, exclusively, to the past, and
was not intended to convey my present
views on the matter. This construction,
though, perhaps, not unwarranted by the
words employed, is, in fact, erroneous; and
it is due to truth, to fair dealing and to all
who take an interest in the matter, that the
subject should now be placed in its true
light.

It is not to be denied that many of the
reasons which, in 1837 and before, oper-
ated to produce the conviction I then ex-
pressed, no longer existed; and if, when
writing to the New York delegation at
Utica, I could have anticipated what has
since occurred, I should have felt it my
duty to discriminate between the reasons
which had passed away, and those which
yet remain. But when my letter to them
was written, nothing could have been fur-
ther from my expectations, than that I
should ever again be a candidate for the
Presidency; and, of course, it was not my
intention to say what my conduct would be
on this or any other matter, if again an in-
cumbent of that place.

I have spoken, in a former part of this
letter, of the three leading features of the
policy, in regard to slavery, adopted by the
Fathers of the Republic. History, if true,
must record the fact, that the north has