

BEVERLEY TUCKER,  
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 12, 1856.

## DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS.

FOR PRESIDENT,  
**JAMES BUCHANAN,**  
OF PENNSYLVANIA.FOR VICE PRESIDENT,  
**JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE,**  
OF KENTUCKY.

## NOTICE.

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE ROOMS,  
July 5, 1856.

State executive committees, county and city clubs and associations, organized to promote the election of the Democratic nominees for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States, will address their communications to Hon. CHARLES J. FAULKNER, of Virginia, Chairman of the National Democratic Resident Committee, Washington City, D. C.

Democratic papers throughout the United States are requested to copy the above notice.

By order of the Committee.

## A VOICE FROM LINDENWALD-LETTER OF EX-PRESIDENT VAN BUREN.

We give place in another column to the letter of MARTIN VAN BUREN, addressed to the Committee of the Tammany Society of New York, in response to an invitation to unite with its members in their celebration of the Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. We commend this letter to the careful perusal of our readers, North and South. It is a production of matured reflection; and, whilst it teaches a useful lesson to Northern men, who are balancing on the brink of the Rubicon, bounding the Constitution and the Union on one side, and Abolition fanaticism and disunion on the other, it gives assurance to the South that the patriot of olden times, North or South, although he may have swerved from the true path on occasions, will come boldly to the rescue whenever the integrity of our institutions is seriously assailed, and the existence of the Union put in danger. We have the most cheering evidence of this patriotic spirit, in the recorded history of the great dead patriots and statesmen of the once proud and powerful Whig party, who now sleep their last sleep—and, in the action of the living, who have now placed themselves again on the same constitutional platform, upon which they were illustrious champions in the days of ANDREW JACKSON. The "sober second thought" restored the dominion of their sound judgment, when ever their COUNTRY'S life became imperilled.

The political history of MARTIN VAN BUREN is too well known to require any tracing by us, in presenting his last production to the public. He has passed through all the grades of public service, in times of peril and prosperity. As a member of the Legislature, and an occupant of the gubernatorial chair of his own State—in the Congress of the United States—as Secretary of State, under the immortal JACKSON, and as chief executive of the Republic, he discharged his duties with ability, with fidelity to the great Democratic party and to the country. Some of his subsequent acts, in which we have taken part, have been the subject of bitter animadversion. But time has done its work—human infirmity is acknowledged and vindicated—and errors of the past, no matter by what cause produced, are now consigned to oblivion. MARTIN VAN BUREN, once the head of this great nation, is now in retirement, at his home of "Lindenwald." He has passed the age of three-score and ten years. He has no longer any views of official ambition, he has retired from the turmoil of party political strife, and has nothing to do now in this world, but to complete the record of an AMERICAN PATRIOT, to be left as a legacy to his children and his country. In his masterly production, which we, to-day, present to our readers, he makes the declaration that it shall be his last appearance in a political career, except at the ballot-box. We again say, especially to our friends of the Northern section of the Union, read *Martin Van Buren's* letter, and reflect upon it.

## THE MAN OF STRAW.

Heretofore candidates for the Presidency have been selected by the great parties, from those who have rendered great and important services to the nation. No national party pride to 1856 has ever presumed to offer a man as a candidate for President, unless he had a national reputation, and that won by long continued service in posts of high responsibility. Examine the history of the country and this will be found to be strictly true. John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson were the first Presidential candidates who did not belong to the era of the revolution. Then came Mr. Van Buren, who had been long in the Senate of the United States, Governor of New York, a Secretary of State of the United States. To him succeeded General Harrison, who for forty years had occupied posts of honor and high trust. Generals Taylor and Scott had both won a national reputation, which justified their presentation as Presidential candidates. Mr. Polk and Mr. Fillmore for many years in Congress, had been considered among the first statesmen of the country before their names were offered to the people for their suffrages.

But what are the antecedents of John C. Fremont? He had been an explorer of dubious reputation. We know of no useful practical results from his services as an explorer. Capt. Wilkes detected errors in his lines and observations, and emigrants to California and Oregon, misled by his published reports, have denounced him as a humbug.

Twenty-one days in the Senate of the United States was the amount of his service in the Councils of the nation. In that time his position was below that of mediocrity. He participated in no important discussion—he proposed no measure of consequence. He was really the most insignificant member of the body to which he belonged. His constituents properly

estimated his worth and did not repeat the experiment of electing him to the Senate.

He was indebted for his first election more to the fact that he was the son-in-law of Colonel Benton than to any intrinsic merits of his own. The Californians supposed that if they sent Fremont to the Senate they would have the benefit of Colonel Benton's exertions in aid of the great mass of legislation which they required of Congress.

Since he left the Senate he has been engaged chiefly in vindicating his title to California lands, which it is said abound in gold-bearing quartz. These lands, it is said, have made him rich, though others say that they are worthless, and that it costs more to extract the gold from them than it is worth.

His services in California, when examined by the light which public documents afford, are found to have been neither important nor brilliant. They might have been as well performed by almost any other person. He was never in a single battle in California. He always arrived after the fighting was over.

But he was undoubtedly able to command funds with which to purchase the Republican nomination on the 17th of June. This was the greatest exploit which he ever performed.

But what are his qualifications for the Presidency? We have not yet been able to ascertain what peculiar merit his friends ascribe to him, constituting the semblance of fitness for the post of Chief Magistrate. Are the people prepared to elevate a man to the Presidency devoid of qualifications for the office? If so, we might as well choose our President by lot.

Mr. Fremont never would have been chosen as the candidate of any respectable party by the people. A few politicians who aspire to control the Government, selected him for his negative qualities, and under the impression which he has artfully created, that he has command of boundless wealth. He is a man of straw. They are already sick of their bargain. They can arouse no enthusiasm for his course. They have made an egregious blunder in selecting him. The more his history is sifted, the more worthless his merits as a candidate will appear.

He is, after all, not the candidate of the present party of opposition to the Administration, but simply the candidate of the Abolition party. The Abolition leaders contested the convention which nominated him. The platform on which he was nominated is *ultra Abolition*, denying the right of slavery everywhere outside of the old thirteen States. He will receive only the Abolition vote—slightly augmented by a few renegade Whigs and Free-soil Democrats. He has not the remotest chance of success. There is hardly a probability that he will carry as many States as General Scott. Messrs. Seward, Weed, Greeley, Giddings, and Co., will have to try their hand with somebody else. They will never get possession of the Government through the instrumentality of John C. Fremont.

## THE ISSUE.

The success of the Democratic party, in the approaching elections, will secure to the nation four years exemption from any legislation on the subject of slavery.

The success of the Black Republican party on the other hand insures the initiation of a series of the most expediting legislation.

The simple statement of the respective results of the success of either of these parties, should of itself decide the victory without a contest.

We ask considerate men one plain question. What benefit to the general and individual interests of the country is to arise from a series of expediting legislation on the subject of slavery, as to render it a paramount matter?

Of what benefit, Mr. BUCHANAN justly asks, has been all the legislation on the subject of slavery? Had there been no attempt at legislation; there had been no agitation, none of the fierce hate and alienation which now renders the North and the South alike almost indifferent as to dissolution; in fact, large masses, North and South, are sufficiently sated to desire a separation.

That a separation is inevitable if the Black Republican principles be carried into action, no one can doubt; because fifteen States of the Union would feel that the Constitution was only a chain to bind them submissive to men, who express horror at their institutions, detestation of their people, and a determination unreservedly to deprive them of what they deem unquestioned rights.

If the evils of dissolution approach in magnitude and fell disaster, the pictures drawn from its consequences by Washington and by every patriot whose memory is revered, how imperative should be that necessity which would endanger dissolution.

The evils to flow from this would be too real, wide spread and enduring to be contemplated, without shuddering, by any honest heart.

Sectional animosity, mutual recriminations, and retaliatory acts of State Legislation, in themselves unlawful, because in violation of the federal constitution, a general alienation of feeling and a deep-rooted hostility springing up are the seeds of slavery agitation, of attempts at slavery legislation.

The evils which have flowed from this prolific source of evil we all do know; but who will show any particle of good which has sprung from this source. None can show it. The evil is unmixed and inimitable.

Is it strange, therefore, that Mr. BUCHANAN should make it a primary matter of his administration, to hermetically seal this Pandora's box, and to afford to the nation a term of quiet, that men's minds and passions may subside, while truth, reason and justice be allowed to resume their rightful way.

The issue between the Republican and the Democratic party is just this; that the one would restore quiet, banish the fell apple of discord, while the other would keep open this Pandora's box, and swing out its whole multitude of evils with which to affect the nation.

On the issue of the contest hang peace and dire discord.

The Buchanan flag is the white flag of peace.

The Fremont flag, is the black flag of demon discord.

Patriots choose ye.

## HARD PRESSED FOR AN OBJECTION.

Unable to find any substantial or reasonable objection to the Senate bill for the admission of Kansas, the advocates for its admission, with the Topeka constitution, seek for "a reason as is not a reason," as Captain Cuttle would say.

The New York *Courier and Enquirer*, the most modest of journals, with its perfumed handkerchief to nose, and a characteristic wriggle, presents its objection, to wit:

"Its source discredits it."

The bill itself, in all its provisions, is more fair, equitable, and impartial than any other, having, in addition, the assurance of General Cass that the best men of all parties shall be on the commission to carry it out.

This bill provides for, and secures to every bona fide free-soil settler of Kansas, a full and equal participation in the formation of the constitution.

The Topeka constitution advocated by the *Courier and Enquirer*, was admittedly the work of exclusive Free-soilers, no pro-slavery man having a voice in it. It was made by men of whose election we not only know was illegal, but we are also ignorant of how the nominal election was made. This Topeka constitution excludes from all participation a large portion, perhaps a large majority, of the people of Kansas, and is in direct violation of the wishes of a majority of the bona fide residents of Kansas; but "its source discredits it," in the opinion of the *Courier and Enquirer*. It is the "source" of a measure which makes it right or wrong with this close logician.

Two bills are presented. One, on its face, a patent and a flagrant fraud; but "its source" consecrates the fraud.

The other wears patent on its face—all the features of truth, honesty, and equity, but "its source discredits it."

One would suppose that the "source" of the first bill would be discredited by the bill itself, and that the "source" of the Senate bill would be stamped as righteous, both upon the simple proverb, that a tree shall be known by its fruit.

The *Courier and Enquirer* is the most amusing logician in the land; its premises and corollaries harmonize somewhat after the fashion of cross readings.

## A CONTRAST—KANSAS.

On Thursday last, (July 3d.), a bill authorizing the people of Kansas to elect delegates to a convention and frame a constitution was adopted by the Senate.

On the same day, a bill admitting Kansas as a State, with the Topeka constitution, was adopted by the House of Representatives.

We desire to draw the attention of the people of the United States to the contrast in the action of the Democratic Senate and the Black Republican House.

The former has approved a measure well calculated, by its fairness and liberality, to heal the dissensions existing throughout the country in reference to Kansas.

The latter has approved an unconstitutional measure which is unjust and tyrannical towards the people of Kansas, whose voice in it no wise represents, and which is aggressive towards the slaveholding States.

The evident object of the Senate was by justice to insure domestic tranquility. That of the House by injustice to gain political power.

We publish in another column the bill passed by the Senate as we find it in the *National Intelligencer* of Friday last.

The debate which took place in the Senate on the night preceding the passage of the bill is well calculated to open the eyes of the people of the United States to the true objects of the Black Republican leaders.

For a year past the Abolitionists have been asserting that a majority of the bona fide settlers in Kansas were in favor of making Kansas a free State, and that in the elections held in that Territory their majority had been borne down by Missouri ruffians; that Kansas had been invaded and conquered.

The northern prints have teemed with these assertions, and northern Senators and Representatives have declaimed on this topic and hurled invectives at the perpetrators of the crime of stifling the true voice of "bleeding Kansas."

Senator Sumner, in his late speech, said: "I show you how their dearest rights have been cloven down, while a Tyrannical Usurpation has sought to install itself on their very necks!"

The wrongs of bleeding, invaded, and subjugated Kansas have been spread before the public in every variety of style which might be supposed to suit the popular taste.

The remedy proposed for all this wrong was the admission at once of Kansas as a State, with the Topeka constitution, or a constitution prohibiting slavery. This was urged as a measure of justice, because, as was asserted, the majority of the bona fide settlers in Kansas were in favor of excluding slavery.

Mr. Seward introduced such a bill. Mr. Sumner advocated its passage, as did other members of the Republican party.

The bill introduced by Mr. Seward was, with other propositions as to Kansas, referred to the Committee on Territories, which made a report, through its chairman, Judge Douglas, which will be found in another column.

The Committee reported in favor of the bill introduced by Mr. Toombs.

The Black Republicans in Congress asked for the immediate admission of Kansas as a State. Mr. Toombs's bill provides for this.

The Black Republicans asked for the admission of Kansas with a constitution prohibiting slavery, because, as they declared, such a constitution was in accordance with the wishes of a majority of the bona fide settlers in Kansas.

The Toombs bill provides that Kansas shall be admitted with such a constitution, if the bona fide settlers will make a declaration that such is their wish.

We call on our readers to examine the bill for themselves, and see how stringent are the provisions to secure a free and fair expression of the will of the bona fide settlers in Kansas.

It provides for five commissioners to arrange all the necessary details, under regulations to be prescribed under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and places at their disposal such military force as shall be deemed necessary to secure the provisions of the bill.

The proposition contained in the Toombs

bill, as it came from the Committee on Territories, was opposed by Messrs. Seward, Wilson, Wade, & Co.; among other reasons, because many hundreds of the "free State men" had been driven out of Kansas and were scattered over the Northern States, and could not return to Kansas by the fourth of July. [See section 11 of the Toombs bill.]

In consequence of this objection, the bill was so amended as to give such persons until the 1st of October to return and vote; yet, notwithstanding all this, Messrs. Seward, Wilson, Wade & Co. voted against the bill, declaring that it was a bill to make Kansas a slave State!!

The dignified and patriotic speech of Mr. Crittenden conveyed a deserved rebuke to Mr. Seward, and the bold eloquence of Mr. Toombs told with crushing effect on the same Senator.

Mr. Toombs exposed the designs of the Black Republican leaders to foment difficulties in Kansas as a means of obtaining office, and declared it to be evident that they did not desire peace in Kansas—that they did not themselves believe their oft-reiterated assertions that a majority of the settlers in Kansas were in favor of making Kansas a free State, and that their sympathy with Kansas was feigned.

The object intended to be accomplished by the Toombs bill was to give peace, and the Black Republicans were invited to propose amendments such as in their view would better secure the important objects intended—objects which they had all along professed to have in view. All along the Republicans have been crying out for peace—protection to bleeding Kansas—they have been demanding as an act of justice that the wishes of the bona fide settlers be carried out, and Kansas admitted as a State.

All this was offered by the Toombs bill, in lieu of which Mr. Wilson made a proposition, which Mr. Seward advocated, to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and insert, "All acts passed by the Legislature of Kansas, or any assembly acting as such, be, and the same are hereby, abrogated and declared void and of no effect."

The only effect which could be produced by the amendment offered by Mr. Wilson would be to increase the difficulties at present existing, to legalize outrages of every kind.

This proposition was, in effect, what Mr. Toombs declared it to be—the offer of the cartridge box in lieu of a pure ballot box.

The mask has fallen from the faces of the Black Republican leaders, and their "sympathy with bleeding Kansas" stands confessed, a sham.

The admission of Kansas as a State with the Topeka constitution would be an outrage on the people of Kansas, and an outrage on the Constitution.

The Topeka constitution or form of government is not Republican, as the powers therein declared have not been derived from the people.

The Topeka constitution was framed by men who were but a minority of the people, and were in open resistance to the constitutional authorities, territorial and federal.

The following extract from the report of the Territorial Committee gives the true history of this movement:

"It is not pretended that any of the proceedings which resulted in the formation of the Topeka constitution were had in pursuance of law. The preliminary meetings, the calling of the convention, the appointment of delegates, the assembling of the convention, the formation of the constitution, the voting on its ratification, the election of officers under it—each and every step in the whole movement was not only without the authority of law, but a part of a scheme, openly and boldly avowed in their meetings and conventions, having for its object the subversion of the government established by the authority of Congress in said Territory. They refused to recognize the validity of the laws of the Territory, or the authority of the officers appointed to carry them into effect. Hence there was no law prescribing the qualifications of voters, or excluding illegal votes, or prohibiting any person from voting as many times as he pleased, as in many different places as he chose on the same day. No law providing for the appointment of judges of elections, none prescribing the usual oath, no officer to administer the oath, and no law to punish its violation. In short there was no regularity, no legality, no security for fairness, no safeguards against fraud in any of their proceedings. Besides the whole movement was the work of a political party and not the action of the great body of the people irrespective of party. Their meetings were party meetings, their conventions were party conventions, their resolutions were of a nature which necessarily precluded the co-operation of every man who felt it his duty to yield obedience to the laws and constituted authorities of the Territory under the organic act. Hence it was strictly a partisan movement—a movement of the law-resisting party in opposition to the law-abiding party. It was not a question between those who approved and those who disapproved of the laws of the Kansas legislature; for many good citizens preferred obedience to a code of laws, a portion of which they did not approve, so long as they were held to be constitutional by the courts and remained upon the statute book, as a less evil than armed resistance and lawless violence. Thus it was a partisan movement—an organization of the law-resisting party against the law-abiding party; and the most that can be claimed for it, is that it received the sanction of a decided majority of its own party."

A DIVIDED SOUTH UPON THE ISSUE OF BLACK REPUBLICANISM—SHALL IT BE?

The leading issue which the Black Republican party presents to the country is this—shall the Missouri Compromise be restored and the principle of the Kansas bill be annulled?

That issue is presented to the South especially, because to the South it is a question of equality, of honor and right in the Union.

Shall the issue be accepted by the South, and the gauntlet of defiance from her enemy be raised by her champions?

We insist that her vital interests demand of her boldly to meet the issue now—once and forever. If she do not, she must submit to the yoke of degrading inequality which her enemy proposes, and to the restoration of a law imposing an unconstitutional proscription upon her people in the stead of that Constitution, whose foundation principle was re-announced in the Kansas-Nebraska law. She must choose between the ascendancy of law over the Constitution, or of Constitution over the law!

How is she to meet the issue? We answer, by a bold assertion of her right, and a manful opposition to the intended wrong. She must not meet it apologetically; she must be prepared to maintain her position upon the avowal of its rightfulness. She must not ask to be forgiven for presuming to insist upon expunging from the statute book the act for her delinquency; but she must, in the face of the

world, with an earnest consciousness of seeking only right, and opposing only wrong, ask the verdict of the country upon that question, which involves her co-equal participation in the blessings of the common Union.

It is obvious that she will surrender the strength of her position by creating an issue within herself upon the propriety of the introduction of the bill to repeal the Missouri Compromise, and to re-enact the State equality upon which the Union rests; for, if it was improper to introduce the bill, it must have been, because it was liable to some charge of wrongfulness, or at least, that our rights neither required nor demanded it. And how, then, with this admission, can she, with brazen face, assert that Black Republicanism is wrong in repeating what she admits was wrong, or in restoring what she admits was no wrong upon her, but was proper, and should not have been repealed?

Let the South by implication, or expressly, make this admission, and the verdict upon the issue joined must be for her enemy. The Southern people cannot, admitting the propriety of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, complain of its restoration, or successfully, because they cannot conscientiously, oppose it. If that repeal is to stand, it must be upon the ground that it was right! We can defend it on no other ground. To admit it was wrong, and to insist on its non-repeal, is to defend wrong, and to make a personal issue, in its defence, or it is to beg for a concession to weakness, which cannot be demanded as of right. In either case, it is dishonour, which the South will never incur.

That any considerable party in the South are prepared to shrink from this issue, we cannot, do not believe. That through an error of judgment, or the zeal of a blinded partisanship, the South may be divided upon this issue, the events of the past few weeks would lead us to apprehend.

The Democracy of the Union are wholly united upon this principle of the Kansas bill. They have unanimously in national and State conventions "recognized and adopted" it. Their candidate has boldly, again and again, proclaimed the restoration of the equality of the Constitution, and the abrogation of all political inequalities between the States, as the watch words of the canvass. The issue, which Black Republicanism proposes, JAMES BUCHANAN, the champion of the South, nobly, earnestly meets, and submits it to popular arbitration.

Can the South refuse him as her champion? It is answered, she should prefer another; and that other, Mr. Fillmore.

We will not at present advert to the antecedents of this gentleman, nor to the position he holds as the candidate of a party which the South has just repudiated?

We only ask, does he stand by us in the issue? Does he espouse our cause? Is he prepared to defend and maintain it against our foe?

We answer, he is not with us on the great issue! He does not espouse our cause. He will not defend and maintain it. He condemns the position we have taken as "reckless and wanton!" Our Northern friends he either denounces by indirection, or in satiric vein; hopes God may forgive them, as he freely does. He speaks of the Kansas law as Pandora's box, from which emerge all the evils now affecting the country; and insinuates it was introduced "to aid in the personal advancement of its author." This agitation of which he speaks is the result of Black Republican fury, that the Constitution has been restored, and an unconstitutional reproach upon the South has been repealed! And yet Mr. Fillmore, neglecting to see its unreasonableness, and unable to see the justice of the bill, imputes the Abolition storm to the "reckless and wanton" adoption of a measure to aid in the personal advancement of the friend of the South, Stephen A. Douglas!

Can the South meet the issue, with a man who concedes the wrong upon which Abolition bases the contest? With one, who denounces it as the offspring of the personal ambition of him, whom Abolition hopes to crush? With one, who adopts the platform which her sons repudiated, and which condemns alike the Missouri Repeal and the Kansas bill? With one, who will not now say he will veto a bill to restore the Missouri Compromise, and to repeal the Kansas Law?

It was but the other day, upon the motion to repeal that law and thus restore the "Compromise," and to repeal slavery now in Kansas from the Territory, (!) that Mr. Fillmore's Northern friends voted for it; viz: Broom, Harrison, Haven, Whitney, and perhaps others; and three of them, the same evening, spoke to a slaveholding people, to ratify their favorite's nomination for the Presidency.

Now can any Southern man dream of preferring, upon this issue, Mr. Fillmore to Mr. BUCHANAN? Can he consent to divide the South with the enemy at his doors? Can he abandon that gallant Northern Democracy, which, true to the Constitution, stakes its being upon the maintenance of Southern equality, and grapples with our foe, upon the soil of the North? Will Southern chivalry abandon its most gallant friends for those who are content with lukewarm professions of friendship, but who encourage our enemies, by condemning our acts, denouncing our friends, and refusing to meet Abolition upon the issue it makes against us? It will not—it cannot be. True to her highest interests, and to her unquestionable duty, she will sustain Mr. BUCHANAN with her entire vote. Discord cannot prevail, with safety. In unity of action alone, is she secure.

Surrounded, as Mr. BUCHANAN is, by Senators and Representatives from the North, who plant themselves upon his principles, how can the South fail to prefer him to Mr. Fillmore, who has no Northern Senator to support him, and only a squad of Representatives, most of whom vote against us upon the great issue? Elect the former, and you bring a powerful Northern party into power, to sustain him in defending Southern rights—elect the latter, and you bring only a man into power (and he not with you on the issue to be tried,) with no Northern party to back him for good, but with friends, who will tempt him to evil.

We have thought proper to urge these views now upon the Southern mind, to prevent any divisions, which partisans may suggest,

of Southern strength in this important contest. If occurred in, they must be propitious to the unity of the South, and thus tend to the peace and tranquillity of the Union.

## THE PATRON WHOSE SUMNER DEDICATED HIS SPEECH.

It will be recollected that Mr. Sumner's speech or "Phillipic," as he termed it, was, in a letter from him, dedicated to Theodore Parker. It was prepared expressly for consumption by that class of mad men. Mr. Sumner looked to them for approval and support. They and such as they were consulted as to the propriety of its utterance in the Senate. Mr. Sumner wisely withheld it from the criticism of the Choates, the Everetts, the Winthrops and other honorable men who acknowledged fealty to the Constitution, and who revered the proprieties of the Senate in discussion, he ignored their existence, and sought the applause and approval of the Parkers, the Wendell Phillips, the Garriisons, and such other moral lunatics as are allowed to roam abroad.

We give below from the Boston *P* an exhibition made of himself by this patron of Mr. Sumner, to whom his "Phillipic" was dedicated. All will acknowledge, after reading what follows, that Mr. Sumner made an appropriate selection of a patron to whom to dedicate his long-suffered ranting.

Rev. Theodore Parker.

All who were present at the Music Hall on last Lord's day will agree that the performance of this reverend pastor on that occasion, was, in many respects, the most unique and remarkable ever witnessed on those boards. If it did not stir a jubilee among the imps below, it is because they have been surfeited and sickened with too frequent banquets of the same style, served by the same distinguished caterer.

There was not the usual method in his madness. He was not in his usual good humor. He fretted and sputtered like the fishiest of fish-women. There was more of the hyena than the jackal. He almost swore; and doubtless would have felt relieved by the utterance of a few mild oaths. No class escaped his indignation and frothy denunciations. He did not even spare his supposed friends. He denounced the New England Kansas emigrants as cowards. He denounced "the faithful" at Worcester because they did not even "swear an oath" over the cowardice and pusillanimity of the Sharpe's rifle men who had surrendered on the way to Kansas, and then returned to the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by putting to flight the border ruffians and the United States troops, and then, protected by the "heart of the commonwealth" amidst their guns and their backbones. He endeavored to show that cowardice was a New England proclivity. He said these men should stay at home, and let the women and girls go out, and "make the rough places smooth" for them, by