

Democratic Republican Nominations.

FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, GEN. LEWIS CASS, OF MICHIGAN.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, MAJ. GEN. WM. O. BUTLER, OF KENTUCKY.

Democratic Electors Ticket.

- 1st District, THOMAS BRAGG, Jr., of Northampton. 2d " ASA BIGGS, of Meriden. 3d " PERRIN BUSBEE, of Wake. 4th " GEORGE S. STEVENSON, of Cranston. 5th " WILLIAM S. ASHE, of New Hanover. 6th " SAMUEL J. PERSON, of Moore. 7th " CALYLLAHER JONES, Sr., of Orange. 8th " ROBERT F. DICK, of Rockingham. 9th " GREEN W. CALDWELL, of Mecklenburg. 10th " W. W. AVERY, of Johnston. 11th " WILLIAM H. THOMAS, of Haywood.

DEMOCRATIC MEETING.

We are requested to give notice that there will be a meeting of the Democrats of New Hanover County, at Long Creek Bridge, on Saturday, the 30th inst. William S. Ashe and other speakers will be present, and address the meeting. A large and enthusiastic turnout of the Democracy, it is hoped, will take place on that occasion.

Be sure you read Botts' letter on the 14th page. It is rich.

MILLARD FILLMORE'S PLATFORM.

We mean to keep the following abolition Platform of the Federal candidate for the Vice Presidency, standing until after the election. The Whig papers will not publish it. They dare not let their readers see Millard Fillmore as he is. We shall endeavor to open their eyes.

The Platform of the Whig Candidate for the Vice Presidency.

BUFFALO, Oct. 17, 1848.

SIR: Your communication of the 15th inst., as chairman of a committee appointed by the Anti-Slavery Society of the County of York, has just come to hand. You solicit my answer to the following interrogatories:

- 1st. Do you believe that petitions to Congress on the subject of slavery and the slave trade ought to be received, read, and respectfully considered by the representatives of the people? 2d. Are you opposed to the annexation of Texas to this Union, under any circumstances, so long as slaves are held therein? 3d. Are you in favor of Congress exercising all the Constitutional power it possesses to abolish the internal slave trade between the States? 4th. Are you in favor of the immediate legislation for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia? I am much engaged and have no time to enter into argument, or to explain at length my reasons for my opinion. I shall therefore content myself, for the present, by answering ALL your interrogatories in the AFFIRMATIVE, and leave for some future occasion a more extended discussion on the subject. MILLARD FILLMORE.

THE VOTE OF NORTH-CAROLINA.

It will be seen from the table published on our fourth page, that the vote of North-Carolina, in August last, was an unusually large one. We notice that the vote of Lenoir is not yet officially given—the majority for Reid only is given. By comparing the figures, it will be seen that the aggregate vote for Reid and Manly is 1827 larger than the aggregate vote for Hoke and Graham, in 1844. By ex-ists, in 1848, polled within 326 of as many votes as Graham received in 1844—showing that there was not so much apathy as we would have the world to believe. It will also be seen that Reid received 2053 more votes than were cast for Hoke four years ago—clearly showing that the democratic party has been rapidly gaining strength since the campaign of 1844.

From this statement it will be seen that had the democratic party only exercised themselves a little, they could have carried the State with all ease. Think of the pitiful majority received by Manly; only some 800 out of nearly 80,000 votes. Why, there were enough democrats who stayed away from the polls in McKay's district alone to have turned the scale. Let us then, take warning from the result in August, when we see clearly that it was our own fault that we have not to-day a democratic Governor. Let us be ready to a man, in November, to make a gallant push to carry the State for Cass and Butler. We can do it with all ease. All we ask is that every democrat will go to the polls. We are aware that many were apathetic in August, because they deemed the contest a hopeless one. No feeling of this kind can possibly operate upon any man now. Our chances of carrying North-Carolina are much better than they have been during the last twelve years. Indeed, we can carry it with ease, if every democrat will only do his duty.

P. S. Since writing the above, we have received the Raleigh Standard, of Wednesday, containing the official vote, Lenoir included. The Standard's footing up is as follows: Manly, 42,336; Reid, 41,682; Manly's majority, 854.

Upon this result the Standard remarks:—"The majority for the Whig candidate, Mr. Manly, is only 854. The whole number of votes is 84,018—the largest number ever cast in North-Carolina at any previous election. In 1844 Hoke and Graham received together, 82,019; and in November of the same year Polk and Clay received 82,519. Col. Reid has run ahead of Hoke, 2249; and ahead of Polk 2395 votes. Mr. Manly has run behind Mr. Clay 696 votes, and only 50 votes behind Gov. Graham. The aggregate vote for Reid and Manly is 1699 larger than that for Hoke and Graham. The clear democratic gain, compared with Hoke and Graham is 2,399; and compared with Polk and Clay, it is 2091."

ANOTHER MEMBER DEAD.—We regret to learn that Harrison W. Covington, Whig Senator elect from the counties of Richmond and Robeson, died at his residence in the former county on the 8th inst. This makes three members elect of the Legislature that have died since the August election.

WE are informed that a through ticket between Charleston and Philadelphia has been formed at \$17 50, each way. The Charleston Boats now leave this place at 11 o'clock, A. M.

THE Governor has issued writs of election to fill the vacancies in Richmond and Robeson, Duplin and Burke: the election to take place on the 7th November—the day of the Presidential election.

Gen. QUITMAN addressed the democrats of Natchez, Miss., on the 16th inst. Commercial will please notice.

THE VETO.

Second.—The veto power. The power given by the Constitution to the Executive to interpose his veto, is a high conservative power, but in my opinion should never be exercised except in cases of clear violation of the Constitution, or manifest haste and want of consideration by Congress. In known opinions and wishes of the Executive have exercised an undue and injurious influence upon the legislative department of the government, and for this cause I have thought our system was in danger of undergoing a great change from its original character. The Executive Chair, has happened to occupy the Executive Chair, ought not to control the action of Congress upon questions of domestic policy; nor ought his objections to be interposed where questions of Constitutional power have been settled by the various departments of government, and acquiesced in by the people.

The above paragraph is taken from the "Taylor Platform." General Taylor's Allison letter, number one, and acknowledged contains his views with regard to the veto power. We propose to examine briefly Gen'l Taylor's position on this important subject, and in this connection to state what we conceive to be the Democratic doctrine with regard to this "high conservative power."

The reader will notice that General Taylor starts out with this proposition:—"The power given by the Constitution to the Executive to interpose his veto is a high conservative power, but in my opinion should never be exercised except in cases of clear violation of the Constitution, or manifest haste or want of consideration by Congress." To every letter, word, and syllable of the foregoing sentence, we, as Democrats, most cordially subscribe. This is the doctrine for which we have always contended. Here, however, comes in a most important query—Who is to determine when a measure is "a clear violation of the constitution," or when there is "manifest haste or want of consideration by Congress?" We say, certainly the President of the United States, upon his own responsibility, under the constitution, must alone determine this matter for himself. Suppose Gen. Taylor President, must he not exercise his judgment as to the constitutionality and expediency of all bills passed by Congress before he signs them? Most assuredly he must. And he himself admits that the veto may be properly interposed whenever Congress has passed unconstitutional laws, or has acted in manifest haste, or without proper consideration. How, then, would he like to ask the Taylorites, does their candidate differ from Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Tyler, and Polk, all of whom were Democrats, with the exception of Mr. Tyler, and all of whom exercised the veto power? Why they exercised the veto power precisely upon the same principles with those laid down by Gen. Taylor in the position that we have quoted above. True, persons may differ in their opinions as to the wisdom and expediency of the times and manner in which they did exercise this "high conservative power," but all must agree that they had the undoubted right, under the constitution, so to do.

The Federal party, ever since Gen. Jackson vetoed their darling scheme, the United States Bank bill, in 1832, have waged a ruthless war upon this "high conservative power." Particularly did their wrath become deadly towards it when, in 1841, Mr. Tyler, their own President, exercised the veto power. By the exercise of the "one man power" as Federal orators and Federal papers are in the habit of styling this "high conservative power." Now we think that we have shewn, from Gen. Taylor's own platform, that he, in the proposition quoted above, entertains just the same doctrine that is entertained by every Democrat—that is entertained by Gen'l Cass himself—with regard to the veto power. So long as the constitution remains as it is with this "high conservative power," as one of its features staring the President in the face, we, for one, cannot see that he can possibly be deprived of the power of exercising it. Indeed, so long as he, in good faith, performs his duties, under his oath of office, whenever he thinks any measure either clearly unconstitutional or inexpedient, he must interpose his veto. Who is to determine when and in what manner the veto power shall be exercised? There is only one person in the world who can determine this matter; the President himself, whoever he may be. He is responsible to his constituents, the American people at large.

It may not be here improper to enquire for a moment into the end and object which the framers of the constitution had in view in incorporating into that instrument this "high conservative power." In doing so, we shall quote from Judge Story, whose commentary on the constitution is deservedly high authority with all parties, and particularly with the party that is now so vehemently opposed to the "one man power." For this purpose, we shall quote two sections, wishing that our limits would permit us to give our readers more of "the same sort."

"§ 51. In the next place, the power (the veto) is important, as an additional security against the enactment of rash, immature, and improper laws. It establishes a salutary check upon the legislative body, calculated to preserve the community against the effects of faction, precipitancy, unconstitutional legislation, and temporary excitement, as well as against the influence of interested parties. It is a power, which, if exercised, is not to be presumed to possess more wisdom or virtue, or experience, than belongs to a number of men. But this furnishes no answer to the reasoning. The question is not how much wisdom, or virtue, or experience, is possessed by either branch of the government, (though the executive magistrate may well be presumed to be eminently distinguished in all those respects, and therefore the choice of the people;) but whether the legislature may not be misled by a love of power, the spirit of faction, a political impulse, or a passionate influence, local or sectional, which, at some time, may not, from the difference in the election and the duties of the Executive, reach him at all, or not reach him in the same degree. He will always have a primary inducement to defend his own powers; the legislature may well be presumed to have no desire to favor them. He will have an opportunity solely to examine the acts and resolutions passed by the legislature, not having partaken of their passage, and thus to correct what will sometimes be wrong from haste and inadvertence, as well as design. His view of them, if not wise, or more elevated, will at least be independent, and under an entirely different responsibility to the nation from what belongs to them. He is the representative of the whole nation in the aggregate; and they are the representative of only distinct parts, and sometimes of little more than sectional or local interests."

"§ 52. Nor is there any solid objection to this qualified power. If it should be objected, that it may sometimes prevent the passage of good laws, as well as of bad laws, the objection is entirely without weight. In the first place, it can never be effectively exercised if two thirds of both houses are in favor of the law; and if they are not, it is not so easily demonstrable, that the law is either wise or salutary. The presumption would rather be the other way; or, at least, that the utility of

it is not unquestionable, or it would receive the requisite support. In the next place, the great evil of all free governments is a tendency to over legislation, and the mischief of inconsistency and nullification in the laws, forms a great blemish in the character and genius of all free governments.—The injury which may possibly arise from the postponement of a salutary law, is far less than that of the passage of a mischievous one, or from the redundancy and vacillating legislation, in the next place, there is no practical danger that this power will be much, if any, abused by the President.—The superior weight and influence of the legislative body in a free government, and the hazard to the weight and influence of the executive in a trial of strength, afford a satisfactory security that the power will generally be employed with great care; and that there will be more often great force for a change of timidity, than of rashness, in its exercise."

But Gen'l Taylor modifies the doctrine he has laid down in the first sentence of his "veto" platform, and upon which we have been commenting. He winds up by saying—"The personal opinions of the individual who may happen to occupy the Executive Chair ought not to control the action of Congress upon questions of domestic policy; nor ought his objections to be interposed where questions of constitutional power have been settled by the various departments of government, and acquiesced in by the people." Now, with all due deference to the wisdom and sagacity of old Rough and Ready, we do think the above sentence contains about as much political absurdity as we have ever seen crammed into the same space. "The personal opinions of the individual who may happen to occupy the Executive Chair ought not to control the action of Congress upon questions of domestic policy." Ah, indeed! We take it for granted that Gen. Taylor means that the President should not exercise the veto power with regard to "questions of domestic policy," and yet he says, a few lines above, that it is a "high conservative power," and should be exercised "in cases of clear violation of the constitution, or manifest haste or want of consideration by Congress." We "pray you," if this high conservative power is not to be exercised in questions of domestic policy, how and where is it to be exercised? The slavery question, involving the dearest rights of the South, is certainly a question of "domestic policy," and yet Gen. Taylor says "the personal opinions of the Executive should not control Congress upon questions of domestic policy." Is this not an insult to the South; and would it not, if carried into practice, be a total abandonment of that weaker section of the Union. But perhaps there is something in the phrase, "the personal opinions of the individual." Possibly this expression may comprehend more than we can see. Possibly there may be a difference, in General Taylor's system of ethics, between the "personal" and the "political" opinions of the Executive?

Gen. Taylor's doctrine on the subject of the veto power, puts us very much in mind of an anecdote which we have either read or heard somewhere. A couple of youths, not deeply versed in the science of hunting, on one occasion determined to take a day's sport, in the shape of deer hunting. One of them whilst driving, heard the report of his comrade's gun at a little distance, and hastened immediately to the spot, thinking that a buck had bitten the dust. He found his friend with "arms grounded," and looking earnestly after a "yearling" that was running off, at a little distance. "What's the matter?" asked his friend, as soon as he could get his breath. "There it goes, and he darned to it," replied Nimrod. "Why, that's a yearling; you didn't take that for a deer?" "Well," says Nimrod, "when the darned thing come jumping along through the bushes I wasn't exactly certain whether it was a calf or a deer, but any how I shot at it, so as to hit it if it was a deer, and miss it if it was a calf." Upon exactly the same principle General Taylor has "shot" his veto doctrine, so as to hit a man if he is in favor of the veto power, and to miss him if he is against it.

WESTER AND TAYLOR.

The Editor of the Fayetteville Observer, who has just returned from the North, has a long article in his last paper, in which he endeavors to whistle up the courage of his whig readers. With this we have little to do. We think they need a few crumbs of comfort, and we have no sort of objection to the Observer's dispensing them. Among the most cheering signs which the Observer notices for the election of Gen. TAYLOR, is the speech of DANIEL WEBSTER, recently delivered at Marshfield, in Massachusetts. "We all know how potent in New England is the voice of DANIEL WEBSTER," says the Observer. We presume the Observer has read that speech, and if he is satisfied with Mr. WEBSTER'S flings at the want of capacity in Gen. TAYLOR, surely we ought to care nothing. But Mr. WEBSTER'S voice has been raised in favor of Gen. TAYLOR, says the Observer, and that voice is all-powerful in New England. How raised? Mr. WEBSTER declares explicitly that Gen. TAYLOR is merely a military chieftain, and was selected by the Philadelphia convention solely on the ground of his availability! This is raising his voice with a vengeance. "The people of the South see for a moment what are the main reasons why the 'potent voice' of the great New England federalist and lawyer of the South is raised in favor of Gen. Taylor. It is principally on the score that the election of Gen. TAYLOR would be more favorable to the non extension of slavery than that of Gen. Cass, that Mr. WEBSTER raises his 'potent voice' in his favor. Speaking of Gen. TAYLOR, he tells his audience—

"I believe that he has been from the first opposed to the policy of the Mexican war, as improper, impolitic and inexpedient. I believe, from the best information I can obtain, (and you will take this as my opinion gentlemen,) I believe that his opposition to extend the slave territory of the United States, is not a mere political influence of the United States, but a moral principle, and so much for what may be considered as belonging to the Presidential election as a national question."

This is the main and most "potent" reason that Mr. WEBSTER urges on the federalists of New England, in order to induce them to support the "merciful military" chieftain, who, as Mr. WEBSTER justly says, has no sort of civil qualifications for the office whatever. Will Southern people mark this. And now for one of the principal reasons why the "potent voice" of DANIEL WEBSTER is raised against Gen. CASS. Speaking of the slavery question, Mr. WEBSTER, with his "potent voice," says:—"It will enter into this very election; and gentlemen will venture to say two things. The first is well known to you, that Gen. Cass is in favor of what is called the compromise line, and that the provisions of the Wilmot proviso, or the ordinance of 1787, ought not to be applied to the territory lying south of 36 30. That is his opinion.

If he had not announced that, he would have been 26 30, or more, from the probability of a nomination by the Baltimore Convention. "Well, then, I undertake to say, in the next place, that he will do all he can to establish a compromise line; and lastly, which is a matter of opinion in my conscientious belief, he will establish a line—let him exercise it over certain sections of the country—it is a question for future consideration—they will settle it that Oregon shall be free, and leave Mexico and California to be disposed of hereafter. Let him have the power of this government, and with this inducement, I verily believe, that unless there is renewed strength in the whig votes in Congress, he will accomplish his purpose."

Now if the Observer, a Southern Journal, can see such to comfort and cheer it in this appeal of Daniel Webster, to bring back "conscience whigs" to the General's sheepfold, then must it be hard up for "cheering signs."

But Mr. Webster, with that same "potent voice," in another place says:—"But the nomination of the candidate for the Presidency by the whig convention in Philadelphia is not satisfactory to the whigs of Massachusetts. This is certain, and it would be idle to attempt to conceal the fact. It is surely just, and more patriotic, to take facts and things as they are, and to induce our own convictions of duty, than to exist before us. However so much respectable and distinguished in the line of his own profession or however so much estimable as a private citizen, General Taylor is a military man, and a military man merely. He has had no training in civil affairs; he has performed no functions of a civil character under the constitution of his country; he has been known, and only known, among them, as the head of the army, and among them, are of opinion that it was not wise or discreet to go to the army for the selection of a candidate for the Presidency of the United States. It is the first instance in our history in which any man of a mere military character has been proposed for that high office."

If the Observer can see any thing very cheering in all this, most certainly his ideas of Gen. Taylor's popularity must be gloomy. Why the New York Journal of Commerce, one of the ablest papers in America, and strongly inclined towards Taylor's election, said of this speech in publishing it, that the faint praise of Mr. Webster would damage Gen. Taylor's prospects more in "New England" than any thing that had occurred since his nomination.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

From all quarters, the horizon is daily becoming brighter for Cass and Butler. The democratic party is everywhere united and harmonious, with the single exception of the State of New York; and there, from recent accounts, it is by no means settled, but that Cass and BUTLER will carry the State. On the other hand, the whigs are distracted and divided into factions. In the South, FILLMORE is too bitter a pill to swallow. Even Southern whigs cannot be expected to vote for an notorious abolitionist. At the North, the CLAY men have broken out into open hostility against the non-party nomination of Gen. TAYLOR. Witness the tremendous CLAY meeting, held a few days ago in the city of New York—witness the response from a large meeting of CLAY whigs in Albany, on the 14th, ratifying the N. York meeting, and calling upon all good and true CLAY men throughout the State to lose no time in organizing a CLAY Electoral ticket. In addition to this, we find in the Trenton (N. J.) News, of Friday last, a call signed by 83 of the leading whigs of Hudson county, for a CLAY meeting on that evening, at which DAVID GRAHAM, WILLIS HALL, DREW Selden, and other leading men of New-York were to be present. In New-Brunswick, (N. Y.) we notice another call for a CLAY meeting. Again, read the letter published on the fourth page, from the pen of JOHN MIXER BOTTS—the whig member of Congress from the Richmond, (Va.) district,—and one of the most ultra and prominent whigs in the Union. This non-party nomination of Gen. TAYLOR will, in truth, prove the utter annihilation of the whig party. How can it be otherwise? With no principles that might form a common bond of union for the party throughout the country, how can they expect anything else, than to be split up into factions? On the other hand, look at the democratic party from Maine to Texas, with its glorious old banner floating in the breeze, emblazoned with the principles under which it has so often fought and conquered in bygone days.

We close this paragraph by presenting to our readers an extract from the Albany correspondent of the Baltimore Sun, shewing up how the game stands in the Empire State:—"More of life, spirit, and animation seems to be taking hold of the political world.—Men of all parties and factions are apparently waking up to a realizing sense of their situation. It has been all along very generally conceded that the Van Buren free soil agitation would take sufficiently from the democratic strength in New York to give the electoral vote to Gen. Taylor. But times and seasons change, and men as well as political chances change with them. The bolting of Mr. Clay's friends, the defection extending as it is throughout this State, will result favorably to Gen. Cass, and the probabilities now are strongly in his favor, so far as New York is concerned. Should the Van Buren and Clay men remain firm in their avowed purpose, the result is certain. But we have been assured for some time past, that the Whig party, that wherever it shall be apparent that Gen. Cass is in the ascendency, the Van Buren men will in a body vote for Gen. Taylor. They will do so, the defection of the Clay whigs can be proved by the proceedings on the part of the free soil men, who have been so clamorous, would demonstrate in the most palpable manner that which is already apparent, and which is virtually confessed, that not a particle of principle is involved in the agitation gotten up by these men. Every thing in consideration, and as matters now stand, the prophecy is, that the nomination of Lewis Cass will be President in 1849, and not chosen by the Representatives in Congress."

"The friends of Mr. Clay held a meeting at the Capitol last evening, at which the only big gun exploded was Dudley Selden, now of New York, but formerly a Representative in Congress from this district. Dudley Selden is a backslider from the democratic faith. He warmly urged the claims of Henry Clay, and as warmly repudiated the nomination of the Philadelphia Convention and the nomination of Gen. Taylor. It is estimated that the new element, the Clay agitation, may possibly take from one hundred to one hundred and fifty thousand votes from the side of Gen. Taylor. The Van Buren men will take more from Gen. Cass. So that in fact, as was stated in a former letter, political chances and changes are particularly loose and uncertain at all points."

EDITORIAL CHANGE.—The Hillsboro' Patriot, a sterling democratic paper, has passed into the editorial charge of Thomas B. Bailey, Esq., son of Judge Bailey. Mr. Bailey is a young gentleman of finished education, fine talents and unblemished character. We welcome him into the corps editorial, and predict for him a brilliant and useful career.

WHAT IS A "WHIG" AT THE PRESENT WRITING?

Gen. Taylor says he is a "Whig," but not an ultra "Whig," and the Taylorites in this State still persist in calling themselves "whigs," whilst, so far as we can find out, the Taylorism of 1848 has not a single feature, save that of opposition to a democratic administration, in common with the whiggery with which we battled in 1844. Then the "Whig" party came, for once in its life, under the lead of the gallant Harry of the West, up to the scratch, with some great, tangible principles inscribed on its banner. Now, the only principles inscribed on that banner are the names of ZACHARY TAYLOR, the Military Chieftain, and MILLARD FILLMORE, the ABOLITIONIST! True, we heard Mr. Banks, that "able and faithful champion in the Whig cause," when we looked in for a few moments at the Rough and Ready Club the other evening, say that "the Whig Platform is the Constitution." Now this declaration, according to our notion, is sheer nonsense, or else it is put forth to catch gulls. Why, the omnium gatherum Convention of Abolitionists that assembled at Buffalo some weeks since, planted themselves on the Constitution. Who is there that does not? Every body, no matter what political party or faction he may belong, will tell you that he plants himself upon the Constitution. But what is generally meant by political principles is another thing. It is the manner in which the affairs of the country will be carried on under that Constitution. Now, neither Gen Taylor nor his followers have vouchsafed to tell us in what manner this interesting operation is to be performed, should the Taylorites get the reins of Government into their hands. Gen. Taylor says he will administer the "government honestly and fairly, for all sections of the country, if elected. Ah! indeed! Wonder if Giddings, Hale, or any other Abolitionist would not make the same declaration? Did you ever hear a fisherman cry striking fish?

But what is a Whig of 1848? He is a politician without political principles. In 1844, the Whigs of North Carolina battled manfully for a National Bank, a Protective Tariff, the distribution of the proceeds of the sales of the Public Lands. Now they are dumb as oysters on all these great questions. They have ingloriously stricken them from their flag, and unfortunately for them, they have got nothing in their stead, save and except Whiggery, driven from pillar to post for the last 20 years, it has at last come to this pitiable pass: Will any Whig answer these questions? Is Gen. Taylor, or are the Taylorites of North Carolina in favor of abolishing the Independent Treasury system, and substituting in its stead a United States Bank? Are they in favor of repealing the Revenue Tariff Bill of 1846, and re-enacting the Federal Protective Act of 1842? These are questions we should like to have answered. These are important matters in which the people of this country have a deep interest, and with regard to which the opinions of those seeking their favor should be known.

What are Whig principles in 1848? Answer:—"The federal party has been laboring for the last twenty years to secure the reins of government. It has only succeeded once during all that time—in the election of Harrison and Tyler in 1840—and then through the vilest system of fraud and chicanery ever practiced on an intelligent people. It changes its face often, in the hope that the people may forget its loathsome countenance; but some how or other, they always find it out, no matter under what garb it may appear. While federalism, says a Northern democratic paper—the Pennsylvania—is attempting to combine with all the fac-ends of faction, in order to carry out its designs—while it shows one face to the North smiling upon the abolitionists, and holds out another beaming upon the slave holder—while it has a halo for the soldier, and an anti-war champion for the peace man—while Gen. Taylor's military policy pleases the federalists—while this is so, democracy remains proudly aloof, defying all factions and all isms—standing erect and determined upon its immutable faith. Not only does it keep aloof from and defy the opposition of nativism and abolitionism, but it openly and unequivocally opposes them. It speaks no two languages. Its opinions are freely uttered upon all questions. It laughs at concealment. It scorns reserve. Alike in the north and the south, it invokes no support by promising the one and deceiving the other.—Defeat will be welcomed by this great party, if victory is to be achieved by a dishonorable evasion, or purchased by a disgraceful concession."

This is the contrast that appeals to intelligent men everywhere. It is a contrast that alone teaches which is the party of expediency, and which the party of principle. Let the elector choose.

"INFAMOUS FRAUD."

Under this caption, the Commercial of Saturday last has an article that puts its editor a little ahead of Parson BROWNLOW, of the "Jonesboro' Whig." Can the editor of the Commercial be so devoid of common sense as to think that such an article as that, bearing as it does, RABD, stamped on its face, will do its party any good?

We would like to ask the Commercial if the statements made in the pamphlet alluded to are not true. Do not Gen. TAYLOR'S supporters, e. g. CORWIN, WEBSTER, HUDSON, &c., together with the whole Northern TAYLOR Press, represent him as opposed—entirely opposed—to the extension of slavery? And can the Commercial print to a single passage in any letter ever written by Gen. TAYLOR that negatives that idea? Why does "honest old Rough and Ready" permit this game to be played without putting a stop to it by letting the people of the country know whether he is for or against the extension of slavery? The Commercial says that there were two lives of Gen. Cass, put forth by the "Jackson Democratic Association Committee"—one for the North, and the other for the South—and that too, with his (Gen. C.'s) knowledge and consent. This is absolutely and positively untrue, and the Commercial ought to be ashamed, at its time of life, to put forth such reckless statements. But it is useless to discuss matters of this kind with a print so entirely reckless of what it says.

VERMONT.—The election held in this little federal State, on the 6th inst, has terminated as usual, in favor of the Whigs. The result, in a few words, is a Whig Governor and Legislature, two whig Congressmen and no change in two Districts.

themselves in circulating about a busnel and a half of Federal Documentary slanders that arrived here some two or three weeks since?

MORE FILLMOREISM.

During a lengthened discussion in Richmond, Virginia, some days since, between Democratic and Federal speakers, the following incident occurred. We admire the independence of Mr. Lyons, and have no doubt but that he will stick to his determination.—Indeed, for our own part, we cannot see how any Southern man can vote for Fillmore, with his Abolitionism staring him in the face.—

Mr. Caskie introduced the abominable letter of Millard Fillmore with great effect, and avowed his conviction that Mr. L. could not vote for a man with such atrocious opinions. Mr. L. at first attempted to throw doubt upon the authenticity of the letter; but when Mr. Caskie settled all doubt by reading from the Enquirer of November, 1838, a contemporaneous exposition of the identical letter, Mr. L. emphatically declared that, if Fillmore ever voted for any opinions, he should not vote for him. "If he entertains them," said Mr. L., "so help me God, I shall not vote for him." Mr. Caskie still was not satisfied, and he finally obtained from Mr. L. whose name only we approve, a pledge that Fillmore should be written to on the subject. Mr. Caskie treated this part of the subject with great power; he strongly depicted the degradation to which the whig party of Virginia would be reduced, in voting for such a man, and in glowing terms he invoked Mr. Lyons and the approaching whig convention, to strike the name of Fillmore from the ticket, and save Virginia from the disgrace of supporting such a man. The scene was deeply interesting, and we rejoice to inform the public that it is clearly understood, that unless Fillmore comes out and retracts the infamous opinions of his letter of 1838, his name will be rejected with scorn by Mr. Lyons, and we sincerely trust, by the mass of the southern whigs. The country at large will peruse with interest this evidence of James Lyons, Esq., a distinguished politician and lawyer; the President of the Tippecanoe Club in 1840; a whig elector at large for Virginia in 1844; and now the Chairman of the Whig Central Committee of Virginia.

GEN'L TAYLOR'S ALLISON LETTER, No. 2.

Gen. Taylor having doubtless learned, not only from the public papers of the country but also through letters from his Northern allies, that his acceptance of the nomination of the Charleston Democrats, in conjunction with Gen. Butler, and in repudiation of Millard Fillmore, was playing the deuce with his prospects in New York and other Northern States, has seen fit to put forth another manifesto, declaratory of his position, in the shape of a second letter to Allison. This letter is somewhat law. Our limits will not permit us to give this letter in full in the present number of the Journal. We may do so hereafter. Its real, and, indeed, its apparent object, is to conciliate the disaffected Clay Whigs of the Northern States, who are shewing evident signs of backing out from his support. Whether this letter will have its desired effect, remains to be seen. We clip from the body of this final manifesto of Gen. Taylor, the following paragraph:—"The Democratic Convention met in May, and composed their ticket to suit them. This they had a right to do. The National Whig Convention met in June, and selected me as their candidate. I accepted the nomination with confidence and with pride. I was proud of the confidence of such a body of men representing such a constituency as the Whig party of the United States, a manifestation the more grateful because it was not numbered with exactions incompatible with the dignity of the Presidential office, and the responsibilities of its incumbent to the whole people of the nation. And I may add, that these emotions were increased by the fact, that I was the choice of the distinguished citizens of New York, whose acknowledged abilities and sound conservative opinions might have justly entitled him to the first place on the ticket.

Of course, every man of discernment can see at a glance that all this palaver about "the distinguished citizen of New York" is penned with a twofold purpose in view. In the first place, the old gentleman is anxious to propitiate Mr. Fillmore's friends; and in the second place, he desires to convince the Northern people that he endorses the "sound conservative opinions of" "the distinguished citizen of New York." So Gen. Taylor himself, endorses publicly and above-board, the sound conservative opinions of Millard Fillmore—Sound conservative opinions, indeed! The abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. The prevention of the internal slave trade between the slave States, &c. These are the sound conservative principles of Millard Fillmore, which Gen. Taylor so much admires! And still we find Southern men blindly following him.

NEW YORK.

The three parties have each made their nominations in the Empire State. The democrats have nominated Chancellor WALWORTH, the Barnburners, Senator DIX, and the Federalists, Hon. HAMILTON FISH, as their respective candidates for Governor. The Journal of Commerce, speaking of the democratic nomination, holds the following language:—"The Hunker Convention.—The nomination of Hon. Reuben H. Walworth for Governor, by the Hunker Convention at Syracuse, must be admitted on all hands to be an excellent one. It will command all the Hunker strength in the State, and a great deal more. It would be a great gain for any party, who could secure so many talents and experience, who at the same time is so entirely unobjectionable in other respects. Chancellor Walworth has never contaminated himself with politics, but has attended assiduously to his professional duties, and has probably had a small portion of our citizens know, until his recent retirement, whether he was a Democrat or Whig. The only thing we can think of, that may possibly operate against him, is his never-tiring zeal in the Temperance cause. On this account, some of the grog-bruizers will find it hard to vote for him. With many other of the great moral and religious enterprises of the day his name has been long and intimately associated. Unless the Whigs bring out a much better man than the present incumbent, they may safely calculate that Chancellor Walworth will be elected."

MAINE.

The result of the election of State officers and Congressmen in Maine, is not yet by any means official. Up to this time, the best information that we can gather is that the Legislature is largely Democratic on joint ballot—that Dana, the Democratic candidate for Governor, although he is not elected by the people, has a large plurality of votes over Hamlin, the Federal candidate, and of course will be elected by the Legislature. Out of the seven Congressmen, five are Democrats and two Whigs; at least it is supposed the Whigs have succeeded in electing two members of Congress.

VERMONT.—The election held in this little federal State, on the 6th inst, has terminated as usual, in favor of the Whigs. The result, in a few words, is a Whig Governor and Legislature, two whig Congressmen and no change in two Districts.

EXPLICIT!

The Chronicle of last Wednesday, in noticing the proposition made by Mr. Ashe in Mr. Davis, in the Court House, during the recent discussion there, "that a committee of three Whigs and three Democrats should be appointed to correspond with Mr. Fillmore and Gen. Butler, and ask them for a distinct avowal of their views on the subject of slavery," explains—

"Can Mr. Ashe for a moment suppose that any Whig would offer Mr. Fillmore so great an insult as to question him on a subject so generally held to be his own? Mr. Fillmore would be well employed to be sure in catechising Mr. Fillmore, when on the 31st of July, in his letter to Gov. Gayle, he made known his sentiments in unequivocal language.

Now we don't know what Mr. Ashe thought about the matter, but for his known character as a gentleman, we endorse that the proposition was made in good faith. Why not? Mr. Fillmore now stands—his views on the Atherton Resolutions, and his letter of 1838, are it is undoubtedly an abolitionist. No doubt Mr. Ashe's only object in making the proposition to Mr. Davis, was to give Mr. Fillmore a chance to deny and eat up what he has said and done. This proposition, we gain regret, was NOT RESPONDED TO BY MR. DAVIS. The Chronicle wants to know if Mr. Ashe could "for a moment suppose that any Whig would offer Mr. Fillmore so great an insult as to question him on a subject concerning which he has within six or seven weeks declared himself in the most explicit manner?" In what explicit manner, we ask? Why, to be sure, in his letter to Gov. Gayle, of Alabama, he has been particularly explicit, the Chronicle responds. Let us see what this abolitionist says in his letter to Gov. Gayle, over which the Chronicle and other federal prints are so many peans of joy. We find the explicit part of that letter quoted in the same number of the Chronicle from which the above extract is taken. The Chronicle puts the "explicit part" of this Gayle letter in large italics, as follows:

"That by the Constitution of the United States, the whole power over that question was vested in the several States where the institution was tolerated. If they regarded it as a blessing, they had a constitutional right to enjoy it, and if they regarded it as an evil, they had the power, and knew best how to apply it. I did not conceive that Congress had any power over it, or was in any way responsible for its continuance in the several States where it existed. It was a subject which was reserved to a certain Buffalo Convention, and the 'platform' laid down by that motley crew of abolitionists, whigs, and renegade Democrats. We will give one of the resolutions adopted by this Convention, to which John A. Dole, Joshua R. Giddings, Charles Francis Adams, with a host of other true-blue abolitionists, gave their cordial and hearty acquiescence, and ask the Chronicle if it is not as explicit and satisfactory as Mr. Fillmore's Gayle letter. It reads in the following words:—"Resolved, That Slavery in the several States of