Nashville Patriot.

DAILY $8: TRI-WEEKLY $5: WEEKLY $3

ANTHONY S. CAMP, THOS. CALDWELL. IRA P. JONES, H. EDMUNDSON.

BY A. S. CAMP & CO.

W. HY. SMITH, } Editors.
IRA P. JONES, }
JOHN E. HATCHER, Associate Editor.

Office---No. 16 Deaderick Street.

For President,

JOHN BELL,

OF TENNESSEE.

For Vice-President,

EDWARD EVERETT,

OF MASSACHUSETTS.

ELECTORAL TICKET

FOR THE STATE AT LARGE.

BAILIE PEYTON, of Sumner,
N. G. TAYLOR, of Carter.

FOR THE DISTRICTS.

1. WM. M. BRADFORD, of Jefferson.
2. O. P. TEMPLE, of Knox.
3. ALFRED CALDWELL, of McMinn.
4. S. S. STANTON, of Smith.
5. E. I. GOLLADAY, of Wilson.
6. WM. F. KERCHEVAL, of Lincoln.
7. JOHN C. BROWN, of Giles.
8. JOHN F. HOUSE, of Montgomery.
9. ALVIN HAWKINS, of Carroll.
10. D. B. NABORS, of Shelby.

Central Executive Committee.

EDWIN H. EWING, NEILL S. BROWN, ALLEN A. HALL, P. W. MAXEY, JOHN LELLYETT, JOHN H. CALLENDER, HORACE H. HARRISON.

SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 21, 1860

To the Subscribers of the Nashville News.

Subscribers to the Nashville Daily *News* who have paid for the same in advance will be furnished with the PATRIOT until the expiration of the time for which they have paid. All who have not paid in advance will be charged the regular rates of the PATRIOT from this date. We will continue to send the PATRIOT to all the subscribers of the *News* who were not already subscribers of the PATRIOT, until we receive notice to discontinue. City subscribers who desire the paper discontinued will notify us at once. The confusion incident to such a transfer may disturb the regular delivery of papers for a few days, and such as may be omitted will confer a favor by leaving word at our office.

A. S. CAMP & CO.

The Reception of Abolition Petitions.

The enemies of Mr. BELL, in some of the Southern States, have a great deal to say relative to the course which Mr. BELL pursued many years ago in Congress upon the question of the reception of abolition petitions The best defence of his course, and exposition of his motives, are to be found in his admirable letter to Mr. GILMER, of Georgia, published in the *National Intelligencer* in 1840. That his supporters of to-day may be fully informed upon the subject, we republish the letter this morning. We hope no one will fail to peruse it. The political history of the country, since it was written, shows conclusively that Mr. BELL was right and vindicates his claims to the sagacity and wise forecast of true statesmanship. The evils resulting from the agitation of the slavery question, have been great as he predicted, and may yet end in the destruction of the Government.

Mr. Yancey's Reply to Messrs. Carrol and Waterson,

The Memphis *Avalanche*, of the 17th, publishes a reply from Hon WM. L. YANCEY of Alabama, to the "Address to the Democracy of Tennessee" recently published by Messrs. WM. H. CARROL and HARVEY M. WATERSON. This reply is republished in the *Union and American* of yesterday, and is devoted to a recapitulation of the differences among the democracy, which resulted in a final disruption of that party at Charleston and Baltimore, and to a vindication of the course of the writer since 1848, and a denial by him of a desire to break up the Union. In view of our publications of the 12th and 18th inst., it may be proper for us to notice that portion of the vindication referring to disunion, and we will do so very briefly.

We desire to do Mr. YANCEY no injustice, and will not knowingly do so. He stated in substance, in a speech at Baltimore, that he had endeavored to produce a dissolution of the Union in 1850-51, but that the people had decided against him then, and he had since contented himself with an effort to secure the South in her rights. But he did not say then, nor does he say in his letter which we are now considering, that those rights, as he regards them, are inconsistent with a continuance of the Union. His idea now seems to be that a dissolution is not altogether desirable, that he would be willing to see it continued, provided everybody else in the Union would agree with him. To him, no doubt, this is a very proper and desirable basis of Union; but he knows that it is altogether chimerical. He may express always the utmost devotion to the Union, on those terms, and yet be a most decided disunionist practically. And, to our mind, this is unquestionably the true state of the case with him.

Mr. YANCEY frankly owns that he wrote the letter to Mr. SLAUGHTER; but says, "the letter does not urge disunion—does not advocate disruption, either of democracy or of the Union." But that letter says: "No national party can save us; no sectional party can ever do it. But if we could do as our fathers did—organize 'committees of safety' all over the cotton States, (and it is only in them that we can hope for any effective movement) we shall fire the Southern heart, instruct the southern mind, give courage to each other, and, at the proper moment, by one organized, concerted action, we can precipitate the cotton States into a revolution." Mr. YANCEY may be able to see a difference between "disruption" and "revolution"—to our mind, it is clear that when any of the States are precipitated into a "revolution" the Union is at an end. We give him the benefit of his plea, and refer to the whole letter as heretofore published by us.

In relation to the "Southern League," the motto of which, as quoted by Messrs. CARROLL and WATERSON, was, "A Southern Republic is our only safety," Mr. YANCEY says that this was not in the constitution of the "Montgomery League," which he headed. This may be true. The constitution which we copied entire, and which was quoted by Messrs. CARROLL and WATERSON, was that of a "League" formed at Bethel Church, Montgomery county, Ala. This "League" was constituted immediately after the delivery of an address by Mr. YANCEY, and he was, no doubt, cognizant of all that transpired on that occasion. Whether the Constitutions of the Bethel Church League and the Montgomery League were the same, we have only the statement of Mr. YANCEY. He does not deny that the constitution of the one at Bethel Church, was as we quoted it. His reference to the Montgomery League is, therefore, a mere quibble. There is nothing in the reply of Mr. YANCEY that exhonerates him in our estimation from his odious and treasonable connection with the conspiracy to break up the Union.

☞ A few months ago the organs of the democratic party were mostly engaged in propagating the idea that the Southern Opposition and the Republicans were preparing for a fusion in the then coming struggle for the Presidency. That charge having turned out to be a very pale article of moonshine, they are now engaged in an equally earnest effort to prove that the supporters of BELL and DOUGLAS are about going into a coalition. What will they get up next?

The *Union and American* republishes from the Memphis *Avalanche* an address of W. L. YANCEY to the Democracy of Tennessee. Will our contemporary tell us whether it endorses Mr. YANCEY as a sound democrat, a sound Union man, or a gentleman whose statements of matters of fact are reliable?

Under the title of "*Caucuses of 1860*" M. HALSTEAD, one of the Editors of the Cincinnati *Commercial*, has compiled a History of the National Political Conventions of the current Presidential Campaign: being a Complete Record of the Business of all the Conventions; with sketches of distinguished men in attendance upon them, and descriptions of the most Characteristic Scenes and Memorable Events. The *Commercial* says—"It contains complete lists of delegates; the platforms adopted and the resolutions introduced, which were referred to the committees on platforms; all the important votes taken in the Conventions, given in detail, by States; the substance of all the effective speeches made; someting of the inside work, the pulling of wires and the disposal of test questions, as seen by an observant eyewitness; pen sketches of distinguished men, and descriptions of the various sensation scenes, drawn on the spot; the whole making a compact and beautifully printed volume of 232 pages."

PENNSYLVANIA.—A State Convention has been called in Pennsylvania to meet on the 26th inst, at Harrisburg, to nominate a DOUGLAS electoral ticket.

The Reception of Abolition Petitions —Letter of Hon. John Bell to Hon. George R. Gilmer.

From the National Intelligencer, Aug. 8, 1840.

TO THE HON. GEORGE R. GILMER OF GA.:

SIR:—I take the liberty of addressing this letter to you, without pretending any claim to such a privilege founded on personal or political friendship, but influence solely by your local position, and the high respect I entertain for the probity and independence of your character.

The prominent vices in the character of the public men of the country are *pretension* and *insincerity*. As I shall let my conduct and professions speak for me or against me, on the score of the latter, as they may have been open or covert, no affectation shall prevent me from denying that I can be justly taxed with the former weakness in writing this letter. I do not suppose my opinion to be of great importance on any subject, but gentlemen of some standing appear to have supposed they could derive some advantage to their party by giving my course on the subject of abolition petitions a consequence it does not merit: and, in the prosecution of their designs, some of them have not scrupled to speak and publish what is absolutely untrue, while others have only *insinuated* what they knew to be unfounded. And I now notice the subject, not on my own account, but to prevent any possible injury to those with whom I am associated.

The deliberate and persevering obstinacy with which the supporters of the administration in the slave States persist in making abolition one of the issues between the two great parties, which now divide the country, I consider wicked and mischievous in the highest degree. That all the apprehensions of an accession of strength to the abolition movement in the event of Whig success, and the constquent alarms for the safety of the South so incessantly proclaimed by the partisans of Mr. VAN BUREN in that section, are utterly groundless, no careful observer of the circumstances of the times and of the state of the abolition question can for a moment doubt. If any guaranty for the security of Southern institutions were wanting, in addition to those of the well known feelings and opinions of General HARRISON and the great body of his Northern supporters, it can be provided in the decided, generous, and united support which the whole South and Southwest may accord to his pretensions. If there is one gentleman in the South who really feels the alarm he professes, he will perceive that the only safety, in the present aspect of parties, is for the slave States to rally as one man upon General HARRISON. Such a manifestion of confidence in the great Whig majority in the North and East could not fail to increase the existing good feelings among them towards their Southern brethren; while the ties of party associations and interests would be superadded to those of constitutional obligation in sustaining Southern rights. But what ought to be the measure of indignation and punishment which should be dealt out to those hollow and false guardians of Southern interests, who will, for the sake of a trifling party advantage, put every thing to hazard by perpetual agitation? For there is, and always has been, quite as much to be apprehended on this subject from those who agitate the question on political account in the South, as from the abolitionists themselves.

I have been a member of Congress, as you know, from the commencement of the agitation upon this subject. I have witnessed all that has taken place in Congress in relation to it. I saw, and I think I fully understood, the game that was playing by some gentlemen, but I was not inclined to take part in it, because I thought the stakes too high.

It was a common impression that the first movements of the abolitionists at the North were not looked upon with any deep regret by a portion of our fellow-citizens at the South. The fanatic spirit was rather provoked than deprecated. The North, without distinction, was freely charged with a settled feeling of hostility to Southern interests and institutions; and many injurious reflections were cast upon their motives calculated to give strength to the cause of the fanatics, by uniting with them a more rational and calculating class of the Northern people. The motive to this policy in the South, to whatever extent it was adopted, was, beyond all doubt, to combine the South and Southwest more closely in their political movements and preferences. I then thought the experiment a dangerous one, regarding it in a political view only: for it struck me that, if the ambitious aspirants of the North should take it into their heads to play the same sort of game in retaliation, the South would soon be thrown into a settled minority, and forthwith deprived of political power. Nothing, in that event, would be left for them but unconditional submission or disunion.

In confirmation of what I have written upon this point, permit me to refer you to a debate in the Senate of the United States in 1836, which may have escaped your recollection. I desire your attention particularly to the evidence to be found in that debate, that there was then a strong conviction at the North of the existence of some sinister management in the South connected with this subject. I will first quote a few passages from the speech of the Hon. ISAAC HILL, of New Hampshire, the reputed author of the address put forth by the late Baltimore Convention, and circulated extensively in the Extra Globe:—

"Now, Sir, as much as I abhor the doings of weak or wicked men, who are moving this abolition question at the North, I yet have not as bad an opinion of them as I have of some others who are attempting to make of these puerile proceedings an object of alarm to the whole South"

"Of all the vehicles, tracts, pamphlets and newspapers print d and circulated by the abolitionists, there are not ten or twenty of them who have contributed so much to the excitement as a single newspaper printed in this city. I need not name this paper, when I inform you that for the last five years it has been laboring to produce a Northern and Southern party; to fan the flame of sectional prejudices; to open wider the breach; to drive harder the wedge which shall divide the North from the South."

"It is the newspaper which libels the whole North by representing the almost united people of that region to be insincere in their efforts to prevent the mischief of a few fanatical and misguided persons who are engaged in the abolition cause."

I will now ask you to read what the Hon. John M. Niles said in the same debate. Mr. Niles, you will recollect, was Chairman of the meeting held by the friends of the Administration near the close of the session of 1837 and 1838, and from which emanated the pamphled entitled the "Democratic Address." He has now the honor to be the Postmaster-General of the United States:

"It is a fact, (said Mr. Niles) of general notoriety that there is a press in this city, the one to which the Senator from New Hampshire referred, professedly devoted to the interests of a certain party at the South, which has long labored with a zeal and perseverance worthy of a better cause to agitate the public mind on the slave question, whilst it has sought to alarm the South by the grossest misrepresentations of public sentiment at the North: by magnifying the number and influence of the abolitionists; by representing them as connected with a political party. In the face of the most notorious facts, it has endeavored to encourage the abolitionists to persevere in their mischievous designs."

"Sir, if there are such mischievous agents at the South, who are seeking to build up a sectional party, by appealing to the fears of the people in the Slave States, and misrepresenting public sentiment at the North, they are more execrable and more dangerous than the Northern Abolitionists.

"Sir, I most sincerely hope there is no disposition anywhere in the North or in the South to connect this exciting subject with the party politics of the day. That there is no such intention here we are fully assured. But is there no such intention elsewhere? Sir, I am sorry to say that I fear there is. I cannot shut my eyes to facts of general notoriety; I cannot resist the evidence of my senses. I fear there is a spirit of mischief at work in a certain question at the South as well as at the North: it is, I hope, in both sections, confined to a small number of individuals."

In reading the above extracts from the speeches of Messrs. Hill and Niles, you will be struck with the fact that, at that period, the charge of abolition alliances and sympathies was strongly maintained in the South against Mr. Van Buren and his supporters at the North.

When the abolition movement at the North had reached a point of excitement which began to be felt in Congress, I was actively engaged in the canvass between Judge White and Mr. Van Buren. The question of abolition was of such a nature as to render it almost impossible, in an assembly composed of so many ardent and impulsive spirits as the Congress of the United States, that it should not become, in some shape or degree, connected with the party conflicts of the day. Some of my most valued and cherished friends thought Mr. Van Buren fairly and justly assailable in the South on the ground of his vote to instruct the Senators of New York against the admission of Missouri. The favor which his friends and supporters at that time showed to abolition petitions, by voting for their reception, and also for their reference under Mr. Pinckney's resolution, appeared to them to afford a proper ground of attack before the People. I remonstrated earnestly with my friends against the policy of such a course, and against any proceeding whatever which might tend to bring about a division of parties, to any extent, upon such a delicate, not to say dangerous issue. When I failed to convince their judgments, and regarding them then, as I do still, as not less devoted to the country than myself, and standing alone in opposition to their views, I determined to take no part in the question. I did not feel bound, however, to throw myself in opposition to my friends, unless the mischiefs I feared became manifest: nor, upon such a question, did I think my friends had a right to expect my coöperation.

I therefore seldom voted upon the question of receiving or rejecting abolition petitions: and whe n I did, it was more with a view to dispose of the subject, and to reach some other business on the calendar, than to express any opinion on the question of receiving or referring petitions of that description.

At the period to which I refer, (1836) the opposition to Mr. Van Buren in the South and South-west, with few exceptions, took the position that the right of petition did not exist in this case. This opinion was maintained upon the ground that Congress had no right to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia: and it was contended that a petition to do an unconstitutional act was not entitled to notice, and ought not to be received. The argument was carried still further. It was strenuously urged that the *admission of the power to abolish slavery in the District would be fatal to the South!*

My opinion was, that, whether the petitioners had strict right on their side or not, sound policy dictated the reception and reference of their petitions. I believed that any *unusual* course in regard to them would give undue importance to the movements of the abolitionists, furnish new ground for agitation, and rather increase the existing excitement than alloy it. In my opinion, a report from a committee at each session—temperate, yet firm, and unqualified in its conclusions—would have been well calculated to correct false impressions at the North; to dispel prejudice, and prevent that ferment and angry feeling at the South which, at that stage of the question, was calculated to do mischief. Whether right or wrong, and without pretending to censure those friends who differed with me, I have uniformly held these opinions; yet I will add that few gentlemen in the South would be more prepared for prompt and decisive measures of resistance and protection, should the rights and interests of the South connected with this subject ever be invaded through Congress or otherwise, than myself.

You may remember that I acted upon the same views of policy in reference to the numerous and often very offensive petitions which were presented to Congress in 1830, protesting against the policy of Indian removal, and especially against some of the proceedings of the State of Georgia in relation to the Cherokees. Most of the gentlemen from the South were unwilling to show those petitions any respect: and frequent attempts were made to reject or dispose of them without referring them. But I resisted every such proposition, and uniformly contended that it was the better and wiser course to treat them with the usual respect. Yet I believe you will admit that there were few members of the House more zealous, and perhaps but few more efficient, than I was in defeating the object of the petitioners, and carrying the great measures of Indian removal.

I ought to add, that I was strengthened in my opinions of the proper treatment of abolition petitions, by the judgment of many gentlemen of the North, distinguished for their general good sense and sound views, and of whose opposition to the designs of the abolionists there existed the most incontestable proofs. But under present circumstances, I am unable to refer to any authority in support of my opinions of equal weight with that of the leading champions of Mr. Van Buren and the administration. This question was very fully discussed in the Senate in 1836. I will extract a few passages, relating to this point, from the speeches of several gentlemen of the Administration party, who took part in that debate. I will first present you with a short extract from the speech of the Honorable ISAAC HILL, whose opinions have already been referred to on another point:

"Deny (said Mr. Hill,) the right of petition to the misguided men and women who are induced, from no bad motive, to petition for the abolition of slavery in the District, and you do more to increase their numbers than will thousands of dollars paid to the emissaries who traverse the country to distribute abolition tracts and to spread abolition doctrines."

I must now introduce you, a second time to the Hon. Mr. NILES, Postmaster General:

"They are now in the wrong; public opinion is against them, and I would be careful to give them no advantages; to do no act calculated to check the strong current which is setting against their proceedings. I should be sorry to see, either here or elsewhere, any course pursued towards these misguided and mistaken men calculated to keep up excitement, which the peace and best interests of the country require should be allayed. Nothing but injustice, or injudicious measures, in opposition to their proceedings, can prevent a speedy extinction of abolitionism among an intelligent People, who, jealous of their own rights, will be careful not to invade the rights of others—a People with whom truth and reason bear a controlling sway, and public opinion is the supreme law from which there is no appeal."

"This abolitionism of the new school is an excitement, and like all other excitements, it will soon pass away, unless kept alive by persecution, or some other unjustifiable and unwise measures of resistance to it, and not leave a trace behind. This, sir, is an age of excitement; almost every year is characterized by some excitement."

"But did not this motion involve any sacrifice of principle, did it not conflict with the letter or spirit of the Constitution, I could not vote for it. It is inexpedient, and calculated to keep alive, rather than allay excitement, the spirit of abolitionism. To refuse to receive their petitions is probably the very course the abolitionists would wish you to pursue. This would, at least, have the appearance of injustice, if not of persecution. Will you shut your doors in the face of American citizens who wish to present any subject, no matter what, before Congress? This will be furnishing them with a ground of complaint; it will excite sympathy and tend to form a collateral issue, intimately connected with abolitionism; it would be putting a weapon into their hands, which they can use to advantage. I would not give this class of people any advantages, by treating them unjustly, or denying to them any rights to which they are entitled in common with any American citizen."

I will next request your attention to the sentiment of the Hon. Mr. Wall, Senator from New Jersey:—

"Sir, we all, North and South, abhor abolitionism and incendiarism. But what is it? It is crimsoning the religion of peace with the blood of our fellow-men. It is setting fire to the whole, in order to purify it from the stain of a single spot. This, sir, is monomaniaism; it is fanatical. How, sir, can this be put down? By persecution? No, sir; it is its life's blood, its aliment. Sir, the only way to put down fanaticism is, by infamy or ridicule. The history of fanaticism in all ages, and in all countries, teaches us this lesson."

Now hear the strong language of Senator BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania, on the right of petition and the duty of receiving those on the subject of abolition:

"Let it once be understood that the sacred right of petition and the cause of the abolitionists must rise or must fall together, and the consequences must be fatal. I would therefore warn Southern gentlemen to reflect seriously in what situation they place their friends in the North, by insisting that this petition shall not be received."

"We have just as little right to interfere with slavery in the South as we have to touch the right of petition. Whence is this right derived? Can a Republican Government exist without it? Man might as well attempt to live without breathing the vital air. No Government, possessing any of the elements of liberty, has ever existed, or can ever exist, unless its citizens enjoy this right."

Hear now, my dear sir, the voice of one of the most respectable and intelligent of your own Georgians, and who is at the same time a supporter of Mr. Van Buren:

"However unpatriotic, then, [said Mr. King] these petitioners may be: however deluded, however mischievous in every sense, and however we may reprobate their conduct, they are still citizens of the United States. It was acknowledged that these memorialists are highly respectable and peaceable citizens, as those belonging to the Society of Friends usually are. However this might be, they were certainly citizens submitting to the operation of the Government, and contributing to its support, and must, under its theory, be allowed, like other citizens, to petition the Government, the Government having a perfect right to reject their prayers after receiving their petitions. The simple right of petition was the most harmless and inoffensive of all possible rights if it be treated properly. It enforced nothing, and effected nothing but what Government though proper to yield to it. The peaceable exercise of the right, however idly employed, could rarely be productive of mischief, though it might sometimes be evidence of mischievous intentions. The greatest danger was in imprudently and unsuccessfully resisting it. All history was full of the most warning instances in which men of the most worthless principles had been elevated to unmerited consequence by opportunities incautiously given them of throwing themselves into the breaches of a violated Constitution."

If I cannot be acquitted of the charge of voting to receive and refer abolition petitions from a bad motive, when I am supported by names which stand as high upon the administration calendar as Isaac Hill, of New Hampshire, Niles of Connecticut, Buchanan of Pennsylvania, Wall of New Jersey, and King of Georgia, it will be useless to attempt any further defense. I have only to add, upon this point, that when, at the meeting of Congress in 1838, I saw, or thought saw, in the increased number of abolition petitions, and the great number of remonstrances against the violation of the right of petition, a verification of the mischief I had feared would result from the injudicious treatment of former petitions, I resolved to express my sentiments on that subject at least by a vote, which was all I could expect to do under the gag of the previous question; and I did so by recording it against Mr. Atherton's resolutions. At the late session I voted against the course of the majority on this question, and for the same reasons.

Since the discussion of 1836, upon the right of petition and the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District, a most singular revolution in sentiment, or *shifting of position*, has taken place in certain great quarters. I have already called your attention to the fact that, in 1836, Mr. Van Buren and his friends had to bear the assaults of the Southern phalanx on the charge of favoring abolition. Since 1837, however, the Whigs are sought to be inculpated on this score. To explain these changes will require some further detail.

Mr. Calhoun is obliged to be noticed in the narrative, because he was, from the first, so prominent an actor in all the proceedings in Congress relating to this subject. In 1836, that gentleman, in a speech delivered in the Senate, expressed himself on the subject of the right of petition and the duty of Congress to reject all abolition petitions, in the following language:

"[said Mr. C.] am gratified that the Senator from Georgia concedes the point that Congress has no power to abolish slavery in the District—a concession which atones for much he has said. *To yield the right here is to yield the right to Congress to abolish slavery in the States. I would proclaim* [said Mr. C.] *to the whole South that, if the right be surrendered to abolish slavery in the District, their most effectual guard is surrendered.* But I will ask the Senator from Georgia, if Congress has no right to abolish slavery in this District more than to do so in the States, upon what principle can he vote for the reception of this petition, which, he concedes, prays the Senate to pass a law in violation of the Constitution?"

In the following winter (1837 and 1838,) the same gentleman brought forward his celebrated abolition resolutions in the Senate, which I need not quote, since they are so generally known.

It is necessary to the proper understanding of this subject, that you should now have your attention drawn to the course of Mr. Clay in relation to it. That gentleman, from the first, took ground in favor of the reception and reference of abolition petitions, as the most safe and judicious mode of treating the excitement that existed at the North on the subject of slavery. This, of course, laid him open to the attacks of those zealous champions of Southern interests, who could not, at that time, tolerate the right of petition in such a case, much less the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District. Without changing his opinion in relation to the proper mode of disposing of abolition petitions, Mr. Clay, in the month of February, 1839, took occasion to express his views very much at large, and very strongly in opposition to the designs of the abolitionists. His views upon the whole subject were so manly, just and commendable, that when he ceased his speech, Mr. Calhoun rose and expressed his entire approbation of it. He did more. He thought the occasion a proper one to announce to the whole country that the abolition movement was at an end! But what was then said by Mr. Calhoun on this subject is of too much importance to be passed over without giving his sentiment the advantage of his own language:

"Sir, (said Mr. Calhoun) this is a good epoch in our political history. Of all the dangers to which we have been exposed, this has been the greatest. We may now consider it as past. The resolutions to which he referred, meaning his anti-abolition resolutions of 1837-38, (with the following movement, meaning the Democratic address signed by Mr. Niles, as Chairman,) gave the fatal blow, to which the position now assumed by the Senator from Kentucky gave the finishing stroke."

It would seem, in the opinion of Mr. Calhoun expressed as late as February, 1839, that he and his associates, Mr. Niles and others, of the administration party, had already given the fatal blow to abolition and that Mr. Clay could do no more than precipitate its extinction. Not the least remarkable result of this formal announcement, that the terms of abolition had ceased, was, that, besides the comparative quiet that ensued in the South, the supporters of the Administration every where thought it perfectly allowable to court the abolitionists. Their numbers were then admitted to be too small to become formidable to the interests of the South, and there was, of course, no impropriety in securing their votes to Mr. Van Buren. Mr. Clay, after his speech in the Senate, could not expect their united support and Mr. Van Buren, without scruple or hesitation, began his courtship by the appointment of William Leggett, one of the most cherished advocates of their doctrines in the State of New York, to a station of distinction and honor.

How it has fallen out that the idea of abolition voters has once more become so abhorrent to the feelings of gentlemen who so recently saw nothing objectionable in them, it is not necessary to explain. The public will perceive the reason at once.

But since it is deemed important again to impress the South with a sense of impending danger from the abolition movement, some explanation will be required to show why it is that the *admission of the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District is less fatal to the South at this time than in* 1836. The power is admitted by Mr. Van Buren, and yet he receives the support of those who, in 1836, considered his doctrine fatal to their interests.

I will bring my letter to a close by stating, that I have been driven to adopt this mode of giving the explanation of my course and opinions on this subject, by the habitual gag in the House of Representatives whenever I desire to speak.

I am, sir, with unfeigned respect,
Your obedient servant,
JOHN BELL.

New Advertisements.

Sheriff's Sale.

BY virtue of a vend. ex., No. 1756, to me directed, and delivered from the Honorable Circuit Court of Davidson county, Tennessee, at its May Term, 1860, I will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder for cash, at the Court-house yard, in the city of Nashville, on Saturday, the 11th day of August, 1860, all the right, title, claim, interest and estate, which Joel A. Battle then had or may have since acquired in and to the following described Tract or parcel of Land, lying the 6th district of Davidson county, on the road running from Nolensville to Lavergne, containing about Eight Hundred Acres, being the same tract of land on which Joel A. Battle now lives, bounded on the North by the land of Sarah J. Battle, on the east by the lands of R. Gooch, Charles Johnson and B. Gray, on the North by the land of Mrs. Austin and on the West by the lands of A. Bush, Jos. Nance and Sarah Battle, with all improvements thereon; being levied on as the property of Joel A. Battle to satisfy a judgment rendered in favor of H. S. French & Son against the said Joel A. Battle.

J. K. EDMUNDSON, Sheriff.
By E. D. WHITWORTH, D. Sheriff.
july20-td

Sheriff's Sale.

BY virtue of a vend. ex., No. 1838, to me directed, and delivered from the Honorable Circuit Court of Davidson county, Tennessee, at its May Term, 1860, I will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder for cash, at the Court-house yard, in the city of Nashville, on Saturday, the 11th day of August, 1860, all the right, title, claim, interest and estate which Martha Goodwin then had or may have since acquired in and to the following lot of ground, lying in the county and State aforesaid, in district No. 18, fronting on a street that runs between and parallel with Spring and Foster streets, in Edgefield, beginning in the Northern verge of said street, 150 feet from L. Lumsden's South-West corner; thence, westwardly, toward Cumberland river, along the Northern verge of said street, 50 feet, to a stake; thence, at right angles and westwardly, towards Foster street, 210 feet more or less, to an alley; thence Eastwardly with said alley 50 feet, to a stake which is 210 feet more or less to the beginning; being levied on as the property of Martha Goodwin to satisfy a judgment rendered in favor of John Ramage against Daniel Winters and Martha Goodwin.

J. K. EDMUNDSON, Sheriff.
By E. D. WHITWORTH, D. Sheriff.
july30-td

Sheriff's Sale.

BY virtue of a vend. ex., No. 1763, to me directed, and delivered from the Honorable Circuit Court of Davidson county, Tennessee, at its May Term, 1860, I will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder for cash, at the Court-house yard, in the city of Nashville, on Saturday, the 11th day of August, 1860, all the right, title, claim, interest and estate, which Daniel Winters and Martha Goodwin then had, or may have since acquired in and to the following described property: one Lot on Gay street, in the city of Nashville, and bounded as follows: beginning at a point 120 feet 1½ inches from the corner of Gay and Spruce streets, thence parallel with Spring street 100 feet to an alley, thence with the line of said alley, and parallel with the first line, thence along Gay street 22 feet 7½ inches to the beginning; being levied on as the property of Martha Goodwin, to satisfy a judgment rendered in favor of S. W. Gunter against Daniel Winters and Martha Goodwin.

J. K. EDMUNDSON, Sheriff.
By E. D. WHITWORTH, D. Sheriff.
july20-td

Sheriff's Sale.

BY virtue of a vend. ex., No. 644, to me directed, and delivered from the Honorable Circuit Court of Davidson county, at its May Term, 1860, I will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder for cash, at the Court-house yard, in the city of Nashville, on Saturday, the 11th day of August, 1860, all the right, title, claim interest and estate, which R. H. Jones and O. D. Wailing then had, or may have since acquired in and to the following described Lot of Ground in Edgefield and 18th District, of Davidson county, bounded as follows: beginning on the South-west corner of a lot of ground lately conveyed by R. Houston to Silas Norris, on a street that runs between Spring and Foster streets, in Edgefield; thence northwardly with Norris's line, about 210 feet to an alley, thence westwardly with said alley 112 feet, thence southwardly about 210 feet to first said street, thence eastwardly with said street 112 feet to the beginning; being levied on as the property of O. D. Wailing to satisfy a judgment rendered in favor of Minor & Yearger against R. H. Jones & O. D. Wailing.

J. K. EDMUNDSON, Sheriff.
By E. D. WHITWORTH, D. Sheriff.
july21-td

Sheriff's Sale.

BY virtue of a vend. ex., No. 1848, to me directed, and delivered from the Honorable Circuit Court of Davidson county, Tennessee, at its May Term, 1860, I will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder for cash, at the Court-house yard, in the city of Nashville, on Saturday, the 11th day of August, 1860, all the right, title, claim, interest and estate which Silas Norris et als then had or may have since acquired in and to the following property to wit: a House and Lot, or peice of land, situated on Wetmore street in Edgefield, in the State and county aforesaid, beginning in the Northern Verge of Wetmore street, 154 feet from Lumsden's South-west corner; thence westwardly towards Cumberland river, along the Northern verge of said street 50 feet to a stake, thence at right angles northwardly towards Foster street 210 feet more or less to an alley; thence eastwardly with said alley 50 feet, to a point or stake which is 209 feet from Lumsden's line, thence at right angles and southwardly 210 feet more or less to the beginning; being levied on as the property of Silas Norris to satisfy a judgment rendered in favor of Joseph Wheless, against Silas Norris et als.

J. K. EDMUNDSON, Sheriff.
By E. D. WHITWORTH, D. Sheriff.
June21-td

Sheriff's Sale.

BY virtue of a vend. ex., No. 1779, to me directed, and delivered from the Honorable Circuit Court of Davidson county, Tennessee, at its May Term, 1860, I will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder for cash, at the Court-house yard, in the city of Nashville, on Saturday, the 11th day of August, 1860, all the right, title, claim, interest and estate which Louis Conway then had or may have since acquired, in and to the following described Lot of ground, lying in the county and State aforesaid, in district No. 18, fronting on a street that runs between and parallel with Spring and Foster streets, in Edgefield, beginning in the Northern verge of said street, 150 feet from L. Lumsden's South-West corner; thence, westwardly, toward Cumberland river, along the Northern verge of said street, 50 feet, to a stake; thence, at right angles and westwardly, towards Foster street, 210 feet more or less, to an alley; thence Eastwardly with said alley 50 feet, to a stake which is 210 feet more or less to the beginning; being levied on as the property of Silas Norris, to satisfy a judgment rendered in favor of H. H. Hamner, against Silas Norris and Securities.

J. K. EDMUNDSON, Sheriff.
By E. D. WHITWORTH, D. Sheriff.
july 21-td

Sheriff's Sale.

BY virtue of vend. ex., No. 1821, to me directed and delivered from the Honorable Circuit Court of Davidson County, Tennessee, at its May term, 1860, I will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder, for cash, at the Court House Yard, in the city of Nashville, on Saturday, the 11th day of August, 1860, all the right, title, claim, interest, and estate, which Isham Norris and Silas Norris had, or may have since acquired in and to the following described property, viz: One lot or parcel of land in the County of Davidson and State of Tennessee, in district No. 18, fronting on a street that runs between and parallel with Spring and Foster street, in Edgefield, beginning on the Northern verge of said street, 150 feet fronting Lumsden's Store, West corner; thence westwardly, towards Cumberland river, along the North verge of said street 50 feet, to a stake; thence at right angle westward with Foster street 210 feet, to an alley; thence eastward with said alley 50 feet, to a point or stake, which is 210 feet, more or less, to the beginning: being levied on as the property of Silas Norris, to satisfy a judgment rendered in favor of S. A. G. Noel, against Silas Norris & Co. and others.

J. K. EDMUNDSON, Sheriff.
By E. D. WHITWORTH, D. Sheriff.
july21-td

Sheriff's Sale.

BY virtue of vend. ex. No. 1823, to me directed, and delivered from the Honorable Circuit Court of Davidson County, Tennessee, at its May term, 1860, I will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder, for cash, at the Court House Yard, in the city of Nashville, on Saturday, the 11th day of August, 1860, all the right, title, claim, interest, and estate, which Joseph Bland then had, or may have since acquired, in and to the following described land, viz., situated in the County of Davidson, State of Tennessee, in district No. 5, bounded on the East by the lands of J. H. Charlton and William Higgins, on the South by the lands of William Higgins, on the West by the lands of J. N. Alphonce and Joseph Aldrich, and on the South by the Murfreesboro turnpike, containing 50 acres, more or less; being levied on as the property of Joseph Bland, to satisfy a judgment rendered in favor of J. W. Owen, against Joseph Bland.

J. K. EDMUNDSON, Sheriff.
By E. D. WHITWORTH, D. Sheriff.
july21-td

Sheriff's Sale.

BY virtue of vend. ex. No. 1740, to me directed, and delivered from the Honorable Circuit Court of Davidson County, Tenn., at its May term, 1860, I will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder, for cash, at the Court House Yard, in the city of Nashville, on Saturday, the 11th day of August, 1860, all the right, title, claim, interest and estate, which Joel A. Battle then had, or may have since acquired, in and to the following described tract or parcel of land, lying in the 6th district of Davidson County, on the road running from Nolensville to Lavergne, containing about 800 acres, being the same tract of land on which Joel A. Battle now lives, bounded on the South by the land of Sarah J. Battle, on the East by the lands of R. Gooch, Chas. Johnson, and B. Grey, on the North by the land of W. Austin; on the West by the lands of A. Bush, Jos. Nance, and Sarah J. Battle, with all the improvements thereon; being levied on as the property of Joel A. Battle, to satisfy a judgment rendered in favor of R. R. Cutter, against the said Joel A. Battle.

J. K. EDMUNDSON, Sheriff.
By E. D. WHITWORTH, D. Sheriff.
july21-td

Sheriff's Sale.

BY virtue of vend. ex. No. 1844, to me directed, and delivered from the Honorable Circuit Court of Davidson County, Tennessee, at its May term, 1860, I will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder, for cash, at the Court House Yard, in the City of Nashville, on Saturday, the 11th day of August, 1860, all the right, title, claim, interest, and estate, which Louis Conway then had, or may have since acquired, in the following described tract, piece, or lot of land, situated in the county of Davidson, near the city of Nashville, on the North side, and being one half of No. 153, being the one half lying next to lot 154 in the plan of lots laid off and numbered for sale by R. S. McGavock, said plan being recorded in the Register's office of said county, in Book 17, pages 608 and 609, (for more particular description, see said Book.) being the same property conveyed by McGavock to Louis Conway, and registered in the Register's office, in said county, Book No. 17, page 112, being levied on as the property of Louis Conway, to satisfy a judgment rendered in favor of R. M. G. Southall, against Louis Conway et als.

J. K. EDMUNDSON, Sheriff.
By E. D. WHITWORTH, D. Sheriff.
july21-td.

Sheriff'sSale.

BY virtue of vend. ex. No. 1761, to me directed, and delivered from the Honorable Circuit Court of Davidson County, Tennessee, at its May term, 1860, I will expose to public sale, to the highest bidder for cash, at the Court House Yard, in the city of Nashville, on Saturday, the 11th day of August, 1860, all the right, title, claim, interest, and estate, which Silas Norris et als then had, or may have since acquired in and to the following described lot of ground, lying in the county of Davidson, State of Tennessee, district No. 18, fronting on a street that runs between and parallel with Spring and Foster streets, in Edgefield, beginning in the northern verge of said street, 150 feet from J. Lumsden's South-West corner, thence westwardly towards Cumberland river and along the northern verge of said street 50 feet, to a stake, thence at right angles and westwardly, towards Foster street, 210 feet, more or less, to the beginning, being levied on as the property of Silas