

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

The NATIONAL REPUBLICAN is published every afternoon, (Sundays excepted), at the corner of Indiana Avenue and Second street, and is delivered to city subscribers at six cents per week, mail subscribers at three dollars and fifty cents per annum, in advance.

Advertisements inserted at liberal rates. All communications, whether on business or for publication, should be addressed to LEWIS CLEPHANE & Co., Washington, D. C.

PRICE ONE CENT.

LETTER OF SENATOR WILSON TO HON. CALSB CUSHING.

Hon. Calsb Cushing: Sir: On the 6th of November, one hundred and seventy thousand men of Massachusetts thronged to the ballot-box to express their choice for Chief Magistrate of the Republic. By speech by letter, by sign, your sentiments, opinions, wishes, were made known to these thousands of your native State; yet hardly one thirty-third part of that host of one hundred and seventy thousand men voted with you for the representative of your sentiments, opinions, policy.

You now, sir, step forth from the ranks of your insignificant band of confederates, to lecture the thousands of Massachusetts men who heeded not your voice on the day of the conflict. You assume to speak forth to the people of Massachusetts on the state of the Union. You profess to speak for the Union now in peril. You announce that "we, the people of the United States, are in the midst of a revolution;" that "men in the South have taken the initiative step to dissolve the Union;" that "the ship of State is among the breakers, drifting on the lee-shore of destruction."

As such a crisis, truth, justice, patriotism, should have impelled you to utter the language of the statesman, not the language of the partisan. Have you not spoken as a man? Have you not rather so spoken as to further deceive and mislead those who are already deceived and misled? to excite and embitter those who are already excited and embittered to madness? Have you not, by misrepresenting the feelings, sentiments, opinions, purposes, of the people of your native Massachusetts and of the North, by monstrous accusations against the Republican party, and by perversion of the language of its public men, weaponed the hands of the disloyal men who are now playing upon the passions and fears of the deceived and deluded countrymen?

Had you, sir, tolled with "malignant industry" to frame accusatory and vituperative phrases against the people of Massachusetts and of the North, for the sole use and benefit of your disloyal confederates, who, at Charleston and Baltimore, with your complicity and co-operation, broke up the Democratic party, as "the first step to dissolution," you could not have achieved a greater success than you have achieved in this, the most incendiary speech which falls from the lips of a man during recent contests of opinion and of action.

The British statesman, Canning, describes a class of men "whose element is mischief and whose delight is in disturbance." Surely you, sir, have shown that you are without a peer in the work of misrepresenting the North and exasperating the South, for the sole benefit of men "whose element is mischief and whose delight is in disturbance." No one can read your speech without feeling that you entered upon the performance of your self-imposed task with a heart and a will with a sort of jubilant ferocity. Your brain seems to lust, to hunger and thirst after accusatory and vituperative phrases to stigmatize the "degenerate sons" of Massachusetts and of the North. With reckless audacity you assert that the mind of Massachusetts is "INFILTRATED WITH THE VENOM OF ABOLITIONISM;" that her people are filled with "SECTIONAL HATE AND ABOLITION RAGE;" that "SECTIONAL HATE AND ABOLITION DELIRIUM HAS SEIZED UPON THE MIND OF MASSACHUSETTS, CORRUPTING HER CONSCIENCE, PERVERTING HER RELIGION, DISTORTING HER MORALITY, POISONING HER LAW, EXTINGUISHING HER PATRIOTISM, MISGUIDING HER CONDUCT."

Why, sir, are these railing accusations now made against Massachusetts? Why are these vituperative phrases now blurted into the too-willing ear of the credulous, sensitive, and mad-dened South? Will the utterance of these phrases, which the heart of Massachusetts instinctively pronounces false—will the utterance of these phrases tend to save the imperilled Union? Will their utterance do rather spurn on the fiery spirits who would "plunge the cotton States into revolution," and "shiver the Union from turret to foundation stone?"

You stigmatize the Christian men of the North as "degenerate sons," who "had organized, in the Northern States, a system for the purpose of preaching a crusade against the people of the South." You assert that "the minds of too many of the North had gone madly, madly lost to all sense of truth or falsehood, right or wrong; and everything of good gave way to the frantic clamor of mere unreasoning and senseless sympathy with black men;" that "the sacred pulpits, to a great extent, became infected with political abolitionism as with an epidemic plague;" that "political power at the North could be obtained only by pandering to this unconstitutional spirit of intermeddlesomeness;" that "thus the daily speech and thought of tens of thousands of persons in the Northern States was of such hostility of feeling towards their fellow citizens of the Southern States, as the bitterest national hatred, and that only, could apply to foreign enemies."

Why, sir, in this perilous crisis of the nation, do you thus accuse the North? Is it your purpose to deepen the fearful delusion of the South, concerning the feelings, sentiments, opinions, of the North? Would you intensify the angry excitement of the South? You gave aid and comfort to Yancey and his associates at Charleston and Baltimore, in their efforts to disrupt the Democratic party. Then you were their confederate, or their instrument. Is it your purpose now to give aid and comfort to Yancey and his disloyal confederates, in their mad efforts to disrupt the Union? Mean you that by their accomplice or their instrument now? Iago said that he would not only deceive Othello, but so far prevail as to earn his thanks, even while practicing upon him the fatal deception: "Make the Moor thank me, love me, and reward me, For making him egregiously an ass, And practicing upon his peace and quiet Even to madness."

National Republican

VOL. I. WASHINGTON, D. C., SATURDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1860. No. 17.

chusetts—I know something of her people. During the past fifteen years, I have traversed every portion of the State, from the sands of the Cape to the hills of Berkshire; spoken in nearly every town; sat at the tables and slept beneath the roofs of her people. Around those tables and beneath those roofs I have heard prayers to Almighty God for blessings on slave and on master. From thousands of Christian homes, in Massachusetts, New England, the North, tens of thousands of men and women daily implore God's blessing upon the whole country—upon the poor slave and his proud master. Go, sir, to the firesides of the liberty-loving, God-fearing men of your native State, you now stigmatize as "degenerate sons," filled with "sectional hate and abolition rage," and you will hear them, with open Bibles and on bended knees, commend master and slave, and the whole country, to the protection of that Being who made all men in His own image.

Men of the South visiting Massachusetts, on pleasure or business, are ever treated by all her people with considerate kindness and fraternal regard. The public men of the South are ever welcomed to Massachusetts; treated with courtesy by all, and sometimes with "complimentary flunkeyism" by the few. Yancey, Henry, Hilliard, Maynard, and other men of the South, were during the late canvass listened to with attention and the utmost courtesy, and that, too, when quiet citizens of Massachusetts were, in portions of the South, subjected to the greatest indignities.

During the past seven years I have travelled more than eighty thousand miles, in seventeen States, delivered more than four hundred addresses, looked into the faces of hundreds of thousands of the people, sat with them at their tables, slept beneath their roofs, listened to their words; and what I have said of the people of Massachusetts, I can say, also, of the people of New England and of the North. During the late canvass I attended nearly one hundred public meetings in the North, saw hundreds of thousands of people, and heard many addresses by others. I have often disclaimed, for myself and for the people of the North, any feelings of hostility towards our brethren of the South, and I have heard other speakers do the same, and everywhere the people unanimously and enthusiastically applauded the sentiment. All over the free States, the Republican speakers, while firmly asserting their determination to use all constitutional and legal means to arrest the extension of slavery, disclaimed for the Republican party all feelings of hostility towards the people of the South, and everywhere the whole people heartily applauded the sentiment.

Not one, no, not one in a thousand of the one million eight hundred thousand men who voted for Lincoln, was actuated by "sectional hate and abolition rage." This I assert positively, and without fear or qualification, and I put my assertion against yours.

The people of Massachusetts loathed slavery and loved liberty; they were ready to step to the verge of constitutional power to arrest its extension, but they hated not their brethren of the South; they embraced in their affections the whole country, and the people of the whole country. Is it "sectional hate and abolition rage" to express "disapprobation of slavery," which you, sir, once pronounced in Congress "but another form of the love of liberty?" Look, sir, at your own history, before you undertake to utter such a charge against your countrymen.

On the Fourth of July, 1833, you told the men of Massachusetts that "this proud anniversary day of our emancipation should be 'consecrated' to 'the spreading abroad of the great truth that all men are born to equal participation in the blessings of life—the rights and wrongs of the slave, wherever he may be, and of whatever clime or complexion.' You wished 'that the curse of involuntary servitude did not still cling to so large a portion of our countrymen, destroying their peace, filling their dwellings with the agonies of perpetual domestic suspicion, subjecting their families to massacre, and hanging its dead weight upon their public welfare; that the chains of the negro were at length and forever struck from his limbs; that liberty, knowledge, and Christianity, were made equally the unpurchased birthright of the European and the African, throughout the New World.'

You asserted that "the doctrines of emancipation are among the peculiar and characteristic lessons of the religion of Jesus Christ." You declared, "We see, among the States of the Union, some which nature has most bounteously favored, can arrest very imperfectly by the system of slave labor—rendered tributary to the industrious population of the free States or of foreign countries, for all the comforts and conveniences of life—unblesed by the signs of universal competency, happiness, and welfare, the commodious habitations, the thrifty and well-ordered farms, the flourishing manufactories, the ships, the churches, the schools, which are the result and honor of free labor in the Eastern and Middle States; we see all this, the tribulation which slavery works out upon itself, we see that monstrous disloyalty towards the Union, in certain regions of the South, of which, whatever be the pretext, this UNDOUBTEDLY IS NOT THE LEAST FAULTFUL SOURCE; and in these considerations, even if the right of the slave did not cry to Heaven for his ransom, we should find incentives enough to plead, and labor, and pray, for the purification of this spotted spot from our land;—for the end of this great drawback in the palmy prosperity of the Union."

You fully proclaimed—"I AVOX THERE TO BE THE SENTIMENTS WHICH I ENTERTAIN; I BELIEVE THEM TO HAVE UNIVERSAL CURRENCY THROUGHOUT NEW ENGLAND." Is it "sectional hate and abolition rage" for Massachusetts—for the Republicans of Massachusetts—to wish that "the curse of involuntary servitude did not cling to so large a portion of our countrymen;" to regard slavery as a "PLAGUE SPOT"—"the 'PITTFUL SOURCE' OF THAT 'MONSTROUS DISLOYALTY TOWARDS THE UNION IN CERTAIN REGIONS OF THE SOUTH'—to believe that 'the doctrines of emancipation are among the peculiar and characteristic lessons of the religion of Jesus Christ?'"

gress has, by the Constitution, power to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia; that "Congress ought to take measures to effect the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia;" that "the rights of humanity, the claims of justice and the common good, alike demand the suppression of the slave trade carried on in and through the District of Columbia;" that "Congress has power to abolish slavery in the Territories of the United States;" that "Congress has power to abolish the traffic in slaves between different States;" "the exercise of this power is demanded by the principles of humanity and justice;" that "no new slave State should hereafter be admitted into the Union." Is it "sectional hate and abolition rage" for Massachusetts—for the Republicans of Massachusetts—to believe that "Congress has, by the Constitution, power to prohibit slavery in the Territories of the United States;" and "to resolve to continue to maintain as heretofore its principles and spirit?"

You proudly "confessed," twenty-three years ago, in the Halls of Congress, that "we of the State of Massachusetts hold universally that domestic slavery is an evil—moral, political, and social; we hold that negro slavery, as it now exists in some of the States of this Union, is an evil; and if it depended on us, and slavery could be abolished lawfully, and with safety both to the blacks and the whites, the two races would not coexist in their present relations another day." You then declared that "these opinions" were not the "wild chimera of incendiary secessionists;" that they were the opinions of the great oracles of republicanism in the South as well as the North; that they were not only the opinions of Jefferson, but of Washington, Madison, and others, the brightest names in the annals of America. Is it "sectional hate and abolition rage" for the people of Massachusetts, and for the Republicans of Massachusetts, to cling to these doctrines, which you, in 1837, averred to be the doctrines of Virginia, "not the Virginia of the revolutionary year 'seventy-six merely, but the Virginia of this blessed year of our Lord?'"

In 1836, you stigmatized slavery in the Constitution of Arkansas as "a noxious matter," "the unclean thing." Then you asked, "shall we, with the accents of liberty perpetually on our lips, shall we be breathily dumb, when it is sought, through us, to render slavery irremediably perpetual in a new State soliciting admission into the Union?" The reply you declared, "I do not persuade myself that liberty is an evil or slavery a blessing. When called upon to accord my official sanction to a frame of government, which not merely permits, but expressly perpetuates, slavery, I should be false to the opinions and principles of my life if I did not promptly return a peremptory and emphatic 'no.' Is it 'sectional hate and abolition rage' for the people of Massachusetts, for the Republicans of Massachusetts, now to regard slavery as a "noxious matter"—"an unclean thing"—to the extension of which they would "promptly return a peremptory and emphatic 'no?'"

In those days, when you "gloried" in "the old and persevering dedication to liberty" of New England, you proudly proclaimed: "Every tendency of my nature, and every lesson of my education; the institutions and historical associations amid which I was born and bred; the moral force of the literature I cultivated, and the laws I aid to administer; the maxims of religion, ethics, and seamanship; in a word, the whole of my education, which surrounded me through life, and that innate spirit of the undying thought, which is above and beyond every circumstance of time and place—all impel me to reprobate slavery as the greatest of social and political evils." Is it "sectional hate and abolition rage" for the people of Massachusetts, for the Republicans of Massachusetts, now to "reprobate slavery as the greatest of social and political evils?"

In those days, when you averred that "if it were alleged to us that slavery is a blessing, we should be prone to shrug our shoulders in silent wonder, and pass on," you declared, "for the fullest recognition of the reserved rights of the States, 'I do not admit any implication in the Constitution adverse to liberty.'" "The political power which the pre-eminent statesmen of the revolutionary epoch, amid the disruptions of ancient ties, and by their blood and sufferings, strove to rear up in this New World out of the ruins of the colonial condition, was no trifling power, with which they were not to be trifled. When they undertook this sacred and arduous task, they were not to be trifled with. They looked to the eventual cessation of personal servitude from among us, and made no mental reservation or limitation in its favor." Is it "sectional hate and abolition rage" for the people of Massachusetts, for the Republicans of Massachusetts, now to interpret and understand the Constitution of the United States, and understand it to believe that "the pre-eminent statesmen of the revolutionary epoch, when they unfurled the banner of independence to the startled gaze of nations, did not design that 'liberty' should flash forth its lightning letters from one side of it, and the dark scroll of 'slavery' hover on the other. They looked to the eventual cessation of personal servitude from among us, and made no mental reservation or limitation in its favor."

But you now say, sir, it was left to the "degenerate sons" to begin to undo the work of the fathers; that it was not until 1850, after the establishment of the Constitution, when the last of the Revolutionary Presidents "was in the seat of Federal power, that men of the Northern States began to strike blows at the equality of the States, by insisting on 'putting of the institutions of Southern States' under the ban of the Union, in excluding them from the common Federal territory."

Now, you arraign, accuse, and censure the North for the Missouri restrictions of 1820. Now, those restrictions are "blows at the equality of the States," struck by the "degenerate sons" of the North. In 1836, when you "felt it to be your duty as a Northern man to take a counter stand in conservation of one among the dearest of the institutions of the North—the institution of liberty"—when "no choice remained to us but to maintain, temperately yet firmly, the rights and the principles of the North," you approvingly referred to these Missouri restrictions as precedents for, and incentives to, the imposition of restrictions on Arkansas. You could not "suffer the bill for the admission of Arkansas to pass without a word of protestation"—you "conferred in reprobating the clause" of her Constitution concerning slavery—"I foreclosed in advance the progress of civilization and of liberty forever." Then restrictions upon slavery were not "blows at the equality of the States"—then you questioned not the power of slavery restrictions, for you claimed that Congress might require "Duba, if she asked admission into the Union, to emancipate her slaves"—now, the exclusion of slavery from the territories is "putting the institutions of the South under the ban of the Union"—striking blows at the equality of the States. To this, your arraignment of the "men of the Northern States"—the

"degenerate sons"—for striking "blows at the equality of the States" they reply, in the words of Daniel Webster, "NEITHER IN PRINCIPLE NOR IN FACT IS THERE ANY INEQUALITY"—"there is no exclusion of Southern people; there is only the exclusion of a peculiar local law."

By the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, "the state of slavery is a mere municipal regulation, founded upon and limited to the verge of the State law." Slavery by common consent, is the creature of the local laws, customs, and usages of the States; and the jurists of the country, South and North, have held and decided, that when the master takes his slave beyond the jurisdiction of the local law of the State recognizing slavery, into a free State, the slave becomes a free man. This was the doctrine of the Republican fathers of the Statesmen and jurists of the North and South. Southern States courts have going and again affirmed this doctrine. In this crisis of the nation, when the disloyal men in the South threaten the disruption of the Union, you stand forth to accuse the "Northern States" of "confiscating the property and other domestic rights of citizens of the South, sojourning or in transit at the North." You say:

"Trading in the same path, the next step of abandonment or perversion of the Constitution by the sons, was for the Northern States to assume the confiscation of the property and other domestic rights of citizens of the South, sojourning or in transit at the North, the possession of which, during such sojourn or transit, is guaranteed to them by the same explicit provision of the Constitution which guarantees to the citizens of the North the privilege to go with their property and other domestic rights in transit or sojourn into any Southern State."

To answer this monstrous accusation, now made by you against the Northern States, of the "abandonment or perversion of the Constitution," by assuming "to confiscate the property and other domestic rights of citizens of the South, sojourning or in transit at the North," I quote your opinions in 1858.

On the 26th of February, 1858, you made a speech in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, on the "jury bill." The discussion strayed into the character and merits of the Dred Scott decision, and a large part of your speech was devoted to that subject. Mr. Wells said: "The Constitution of the United States provides that the citizens of one State shall be entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of that State. I ask the gentleman if the Dred Scott decision does not expressly deprive every colored man of that right?"

You, in reply, said: "I reply, that the Dred Scott case does not touch that question; and I must beg pardon of the House if I occupy treble the time I intended. Gentleman after gentleman introduces new questions, and I must reply to them, or else leave it to be assumed that they are right." The gentleman assumes that but for the decision of the case of Dred Scott vs. Sandford, the citizen of Massachusetts has all equal rights in Missouri, under the Constitution. Now let us see what the proposition of the Constitution to which he refers means, and I beg that the gentleman will read what there is in the various commentaries on the subject. What are the rights of a citizen of Virginia in Virginia? One right is to hold slaves. Does the gentleman admit that he has that right in Massachusetts? If his theory is true, he has. He has the right to carry his slave through the State of North Carolina into South Carolina. Has he the right to carry his slave through Massachusetts into Vermont? He has, upon the premises of the gentleman from Greenfield. Nay, let us look at the still more extravagant consequences of these premises of the gentleman from Greenfield. In the State of Michigan, he is expressly prohibited by a constitutional provision, which he shall have made the preparatory declaration of their intention to become citizens of the United States, shall be citizens of that State. Are they citizens of Massachusetts? I repeat the question: Do they, therefore, become admitted to all the rights of citizenship in the State of Massachusetts?"

In February, 1858, you thus explicitly denied the right of the slave owner to take his slave through Massachusetts into Vermont. The course of the debate led you to put this denial into form of an interrogatory, but it is none the less explicit. You speak of the doctrine as leading to extravagant consequences. Now, in November, 1859, expounding the very same clause in the Constitution to which your attention was directed in 1858 by Mr. Wells, you announce the opposite doctrine, and berate the people of Massachusetts and other Northern States, "degenerate sons" of their fathers, as you call them, for interfering with a constitutional right, which, two and a half years ago, you scouted and ridiculed as being an absurd and extravagant claim. That you should remember to forget your early declarations of sentiment and opinion does not surprise me in the least; but that you should remember to forget your avowed opinions of two and a half years ago, does surprise me, I confess. Surely, the audacity of inconsistency cannot further go.

The Republicans are committed, fully committed, to the doctrine which the Republican fathers, "Our policy," in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "is exactly the policy of the men who made the Union; nothing more nor nothing less." Washington and his co-workers "saw the direful effects of slavery." They believed it to be in the process of ultimate extinction; they hoped "we should have a Confederacy of free States." Even you, sir, admitted, ay, proudly and triumphantly boasted, a quarter of a century ago, in the Halls of Congress, that "the prominent statement of the revolutionary epoch looked to the eventual cessation of personal servitude from among us, and made no mental reservation or limitation in its favor."

You now, sir, charge the Republican party with the abandonment of the doctrine of the "coequality of the States;" with attempting to inaugurate the doctrines of "the irrepressible conflict"—the idea of "the unification of labor" over "the rights of the States." In your speech before the Fugitive Slave Convention, in Boston, in September, you said: "The Republican party has been conceived, born, and nurtured into strength, in order, if possible, to force or induce the Federal Government into abolitionism, or else the Republican party is a monstrous and ridiculous abortion, a gigantic falsehood, swindle, and fraud. And I reassert, confidently, if Mr. Lincoln is elected, the Republicans will have to burst up at once, or to attack the domestic rights of the States."

The National or State Governments, do you refer for evidence to sustain these wanton allegations, but you refer to the language of Mr. Seward and Mr. Lincoln—language which does not, without perversion, bear the construction you put upon it; and to a few unmediated, untraded, un-revised words of mine—words which have been, and may be perverted, but which were never intended to express the meaning you so unjustly and unfairly put upon them.

Why, sir, resort to this quibbling; to this petty criticism upon words and phrases, this perversion and misrepresentation of men who recognize the doctrine of State rights? Why attempt, by this playing upon words, to misstate the position of a great party, that everywhere proclaims non-intervention by Congress with the domestic rights of the States? Mr. Seward can appeal to the records of his country for vindication against your allegations. To those records I too can appeal for vindication. Mr. Lincoln, in reply to the charge of Mr. Douglas of being "in favor of making war by the North upon the South, for the extermination of slavery," said, "I do not believe the language I employed will bear any such construction; and I believe that no fair mind can infer any such thing from anything I have ever said."

"I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so." "If it is said that I am in favor of interfering with slavery where it exists, I know it is unwarranted by anything I have ever uttered, and, as I believe, by anything I have ever said." "I hold myself under constitutional obligations to allow the people in all the States, without interference, direct or indirect, to do exactly as they please, and I deny that I have any inclination to interfere with them, even if there were no such constitutional obligation."

"I have said a hundred times, and I have now no inclination to take it back, that I believe there is no right, and ought to be no inclination in the people of the free States to enter into the slave States, and interfere with the question of slavery at all."

To maintain your allegations against the Republicans, you also refer to and quote from a few untraded sentences of mine, uttered in a first flush of my brilliant national triumph. These sentences, which a legal and powerful success, achieved by the ballot-box, is described in the metaphorical language of the conflicts and triumphs of physical forces, you, sir, misinterpret, misconstrue, pervert—from them you draw inferences of my meaning, wholly unwarranted. In speaking of the magnitude of the victory, I spoke of it as a triumph over that element of political power, the slave power. That phrase, the slave power, which you now stigmatize as a "putty piece of faction," upon which "Republicans are continually ringing the changes," has been for many years used by political parties, by public men, by presses, by the people; and I supposed every man knew its political significance, knew there was a well-defined and vital distinction between the words slave power and slavery, slaveholders, slave States, South, Local Interest, State rights. We speak of the slave power as an illegitimate power, begotten of slavery, a self-seeking, aggressive, domineering power, which has for some years ago, and which controlled the powers of the General Government, and the spirit of the laws and the Constitution, against the justice, liberty, faith, honor, humanity, and religion of the nation, for the purposes of personal ambition and sectional domination. When we speak of the slave power, we no more speak of the purely local domestic interests and legal and constitutional rights of slave States, than do the people of New York speak of the just legal rights of the Central Railroad, when they speak of its controlling influence at Albany.

I said, in the speech you so unfairly criticize, that the present haughty and domineering slave power had borne our country far away from the faith and policy of our fathers—that we had protested against its aggressive policy, appealed to the heart, conscience, and reason of the nation—that it was now broken beneath our feet, that our heels were upon it, that it was grinding to powder—that whatever we do, happy, whoever might come into power hereafter, that the slave power could never be what it had been, could never sway the councils of America. You say, sir, that I "did not distinctly define" what I "intended by the expression, slave power;" that it "intends, and must intend, the entire slaveholding interest of the South—that is to say, the slave property and the constitutional and legal rights therein of fifteen Southern States"—that I mean "fifteen States of the Union, their power and their rights and their persons;" "the power and the rights of those at the North, who sympathize with the Southern States, are crushed and ground to powder by the numerical power of sixteen States." These inferences are unwarranted by my words—these imputations are entirely unjust. My unpremeditated, unguarded words concerning the slave power may perhaps be tortured by the reckless tongue or pen of political malignity so as to appear to mean "the entire slaveholding interest of the South, the slave property and the constitutional and legal rights of the fifteen Southern States"—"their rights and their persons;" but I never conceived, thought, nor intended to give utterance to any such sentiments. If I know myself, I should blush with a sense of self-abasement, if I could cherish in my heart a sentiment of hatred, or the wish to put the brand of inequality or degradation upon my countrymen of any section of the Union. In hundreds of addresses before the people, in the public press, in halls of legislation, I have over and over again recognized the doctrine of States rights in its fullest sense, disavowed any purpose to make aggression upon the constitutional rights of the States within the Union, to regulate their domestic affairs, and disclaimed all hostility towards our countrymen of the South. I have voted as cheerfully for measures for the interests of the South as I have for the interests of the North. I would pour out the treasure and the blood of the nation as generously for the defence of the South as I would for the defence of my native New England.

Why, sir, do you resort to these misrepresentations and perversions of a few words separated from their context, to establish the faith, creed, purpose, of the Republican party? The Republican party has a right to be judged by the faith and creed embodied in its national platform, and not by the unexplained utterance

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES.

Subscriptions, advertisements, and communications, intended for this paper, may be left at Adamson's periodical store, on Seventh street, opposite the General Post Office, where copies of the paper may also be had immediately on its issue.

Advertisements should be sent in before twelve o'clock, M., otherwise they may have to lie over a day. Communications upon all subjects, particularly with reference to our city affairs, will receive respectful attention.

of any man. To the Chicago platform we appeal, against your inferences from the distorted words of men. This platform of Republicanism declares— "That the maintenance inviolate of the RIGHTS OF THE STATES, AND ESPECIALLY THE RIGHT OF EACH STATE TO ORDER AND CONTROL ITS OWN DOMESTIC INSTITUTIONS, ACCORDING TO ITS OWN JUDGMENT exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political faith depends, and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes."

In the Chicago platform are embodied the principles of the Republican party. Mr. Seward, foremost among the Republican statesmen of the Republic, standing last autumn in the Hall where this creed was proclaimed, uttered the united voice of 1,560,000 Republicans when he said: "Hail to this council chamber of the great Republican party! jointly adopted by its vastness and its simplicity to its great purpose—the hall where the Representatives of freemen framed that creed of Republican faith which carries healing for the relief of a disordered nation. We! we! be to him who shall add, or shall subtract one word from that simple, sublime, truthful, beneficent creed."

Mr. Lincoln, in accepting the nomination of the Republican party, committed himself fully and unreservedly to this "creed of Republican faith," this "simple, sublime, truthful, beneficent creed."

In his letter of acceptance, Mr. Lincoln said: "The declaration of principles and sentiments, which accompanies your letter, meets my approval: and it shall be my care not to violate or disregard it in any part. Implying the assistance of Divine Providence; and with due regard to the views and feelings of all who were represented in the Convention: TO THE RIGHTS OF ALL THE STATES AND TERRITORIES, and people of the nation; to the inviolability of the Constitution, and the perpetual union, harmony, and prosperity of all, I am most happy to co-operate for the practical success of the principles declared by the Convention."

You, sir, are now retelling the theories and repeating the fallacies of the disciples of Mr. Calhoun to Massachusetts. Vain, sir, will be your efforts to pervert the reason or seduce the heart of her sons. The men of Massachusetts stand, and they will continue to stand, on those questions concerning the powers of the General Government, secession, nullification, and disunion, by the doctrines of Daniel Webster and the acts of Andrew Jackson. They will be slow to repudiate the principles of Constitutional construction Daniel Webster maintained in his immortal replies to Hayne and Calhoun, which Andrew Jackson enunciated in his proclamation against nullification. You speak, sir, of "reigns of terror," of being "doomed to die in exile from Massachusetts," of your "chances of proscription, exile, or axe?" Or do you wish to arouse the sensibilities, excite the admiration, quicken the gratitude, of the secessionists? Or are these only the utterances of that teasing fancy which sees the advancing specter of the "man on horseback?" Pray, sir, pardon me for suggesting that you quit magnificently your position in Massachusetts. Surely, a gentleman who was "exiled" into the ranks of the little squad of the slave-code Democrats of Massachusetts, last November, cannot be deemed, by the people of that Commonwealth, in their pride of conscious power, other than harmless. If you make no attempt—and I am sure you will not—to put in execution your impotent threat, to "throttle us in our tracks," in a certain event, you may yet live many years on the banks of your clear, bright, sparkling Merrimac, and, after "life's fitful fever," sleep among friends and kindred. Perhaps a generous people may forgive, if they do not forget, your speeches and acts in the interests of slavery, and gratefully remember your earlier accents for liberty.

HENRY WILSON.

G. W. DUTTON, BUTCHER AND VICTUALLER, F street, (north side,) near Eleventh. THE subscriber has opened a regular Family Market on F street, near Eleventh street, where he is prepared to furnish Meats of all kinds, Vegetables, Oysters, Butter, Eggs, and every description of Family Provisions, for family use, and respectfully solicits a share of the public patronage. He still continues to carry on the Butchering business at his stands, No. 7 in the Centre Market, and No. 46 in the Northern Liberties Market, where he will always be found on market days, ready to supply his customers with choice Meats. G. W. DUTTON, nov 26

G. W. GOODALL, Plumber and Gas and Steam Fitter, 564 Seventh street, near Canal Bridge, Washington. ALL orders executed at the shortest notice, in the most substantial manner, and on reasonable terms. Personal attention given to every department of the business. nov 26

STILAY SHEEP. CAME to the premises of the subscriber, on Thursday last, a stray SHEEP, which the owner can have by proving property and paying all expenses incurred. JAMES GORMAN, 696 G street. dec 11

JOHN R. ELVANS, 309 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, Between Ninth and Tenth streets, DEALER IN COACH AND CABINET HARDWARE, BAR-IRON, STEEL, &c. SIGN OF THE ARM AND HAMMER. nov 26—1meod.