

7

GENERAL TAYLOR

AND THE

WILMOT PROVISO.

TO THE READER.

THE author of this pamphlet has adopted, in many instances, the opinions and words of others, without making the usual acknowledgment.

As this production is published anonymously, no excuse is thought to be necessary for what would otherwise seem to be improper.

GENERAL TAYLOR

AND THE

WILMOT PROVISIO.

*From the report of Mr. Webster's Speech at Marshfield,
Sept. 1, 1848.*

"In my judgment, the interests of the country and the feelings of a vast majority require that a President of these United States should be elected, who will neither use official influence to promote, nor who feels any desire in his heart to promote, the further extension of slavery in this community, [*Great Cheering*], or the further influence of it in the public councils."

From the report of Mr. Corwin's Speech on the Oregon Bill in the Senate, July, 1848.

[While Mr. Corwin was speaking, there occurred the following conversation between him and Mr. Hannegan.]

MR. HANNEGAN. "I would like to be informed by the Senator from Ohio, as he has referred to Gen. Cass's [position on the Wilmot Proviso.] and as he is about to give his support to Gen. Taylor, if he can give us Gen. Taylor's views on this subject, and what his opinion will be as expressed in his Message to Congress."

MR. CORWIN. "I cannot."

MR. HANNEGAN. "I understand the Senator from Ohio to say, that if General Taylor would interpose a veto upon the subject, he would not vote for him under any circumstances."

MR. CORWIN. "I would not, nor would any man in my State, unless, indeed, I found him opposed to just such another man, who had a good many bad qualities beside. But, sir, I have to say that I do not believe that Gen. Taylor could get the electoral vote of a Free State in America, if it were not for the belief that prevails, that upon this subject, as well as upon any other of a like character, he would not interpose his veto. I believe the man who does it, be he who he may, deserves impeachment, and to have his head rolled from a block. That has been my opinion for some time!"

*Extract from Gen. Lincoln's Speech at Worcester,
July, 1848.*

"Again I say, first, if the nominees of that Convention are not the true representatives, entertaining and reflecting the sentiments of the Whig party, if they be opposed to our principles, if they are hostile to our measures, if they are unfriendly to the peace of the country, if they are opposed to the best interests of the people, then repudiate the nomination. [*Cheers*.] AND I GO FURTHER, and I am ready to act with those who object to it, if the nominees of that Convention are the 'socks and slaves' of any portion of the community, or of any interest or party in the country, if they are the representations of slave-

dom,' in the language applied to one of those nominees, IF EVEN THEY ARE FOR THE EXTENSION OF SLAVERY. (I go that length,) then as a freeman, ay, as the friend and representative of freemen, as the representative of your sentiments at this moment, upon this floor, I undertake to say for you, as for myself, RE-VUDIATE THAT NOMINATION." [*Cheers*.]

The sentiments of Mr. Webster, Mr. Corwin, and Mr. Lincoln, which we have placed at the head of this pamphlet, are, we presume, the deliberate opinions and determinations of the vast majority of the people of the Free States.

There is not, probably, a single supporter of Gen. Taylor north of Mason and Dixon's line, who will openly avow his preference for the Philadelphia nomination, on the ground that it will secure the extension of slavery. It is all the other way. Gen. Taylor is advocated and supported at the North expressly because he is a Whig, and committed to the whig doctrine of NO MORE SLAVE TERRITORY; or at least, that he will not use his influence, or exercise the veto power, to extend slavery over new territories; or to prevent the enactment of the ordinance of 1787 in regard to them.

For our part, we have no doubt that the intelligent and conscientious Whig party of the North is about to be betrayed by its leaders into an act which it abhors. We believe, and expect to be able to prove, that Gen. Taylor is, by his own showing and in the estimation of his nearest friends and neighbors, those who are presumed to know him best, and who unanimously supported his nomination at Philadelphia, not only NOT IN FAVOR OF THE WILMOT PROVISIO, but altogether and decidedly opposed to it.

We believe, too, that if we can make this clear to the Whigs of the North, they will break away from party connections, and vote, in this crisis, as becomes a free, intelligent, Christian people.

The approaching Presidential Election may decide the future character of our government. Upon its issue hang questions of Foreign and Domestic Policy, and of Internal Peace and Happiness, of more importance than have yet been connected with any federal election. Upon it hang, in some sort, the issues of life and death. The ordinary themes of the Tariff, Finance, Commerce, &c., that have usually been the rallying cries of party warfare, are not heard at this time. Minor topics like these have sunk out of sight. Towering above them all, and absorbing or

over-shadowing all, is the one imminent, momentous, threatening question of the SLAVE POWER.

It cannot be disguised, and it ought not to be. This is the great issue in this Presidential campaign:—Shall there be a further increase of the Slave Power in the national councils? Shall this institution be extended over new territory, or shall it be confined within its present sectional, local, and constitutional limits?

It is to battle for victory in this contest that the political hosts are now marshalling themselves. We may attempt to conceal the fact from ourselves at the North, and try to keep it out of sight by all sorts of political subterfuges; but the South is more bold and more honest. She sees, and admits that she sees, that it is necessary for her purposes, that a Southern Slaveholding Whig, who is also in favor of the extension of Slavery, should be thrust upon the North, and that we should be required, with our own hands, to set a man over us who will achieve our political subjection, or at least secure the political supremacy of the South. It is required, in this struggle for existence, that the North should commit a political suicide, in order that the South may become her heir at law.

To accomplish this end, Southern politicians have resorted to the cheap expedient of carrying the war into the enemy's country. They are endeavoring to bring about a state of things in which it will be necessary, or appear to be necessary, for the Whigs of the North to unite their force upon a Southern candidate. The more effectually to attain this result, the democratic wing of the Southern army—the entire South fights under but one banner, no matter how many squadrons she musters for the field—has selected for its leader a renegade citizen of the North-west. It would not answer to nominate a slaveholder—that would not serve her turn—besides, it would be useless. This pitch of infamy was left to the free North. It has been reserved, as the last degree of cowardice and subjugation, for us, after forging our own chains, during several years of wicked legislation upon Texas, Mexico, and Slavery, to fasten them upon our supple limbs, with our own willing hands. And all for what? For party success—for personal aggrandizement.

It is to be feared that the Whig party of the North will earn for itself, by its conduct during the canvass, the unenviable title of—the BETRAYER OF LIBERTY.

What will the intelligent Whig party be able to say for itself, when it is inquired of by the lovers of Constitutional Liberty at home and by the friends of Humanity every where, what hand it had in perpetuating slavery and increasing the slave power? What answer will the free North give, when it is asked what disposition it has made of the rich legacy of the Revolution? "The blood of our fathers cries to us from the ground. My sons, scorn to be slaves." The blood of millions of slaves cries to us from the soil we are about to curse with the horrid institution. "Fellow-men, do not rivet our chains."

We shall proceed to consider, in the first place,

General Taylor's published letters. Nothing else is known of him, for a certainty, but what these contain. The vague assertions of politicians, in different parts of the country, can avail nothing by the side of General Taylor's own declarations.

We shall then introduce the opinions of his Southern friends—and add such commentaries as our space will permit.

We shall notice only such of General Taylor's letters as are relied on by his friends as the exponents of his principles.

We omit all letters of compliment and courtesy, and the acceptances of nominations by different conventions. They express no more than the letter we publish, and are not quoted by Taylor Whigs in support of their candidate.

We begin with the Signal Letter; and in order to understand it fully, we prefix the editorial of the Signal, to which General Taylor is supposed to reply. We beg our readers to notice both productions carefully. There is a great deal of noise in the Taylor papers about the "Signal Editorial" and the "Signal Letter." Let us see what they amount to.

We will not attempt preliminary comment, for the sake of biasing the mind of the reader. Let him read for himself, and, if he choose, examine the comments we shall append. The article, to which reference has been made, was published in the *Signal* of April 13. and is as follows:—

"GENERAL TAYLOR AND THE PRESIDENCY.

"We perceive, in various quarters, the nomination of General ZACHARY TAYLOR for the Presidency. So far as such a demonstration is the mere transport of military enthusiasm, or the trick of political fiction, it would be unworthy of notice; but we think it evident that this movement of the public mind has a much higher character, and grows out of a conviction that General Taylor has displayed an energy and wisdom of conduct, and a modesty of demeanor, which are as requisite to the deliberations of a cabinet as the plan of a campaign. It is a great mistake to suppose that the people are blinded in their political preferences by the mere fact of military achievement. It was the popular impulses and the stern honesty of Andrew Jackson which aroused the sympathy and trust of the nation; and we predict that, whatever skill or success may attend the march of General Scott to Mexico, he will never excite the attachment or confidence which follows the hero of Buena Vista. We are not surprised, therefore, that ardent spirits are calling for the sword of General Taylor to cut the Gordian knot of political intrigues. But it is a far different question, whether his name and fame shall be made an instrument of mere partisan warfare. In this respect, there is a distinction, which we are confident General Taylor will be among the first to perceive and act upon, and which we hope to illustrate in a few remarks that we feel constrained to make in reference to existing and future agitation of this subject.

"What an enviable rank, in the eyes of the world and the hearts of his countrymen, General Taylor now holds! Should he return from the fields of the Rio Grande and the heights of the Sierra Madre, with what affection and respect would he be greeted by men of all parties! Himself never a politician, content in the quiet discharge of duty and the enjoyment of domestic life; and while prompt to meet the Indian foe in prairie or everglade, and to stand by the flag of the country when advanced to a foreign frontier, yet devoted, as all accounts represent him, to that home and family in the bosom of which the in-

servals of his life thus far have passed peacefully and happily, we confess that our impressions of General Taylor are such, that we should not be surprised if he firmly disregarded every acclamation which connected his name with the Presidency. Should he do so, he jeopardizes nothing of the present spring-tide of popular favor; nay, more—he takes instant rank with Washington, as an unobscured but eloquent preacher of the highest political morals. How much more enviable such a destiny for the evening of his days, than to cast the mantle of his military fame and private virtues over the excesses and corruptions which disfigure the party politics of the day! He is no friend to the reputation of General Taylor, who would thus seek to restrict the applause of the whole country to the interested clamor of a party.

Still, as a citizen of a free Republic, General Taylor is in the hands of the American people; and we can readily imagine a contingency in which it would become his duty to assent to the demand of the country, and assume the responsibilities of political life. But it must be the requisition of the *country*, not of this or that set of office-seekers, which will call him either from his rank or his fireside. It must be such a call as compelled Washington to forego the retirement of Mount Vernon—unanimous, disinterested—the voice of the People, not the flatteries of politicians. We believe that it is in General Taylor's power, at this juncture of the national politics, to take *independent ground*, and become the *president of the people*. Our support of him, or of any other man, shall never be pledged in advance of a full knowledge of the principles and views with which he would assume that responsible station; but we may be allowed, as an independent journalist, to indicate some of the signs of the times which point to the result just mentioned:

1. The presidential canvass of 1848 is in utter confusion. Among the Whigs, a Pittsburg meeting nominates Judge McLean, who is also understood to be a general favorite of his party in the Northwestern States; the anti-war spirit of New England and the Western Reserve indicates its preference for Senator Corwin; the Southern and Middle States cherish a name for Scott, which only requires a victory at Peotone to manifest itself; while as an under-current, deeper and perhaps stronger than all, is the chivalric feeling in behalf of Henry Clay, now intensified by the death of his gallant son, and which may yet determine the shape of the conflicting elements. The Democrats are in a condition equally chaotic. In the West, General Cass has many and warm friends; Mr. C. Johnson, with his compact and disciplined body guard, stands ready to make his presidential fortune, or mar that of other aspirants in the Democratic ranks; Silas Wright, if the New York reverse had not occurred, would have been prominent in the field, and is still the favorite of many; while quietly at Lindenwald sits the statesman of the party, who will probably never again join the political *noëce*, but might prove more available in a strict party trial than many men whose names are frequently heard in the present contention. In the general confusion, an apprehension prevails that the election will revert to the House of Representatives—a result greatly to be deplored; and hence the popular impulse, which chooses to adjourn the strifes of parties and the struggles of their leaders, while the country takes breath under the administration of an *INDEPENDENT PRESIDENT*.

2. A circumstance that may lead to the election of General Taylor, by a sort of acclamation, is the fact that the pride of the respective parties would thus be saved—neither authorized to claim a triumph, and neither suffering the ignominy of defeat. A long intimacy between Mr. Clay and General Taylor reconciles the Whigs to the political orthodoxy of the latter, although General Taylor is said not to have voted for many years; while Mr. Polk, who is, and has been, as we are authoritatively informed, entirely free from any intention or wish for a second term of service, may still be gratified to yield his seat to the successful General of the Mexican war, closely identified as that war is with the success of his administration.

3. The above considerations are subordinate, however, to the principles which are involved in every presidential canvass. The country has been divided for fifteen years upon most exciting topics; and if General Taylor, immediately upon his inauguration as President, was constrained to adopt either extreme, the consequences might be fatal to the success of his administration. It so happens, however, that the results of Mexican hostilities will remove many of these points of collision—at least for a few years. A debt of one hundred millions induces the necessity of a tariff sufficiently advanced in its rates to satisfy New England and Pennsylvania, and at the same time will prevent any distribution of proceeds of the public lands.

We cannot suppose that the Whigs will again urge a Bank of the United States, and Congress will insist upon a fair trial of the Independent Treasury, removing some of those impracticable restrictions which have embarrassed the fiscal action of the government, and are an annoyance to individuals. So far, therefore, as the past contests of the respective parties are concerned, an administration composed of the leading minds of all parties, and supported by the whole people, is not only practicable, but may redound to the highest interests of the whole country.

Only on one condition, however. The executive must no longer insist upon legislative influence. There are questions approaching, which the people must be allowed to settle in their own way, without the interference of executive patronage or prerogative. The old political issues may be postponed, under the pressure of circumstances; and as for the new—those coming events which cast their shadows before—let it be understood that the only path of safety for those who may hereafter fill the Presidential office, is to rest in the discharge of executive functions, and let the legislative will of the people find utterance and enactment. The American people are about to assume the responsibility of framing the institutions of the Pacific States. We have no fears for the issue, if the arena of the high debate is the assemblies of the people and their representative halls.

The extension over the continent, beyond the Rio Grande, of the ordinance of 1787, is an object too high and permanent to be halted by Presidential votes. All that we ask of the incumbent of the highest office under the constitution is to *hold his hand*, to bow to the will of the people, as promulgated in legislative forms, and restrain the executive action in its appropriate channels! Give us an honest administration of the government, and an end to all cabals of a cabinet—all interference from the White House, designed to sway or thwart the action of the American people. If such simplicity and integrity should guide the administration of General Taylor, the North and West would yield to it a warm support and a hearty approval.

We have said all on this subject which the present developments of public opinion require. As other scenes unfold, we shall seek to chronicle them, with fair and independent comment. Meanwhile, we bide the movement of the waters, holding our columns and our ballot, to be disposed of according to our sense of duty, as emergencies of this and all other questions arise.

The first portion of the article, probably one third of it, is an expression of many generous sentiments in relation to the deeds, the services, the character and position of General Taylor. One of the views taken by the writer is, that should the General decline the office of President, he would "take instant rank with Washington." Was it of these "sentiments and views" General Taylor expressed a "high opinion, and decided approval"? Why not? They occupy one third of the article, while the vague reference to the extension of the ordinance of 1787, is contained in fifteen lines, all told! Why apply the General's expression of approval to one, and not to the other?

This eulogistic part of the article is followed by a paragraph, indicating that a crisis might come in which the country would have the right to insist upon the presidential services of General Taylor, and laying down the proposition that such a call must come from the people, not politicians, so that he might stand on "INDEPENDENT GROUND, AND BE THE PRESIDENT OF THE PEOPLE." We quote just as the editor of the Signal printed, and the reader will see at once that this very paragraph contains the pith, the great idea of the whole article. We shall show that if General Taylor's expression of approbation were intended to apply to any of the views and sentiments of the article, it was intended to apply primarily and chiefly to those embraced in this paragraph.

Another third of the article presents several views in detail, showing why General Taylor may yet be the candidate of the people on independent grounds, and elected by acclamation as an independent President. Some of the "views and sentiments" presented are of a purely political character. Did General Taylor in his reply intend to express his "high opinion and decided approval" of these "views and sentiments"? That would have been remarkably modest; and yet it is just as fair to impute this intention to him, as to interpret his expression of "decided approval" into a sanction to the doctrine of slavery restriction.

Again: In discussing the third reason why it was probable that General Taylor would be the President elect of the people, the editor dismissed the questions of land distribution and a national bank as obsolete, indicated the propriety of giving the independent treasury a fair trial, and also the formation of a cabinet composed of "the leading minds of all parties." These Democratic views and sentiments occupy a prominent position in the article, so that if the general phraseology,—"high opinion and decided approval of the sentiments and views embraced in your editorial"—fairly apply to the vague views and sentiments concerning the extension of the ordinance of 1787, it must apply with augmented force to the conspicuous, explicit, Democratic, "sentiments and views" concerning a national bank, land distribution, and the sub-treasury, to say nothing of the fusion of parties in the government.

Next in order follow some just sentiments in regard to the mutual relations of the executive and national legislature, mingled with what is a strong expression of opinion that the policy of extending the ordinance of '87 over the continent, ought not to be crippled by executive vetoes.

When the Signal editorial was written, little prominence had been given to the discussion of the question of slavery extension in relation to the ordinance of '87, and we venture the assertion that the camp at Monterey had not caught the first sound of discord on the subject. What intelligent man will venture, then, the opinion that General Taylor knew what was meant by this allusion to the ordinance? It contains many noble provisions; that in regard to slavery being the very last one an old soldier, who had spent forty years of his life in the camp, on the confines of civilization, beyond the agitations of the political world, and, in all likelihood,

never had read the ordinance, would be apt to think of—especially as there was nothing in the editorial to raise the suspicion of such an allusion.

But why prolong the argument? Read the answer of General Taylor—not the miserably garbled extracts given by the Taylor party presses—and you will see clearly that, in relation to all the views and sentiments respecting political questions referred to in the Signal editorial, the General positively declines any expression of opinion at all:

"HEADQUARTERS, ARMY OF OCCUPATION,
Camp near Monterey, May 13, 1847. }

"SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, with the enclosure of your editorial, extracted from the *Signal* of April 13th.

"At this time my public duties command so fully my attention, that it is impossible to answer your letter in the terms demanded by its courtesy, and the importance of the sentiments to which it alludes; neither, indeed have I the time, should I feel myself at liberty, to enter into the few and most general subjects of public policy suggested by the article in question. My own personal views were better withheld till the end of the war, when my usefulness as a military chief, serving in the field against the common enemy, shall no longer be compromised by their expression or discussion in any manner.

"From many sources, I have been addressed on the subject of the Presidency, and I do violence neither to myself nor to my position as an officer of the army, by acknowledging to you, as I have done to all who have alluded to the use of my name in this exalted connection, that my services are over at the will and call of the country, and that I am not prepared to say that I shall refuse, if the country calls me to the Presidential office, but that I can and shall yield to no call that does not come from the spontaneous action and free will of the nation at large, and void of the slightest agency of my own.

"For the high honor and responsibilities of such an office, I take this occasion to say, that I have not the slightest aspiration; a much more tranquil and satisfactory life, after the termination of my present duties, awaits me, I trust, in the society of my family and particular friends, and in the occupations most congenial to my wishes. In no case can I permit myself to be the candidate of any party, or yield myself to party schemes.

"With these remarks, I trust you will pardon me for thus briefly replying to you, which I do with a high opinion and approval of the sentiments and views embraced in your editorial.

"With many wishes for your prosperity in life, and great usefulness in the sphere in which your talents and exertions are embarked, I beg to acknowledge myself most truly and respectfully your obedient servant.

"Z. TAYLOR.

"Major General U. S. A.

"JAS. W. TAYLOR, Esq., &c. &c."

In the first paragraph he positively declines any expression of opinion in regard to "the few and most general subjects of public policy suggested by the article." These subjects are, and can be no other, than the Bank, Land Distribution, the Sub-Treasury, the Institutions of the Pacific Empire, the Amalgamated Cabinet, and the relations of the Executive to the Legislature.

What, then, does he mean by his "decided approval" of the views, &c., of the editorial? If it mean anything more than a token of courtesy, it must have reference chiefly, if not exclusively, to the views of the editor concerning the "INDEPENDENT GROUND." It would be proper for General Taylor to occupy, should he consent to be a candidate. The second paragraph of this letter, recognizing as it does the precise views of the editorial on this point, confirms this construction.

It is with reluctance that we have devoted so much space to this subject; but it seemed necessary to expose an attempted imposition on the public. We detest imposture. The Whigs have again and again denounced, with unmeasured severity, the Kane Letter, as it is called, which seemed designed to *cheat* the people of Pennsylvania into the support of Mr. Polk. They denounce it, because they say it was a lying pretext. Whatever it was, it could not be more false than the use made of the Signal correspondence, garbled for the purpose of making the people believe that the owner of two hundred slaves, forced upon the free States by the slaveholders, and who has never been known to express an anti-slavery feeling, is opposed to what the entire slaveholding caste demands—the extension of slavery into free territory.

The composition of this letter is neat, compact, and scholarly. It was written before political managers thought of interposing their advice or suggestion. The remarkable declaration in it is this:

"IN NO CASE CAN I PERMIT MYSELF TO BE THE CANDIDATE OF ANY PARTY, OR YIELD MYSELF TO PARTY SCHEMES."

We submit that these comments on the famous Signal Letter are just and natural, and entirely dispel the assertions of General Taylor's Northern friends, that he is pledged by this letter to the Wilmot Proviso.

Let our view should be thought partial and untrue, we call the attention of NORTHERN Taylor Whigs to opinions of their Southern brethren.

Who is most likely to be mistaken?

From the Augusta (Ga.) Republic.

GENERAL TAYLOR AND THE WILMOT PROVISIO.

Some of the Democratic papers are publishing a letter written by General Taylor, in the spring of 1847, to the editor of the Ohio Signal, to make him out a Wilmot Proviso man. The letter was susceptible of a construction that would make General Taylor seem to favor that doctrine. But the charge is easily put to rest, for General Taylor has himself denied that he meant to favor it. We supposed that this denial on his part was generally known. One thing is certain; the editor to whom the letter was written, and who interpreted it to favor the Proviso, has long since given it up, and General Taylor with it. He now opposes him because he knows that his interpretations were erroneous.

Our Democratic friends will find that they have come upon a *mare's nest* in this matter. They might as well give it up at once, for though they may be 'as brisk as a bee in a tar-pot' for a while, in making the charge, they will find themselves *stuck fast* by it before they are done. The General owns too many of the 'niggers' for that; and he will not go for the Proviso till somebody can make one of the blackest ones white by washing him."

From the Independent Monitor, Tuscaloosa, Ala.

"CONFIDENTIAL LETTERS.

"At any rate, we have in our possession an original private letter, in manuscript, written by General Taylor seven months and a half ago, in reply to a specific question on this very point, in which he states, that it was not his intention to intimate his concurrence with, nor opposition to, any of the views of the editor of the Signal;—that the 'Signal Letter' was not written for publication; and that, under the impression that it would not go beyond the person addressed, it was written without that critical attention to the terms employed, which politicians appear so much to require. He replied, he says, to the editor only as a

matter of courtesy; and, as is always his custom, he signifies his respect for opinions honestly entertained, and his approbation of the course of a man who manfully defends what he sincerely believes.

"This letter, which now lies before us, we are not at liberty to publish in full; but when we see efforts making to produce the most injurious impressions in regard to its distinguished author, we should be recalcitrant both to truth and to duty, if we did not, on our own responsibility, make use of the means in our possession, at least so far as may be necessary to correct the misrepresentations."

Who doubts the facts stated by this editor?

Here is the letter referred to in the above article. Can further proof be necessary?

"To the Editor of the Tuscaloosa Monitor.

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY OF OCCUPATION, }
Camp near Monterey, Nov. 5, 1847. }

"SIR: Your letter of the 14th ult. has been received. In reply to your remarks concerning a letter which I addressed some time since to the editor of the Cincinnati Signal, I have no hesitation in stating that it was not my intention in that communication to express an opinion either in concurrence with, or in opposition to, any of the views embraced in the editorial to which it refers.—

"I am, sir, very respectfully,

"Your obt^d serv^t,

"Z. TAYLOR,

"Maj. Gen. U. S. Army."

We extract the following from an account of a political meeting at Warsaw, New York.

"Mr. Taylor, editor of the Cincinnati (Ohio) Signal, was next introduced, and in some very pertinent remarks, explained that he had reasons for knowing that Gen. Taylor's oft quoted letter to that paper was not intended as an endorsement or sanction of the editor's views on the slavery question; and Mr. Taylor announced that it was with deep regret he learned this fact, and felt it, therefore, incumbent upon him to withdraw from the General his support." — *Rochester Daily Adv.*

This statement has been repeated by Mr. Taylor in "The Signal."

It is enough for our purpose to state that "The Signal" has *handed down Gen. Taylor's name, and is now one of the ablest Free Soil papers in Ohio.*

From Mr. Mangum's (of N. C.) Speech in the Senate, 22d June.

MR. MANGUM. "Sir, as regards Gen. Taylor's opinion upon the Wilmot Proviso, I have no express information; but I am willing to rely on his patriotism, intelligence, and sound sense, upon his conservative character as developed in every transaction of his life. As I said before, *the whole South will put their trust in him without any misgivings.*" * * * "Gen. Taylor holds, I believe, that the public sentiment, constitutionally expressed, should in all cases prevail, *when it does not come in conflict with constitutional law.*"

MR. FOOTE. "Does Gen. Taylor regard the Wilmot proviso as constitutional or not?"

MR. MANGUM. "Upon that point I can give the gentleman no information, because I am not one of the initiated. I am somewhat in the condition of a raw recruit; I have not sought information, but I am sure of this, THAT THE QUESTION IS SAFE IN HIS HANDS. I can express what my own opinions are. I have a very clear opinion that Congress has no power, either negative or affirmative, on the subject." * * *

"It is argued from the Signal Letter, that Gen. Taylor must be a Proviso man. I do not understand it so."

THE DELONY LETTER.

The following letter appeared in the *Louisiana Floridian*, of the 7th August, 1847, and was addressed to Dr. Delony, a radical Democrat, of Clinton, Louisiana:

"Camp Monterey, Mexico, June 9.

"DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 15th ultimo, from Clinton, Louisiana, has just reached me, in which you are pleased to say, 'The signs of the times in relation to the next Presidency, and the prominent position of your name in connection with it, is a sufficient excuse for this letter;' that 'it is a happy feature in our Government, that official functionaries under it, from the lowest to the highest station, are not beyond the reach and partial supervision of the humblest citizen; and that it is a right inherent in every freeman to possess himself of the political principles and opinions of those into whose hands the administration of the Government may be placed,' &c.; to all of which I fully coincide with you in opinion. Asking my views on several subjects—First, as to the justice and the necessity of this war with Mexico on our part; second, as to the necessity of a National Bank, and the power of Congress for creating such an institution; third, as to the effects of a high protective Tariff, and the right of Congress, under the Constitution, to create such a system of revenue."

"As regards the first interrogatory, my duties, and the position I occupy, I do not consider it would be proper in me to give any opinion in regard to the same. As a citizen, and particularly as a soldier, it is sufficient for me to know that our country is at war with a foreign nation, to do all in my power to bring it to a speedy and honorable termination, by the most vigorous and energetic operations, without inquiring about its justice, or any thing else connected with it; believing, as I do, it is our wisest policy to be at peace with all the world, as long as it can be done without endangering the honor and interests of the country. As regards the second and third inquiries, I am not prepared to answer them. I could only do so after duly investigating those subjects, which I cannot now do, my whole time being fully occupied in attending to my proper official duties, which must not be neglected under any circumstances; and I must say to you, in substance, what I have said to others in regard to similar matters, that I am no politician."

"Near forty years of my life have been passed in the public service, in the army, most of which in the field, the camp, on our Western frontier, or in the Indian country, and for nearly the two last in this or Texas, during which time, I have not passed one night under the roof of a house. As regards being a candidate for the Presidency at the coming election, I have no aspirations in that way, and regret the subject has been agitated at this early day, and that it had not been deferred until the close of this war, or until the end of the next session of Congress, especially if I am to be mixed up with it, as it is possible it may lead to the injury of the public service in this quarter, by my operations being embarrassed, as well as to produce much excitement in the country, growing out of the discussion of the merits, &c., of the different aspirants for that high office, which might have been very much allayed, if not prevented, had the subject been deferred, as suggested; besides, very many changes may take place between now and 1848, so much so, as to make it desirable, for the interest of the country, that some other individual than myself, better qualified for the situation, should be selected; and, could he be elected, I would not only acquiesce in such an arrangement, but would rejoice that the Republic had one citizen (and no doubt there are thousands) more deserving than I am, and better qualified to discharge the duties of said office."

"If I have been named by others, and considered a candidate for the Presidency, it has been by no agency of mine in the matter. If the good people think my services important in that station, and elect me, I will feel bound to serve them, and all the

pledges and explanations I can enter into and make, as regards this or that policy, is, that I will do so honestly and faithfully, to the best of my abilities, strictly in compliance with the Constitution. Should I ever occupy the White House, it must be by the spontaneous move of the people, and by no act of mine; so that I could go into the office untrammelled, and be the Chief Magistrate of the nation, and not of a party."

"But should they, the people, change their views and opinions, between this and the time of holding the election, and cast their votes for the Presidency for some one else, I will not complain."

"With considerations of respect, I remain your obedient servant,
Z. TAYLOR."

It needs scarcely a word to prove that this letter is the workmanship of an old soldier who has spent forty years of his life in the camp. The composition is ungrammatical, involved, obscure, indicating positively the absence both of education and practice in the writer. Scarcely two consecutive sentences can be parsed. The hand that penned the former never composed the latter. If Gen. Taylor could execute such a letter as that in the *Signal*, he could not, had he tried, have framed such a letter as that in the *Floridian*; and he who could write so neat a letter as the former, could not suffer so clumsy a one as this, if written by an amanuensis, to go out with his indorsement. No man of intelligence will deny these positions; and the inevitable inference is, that the *Signal* Letter is the work of the same hand that drew up the General's despatches, while the epistle to Delony is his own performance: and what a performance!

The two remarkable declarations of the letter are, 1st, the want of any opinion in relation to the necessity of a National Bank, or the power of Congress over the subject, and in relation to the expediency of a high Protective Tariff, or the power of Congress to establish such a tariff; 2dly, independence of party, which is thus affirmed: "Should I ever occupy the White House, it must be by the spontaneous move of the people, and by no act of mine; so that I could go into the office UNTRAMMELLED, AND BE THE CHIEF MAGISTRATE OF A NATION, AND NOT OF A PARTY."

THE INGERSOLL LETTER.

On the 22d February last, a mass meeting of the friends of Gen. Taylor was held at Nibbs's Garden, New York, and a great Taylor festival was celebrated in the saloon of the Chinese Museum, Philadelphia. The most remarkable event of the day was the reading of a letter from General Taylor, written 1st August, but withheld from the public until the demand for an avowal of his opinions became too imperative to be disregarded. We give it as we find it in the *New York Herald*.

"The Hon. Mr. Barrow, late United States Senator from Louisiana, presented a letter from Gen. Taylor, the reading of which he prefaced with an eloquent and brilliant speech, which occasioned the utmost enthusiasm. The following is the letter:

"HEADQUARTERS, ARMY OF OCCUPATION. }
Camp near Monterey, Mexico, Aug. 3, 1847. }

"DEAR SIR: I have the pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of your esteemed letter of the 7th ult., which has just reached me, in which you say, 'I had the honor of being called on, last evening, to address

a mass meeting of the Whigs of the city and county of Philadelphia. At that meeting your name was frequently mentioned in connection with the office of Chief Magistrate of the United States. I stated to that meeting, as I had stated in my place in the House of Representatives at Washington, that you were a Whig—not, indeed, an ultra partisan Whig—but a Whig in principle,—all of which is entirely correct.

“After the discussion which occurred in both Houses of Congress, at the last session, growing out of the capitulation of Monterey, in which discussion you thought proper to defend my conduct in regard to my transactions, when assailed, somewhat, if not entirely, upon party grounds, in the House, of which you were a member, and for which you have my sincere thanks—which was done in such a way by those who disapproved that measure—I can hardly imagine how any one who was present, and heard the speeches on that occasion, or read them after they were published, could well mistake the complexion of my politics.

“At the last Presidential canvass, without interfering in any way with the same, it was well known to all with whom I mixed, (Whigs and Democrats,) for I had no concealment in the matter, that I was decidedly in favor of Mr. Clay's election to the Presidency—and I would now prefer seeing him in that office to any individual in the Union; certainly much more so, at any time, than myself. Independent of his great talents and long experience in government affairs, I consider his views were those of the Whigs; for the most part, more nearly assimilated, as regards political matters, to those of Mr. Jefferson, than their opponents, in whose political creed I was reared, and whose opinions in matters of state I have never lost sight of, as well as endeavored to conform to them as near as my circumstances would permit. My commission as a lieutenant in the army was conferred by him, a short time before he retired from public life.

“Although no one can appreciate more highly than I do the too favorable opinions I fear you have formed as regards my fitness for the first civil office in our country, which I consider, should I reach it, is rather too much of an experiment, I am duly grateful for your aid in bringing me so prominently before the nation for the office in question; yet I cannot permit the present opportunity to pass by without repeating to you, what I have said to others in connection with the subject, that I am no politician. Near forty years of my life have been passed in the military service of the republic—nearly the whole of which in the field, or camp, on our Western frontier, and in the Indian country—I may well say constantly on duty—the two last in Mexico, or the intermediate border, during which time I have not passed one night under the roof of a house. You may, therefore, very readily suppose, under such circumstances, I have had but little time to devote to the consideration or investigation of great questions or subjects, or to their discussion; nor have I attempted to do so, or to be mixed up with political men or measures in any way, not even having voted for one of our Chief Magistrates since I joined the army—having for the most been serving or stationed beyond the limits of the States.

“I must say I have no wish for the Presidency, and cannot consent to be exclusively the candidate of a party; and if I am one at all, or to be made so at the coming election, it must be borne in mind that I have been, or will be made so, by others, without any agency of mine in the matter, independent of my wishes. I greatly doubt my want of the necessary qualifications to discharge the duties properly of any office which was filled and adorned by a Washington, a Jefferson, as well as several others of the purest, wisest, and most accomplished statesmen and patriots of this or any other country.

“I almost tremble at the thought of the undertaking; yet, if the good people think proper to elevate me, at the proper time, to the highest office in their gift, I must feel bound to serve them, if not from inclination, from a principle of duty; and must do so

honestly and faithfully to the best of my ability, in accordance with the principles of the Constitution, as near as I can do so, as it was construed and acted on by our first Presidents, two of whom acted so conspicuous a part in aiding and completing that instrument, as well as in putting it in operation. But very many important changes may take place, at home and abroad, between now and the time of holding the election for our next Chief Magistrate; so much so as to make it desirable for the general good, that some one with more experience in state affairs should be selected as candidate than myself, and could be elected. I will not say I would yield my pretensions—for I have not the vanity to believe I have any—for that distinguished statesman, but would acquiesce, not only with pleasure in the arrangement, but would rejoice that the Republic had one citizen more worthy and better qualified than I am, to discharge the important duties appertaining to that position, and no doubt there are thousands.

“Be this as it may, if ever I occupy the White House, it must be by the spontaneous movement of the People—without any action of mine in relation to it—without pledges, other than I have previously stated, a strict adherence to the provisions of the Constitution—so that I could enter on the arduous and responsible duties appertaining to said office untrammelled—so that I could be the President of the country, and not of a party.

“With considerations of great respect and esteem, I am your obedient servant,

“Z. TAYLOR.

“HON. JOSEPH R. INGERSOLL.”

There can be no mistake as to the authorship of this letter. The same mind that conceived the Delany epistle, conceived and composed this. We know this, for precisely the same reason, that, having once seen the face of Daniel Webster, we should know it again wherever it might appear. The composition is characteristically ungrammatical, involved, and confused.

There are three remarkable declarations in this letter:

1st, That he was in favor of the elevation of Mr. Clay to the Presidency, *because his views, for the most part, more nearly assimilated, as regards political matters, to those of Mr. Jefferson, than those of his opponents—Mr. Jefferson, “in whose political creed I was reared, and whose opinions in matters of state I have never lost sight of, as well as endeavored to conform to them, as near as my circumstances would permit.”*

2dly, That he has not had time to attempt “*the consideration or investigation of great questions or subjects.*”

3dly, That “*I have no wish for the Presidency, and cannot consent to be exclusively the candidate of a party.*”

THE PETER SKEN SMITH LETTER.

We have followed the General from April down to August of last year, and seen how pertinaciously he clings to the idea of being the candidate of no party, the bondman of no pledges. We enter now upon the year 1848; and the first letter in order is one addressed to Peter Sken Smith, a conspicuous member of the Native American Party, which had either nominated or was about to nominate the General as its Presidential candidate.

“BATON ROUGE, La., Jan. 30, 1848.

“SIR: Your communication of the 15th instant has been received, and the suggestions therein offered duly considered.

"In reply to your inquiries, I have again to repeat, that I have neither the power nor the desire to dictate to the American people the exact manner in which they should proceed to nominate me for the Presidency of the United States. If they desire such a result, they must adopt the means best suited, in their opinion, to the consummation of the purpose, and if they think it to bring me before them for this office, through their legislatures, mass meetings, or conventions, I cannot object to their designating these bodies as *Whig, Democratic, or Native*. But, in being thus nominated, I must insist on the condition—and my position on this point is immutable—that I shall not be brought forward by them as the candidate of their party, or considered as the exponent of their party doctrines.

"In conclusion, I have to repeat, that if I were nominated for the Presidency by any body of my fellow-citizens, designated by any names they may choose to adopt, I should esteem it an honor, and would accept such nomination, provided it had been made entirely independent of party considerations.

"I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
Z. TAYLOR.

"PETER SKEN SMITH, Esq., Philadelphia."

This letter is clearly the work of General Taylor by his amanuensis. His declaration of independence of all parties is reiterated with intense emphasis. He will accept a nomination from any legislature, convention, or mass meeting—"But, in being thus nominated, I must INSIST ON THE CONDITION—and my position on THIS POINT IS IMMUTABLE—that I shall NOT be brought forward by them as the candidate of THEIR PARTY, or considered as the exponent of THEIR PARTY DOCTRINES."

Again, he will accept a nomination, "provided it had been made ENTIRELY INDEPENDENT of PARTY CONSIDERATIONS."

THE HENDRICKSON LETTER.

The following is stated to have been written to a member of the late Democratic Convention in Kentucky, and its authenticity is certified by Messrs. J. B. Berriss, J. J. Henderson, D. E. Hendrickson, and William Hendrickson:—

"BATON ROUGE, La., Feb. 6, 1848.

"DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 12th ultimo, in relation to the next Chief Magistrate of the country, has just reached me; in reply to which, I have to state, so far as I am concerned, I have not changed the position I first occupied, as regards my being a candidate for that high office. At the same time, such has been the indications of the people, irrespective of party, as evinced by large meetings in many of the States in favor of my being a candidate for the office in question, as to justify me, without departing from the course I have marked out to pursue, to accept a nomination from a National Convention, should such be held, for the Presidency, from the Whigs or Democrats, or from both, should they think proper to tender it, without being pledged, or even considering myself so, to advocate the views or opinions of either. And I again repeat, I have no aspirations for civil office, and am only a candidate so far as the good people of the country have made me so; and those who are not willing to vote for me, without pledges, for the Presidency, let them cast their votes at the proper time for those who will make them. And should one of whom be preferred to myself, and honored with that high station, it will be neither a matter of disappointment or mortification to me.

"With consideration of high respect and esteem, your obedient servant,

"Z. TAYLOR."

This is General Taylor writing *per se*; and to these Democrats he reiterates the declaration, previously made to Whigs and Natives, of his willingness to accept a nomination, "from a National Convention, should such be held, for the Presidency, from the WHIGS or DEMOCRATS, or from BOTH, should they think proper to tender it, without being pledged, or considering myself so, to advocate the views or opinions of EITHER."

THE KING LETTER.

The next letter is a laconic reply to J. W. King, of Bayou Sara, who had catechized the General in a letter two columns long. Number six must be the work of the same neat hand that penned number one.

"BATON ROUGE, La., March 25, 1848.

"SIR: Your communication of the 14th instant, requesting of me my views in relation to certain political questions therein set forth, has been duly received and considered.

"I regret to inform you, in reply, that I deem it to be inconsistent with the position which I have long since assumed in relation to such subjects, to answer definitely your inquiries; and that, even if I desired on this occasion to make an exception in your favor, my great want of time at the present moment would not permit me to give you satisfactory or even intelligible answers to your numerous questions.

"I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
Z. TAYLOR.

"To MR. J. W. KING, near Bayou Sara.

THE RICHMOND REPUBLICAN LETTER.

The editors of the *Richmond (Va.) Republican*. (Whig paper.) who had announced their determination to support General Taylor for the Presidency, Party or No Party, wrote him a letter, propounding divers questions, as follows:—

"It has been stated in some of the papers, in a most positive manner, that you have said, if Henry Clay be the nominee of the Whig National Convention, you will not suffer your name to be used as a candidate.

"It has been also stated lately that, in recent conversations, you have declared that you are in favor of the Tariff of 1846, of the Sub-Treasury, of the war; that, in fact, the responsibility of the war belongs to you; also, that, if elected President, you will choose your cabinet from both parties.

"We respectfully solicit an answer to the following questions:—

"1. Will you refuse the nomination of a Whig National Convention?

"2. Do you design to withdraw if Henry Clay or any other man shall be the candidate?

"3. Have you stated that you are in favor of the Tariff of 1846, the Sub-Treasury, that you originate the war, and should select your cabinet from both parties?"

The following is General Taylor's reply:—

"BATON ROUGE, La., April 20, 1848.

"DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 10th instant, which alludes to certain statements that have recently been made in some of the papers at the North, and which submits several inquiries for my consideration, has been received.

"To your inquiries I have respectfully to reply—
"First. That, if nominated by the Whig National Convention, I shall not refuse acceptance, provided I am left free of all pledges, and permitted to maintain the position of independence of all parties in which the people and my own sense of duty have placed

me; otherwise, I shall refuse the nomination of any convention or party.

"*Secondly.* I do design to withdraw my name if Mr. Clay be the nominee of the Whig National Convention; and, in this connection, I beg permission to remark, that the statements which have been so positively made in some of the Northern prints, to the effect that, should Mr. Clay be the nominee of the Whig National Convention, I had stated that I could not suffer my name to be used, are not correct, and have no foundation in any oral or written remark of mine. It has not been my intention, at any moment, to change my position, or to withdraw my name from the canvass, whoever may be the nominee of the National Convention, either of the Whig or Democratic party.

"*Thirdly.* I have never stated to any one that I was in favor of the Tariff of 1816, of the Sub-Treasury, or that I originated the war with Mexico; nor, finally, that I should, if elected, select my cabinet from both parties. No such admission, or statements were made by me at any time or to any person. Permit me, however, to add, that, should such high distinction be conferred upon me as that of elevation to the executive office, the constitution, in a strict and honest interpretation, and in the spirit and mode in which it was acted upon by our earlier Presidents, would be my chief guide. In this I conceive to be all that is necessary in the way of pledges.

"The election of another candidate would occasion no mortification to me, but to such a result, as the will of the people, I should willingly and calmly submit. As I have had no ambition to serve but in the desire to serve the country, it would bring to me no disappointment.

"With sentiments of high respect and regard, I remain your most obedient servant.

"Z. TAYLOR.

"C. P. BALDWIN, Esq. or R. H. GALLAGHER, Esq., Editors of the Richmond Republican, Richmond, Va."

This is an all-important letter, as indicating in clear, precise language, the views and purposes of General Taylor, on the 20th of April last. The composition is certainly that of some amanuensis, but the explicit, unmistakable terms in which his resolves are announced, furnish conclusive evidence that the General had maturely considered his ground. Besides, he was dictating a letter in reply to the editors of a leading public print, and he knew that it would be published. Now, note his declarations—they certainly are in perfect keeping with all his statements, from the time he wrote the Signal Letter.

"1st. If nominated by the Whig National Convention, I shall not refuse acceptance, PROVIDED I AM LEFT FREE OF ALL PLEDGES, and permitted to maintain the position of INDEPENDENCE of all PARTIES in which the people and my own sense of duty have placed me; OTHERWISE, I SHALL REFUSE THE NOMINATION OF ANY CONVENTION OR PARTY."

"2d. I do not design to withdraw my name if Henry Clay be the nominee of the Whig National Convention. * * * It has not been my intention, at any moment, to change my position, or to withdraw my name from the canvass, WHOEVER MAY BE THE NOMINEE of the National Convention, either of the Whig or Democratic parties."

THE ALLISON LETTER.

Up to this moment, General Taylor, in his seven letters, ranging through one year, written from the camp or his plantation, in reply to Whigs, Natives, Democrats, *per se* or *per amanuensem*, had maintained, unchanged, one position—that of entire independ-

ence of parties, and inflexible refusal of any pledges—and one resolve, to accept a nomination from any party, provided it involved no adhesion to the doctrines or measures of such party. His Letters, in these respects, were perfectly consistent.

We now open a new chapter. Immediately after the appearance of the last letter, and dated only two days later, the following, addressed to Captain Allison, the brother-in-law of General Taylor, was published in the *New Orleans Picayune* of the 25th April, only three days after it was written. If allowance be made for the time required to reach New Orleans, and for the fact that it was necessary that it should be put in the hands of the printer on the 21th, to appear on the 25th, it would seem that great anxiety was felt to hurry its publication so as to reach the North at least as soon as his letter to the editors of the *Richmond Republican*.

Now read the letter, and say whether its elaborate exposition of indefinite principles, and cunning qualifications of former declarations, and diplomatic explanations of confessions of ignorance, are the work of an unsophisticated, inexperienced old soldier, or the contrivance of some political manager, anxious to afford the Availability Men of the Whig party a pretext to urge the General's claim in the Whig Convention, then on the eve of assembling.

"BATON ROUGE, April 22, 1848.

"DEAR SIR: My opinions have recently been so often misconceived and misrepresented, that I deem it due to myself, if not to my friends, to make a brief exposition of them upon the topics to which you have called my attention.

"I have consented to the use of my name as a candidate for the Presidency. I have frankly avowed my own distrust of my fitness for that high station; but having, at the solicitation of many of my countrymen, taking my position as a candidate, I do not feel at liberty to surrender that position, until my friends manifest a wish that I should retire from it. I will then most gladly do so. I have no private purposes to accomplish—no party projects to build up—no enemies to punish—nothing to serve but my country.

"I have been very often addressed by letter, and my opinions have been asked upon almost every question that might occur to the writers as affecting the interests of their country or their party. I have not always responded to those inquiries, for various reasons.

"I confess, whilst I have great cardinal principles which will regulate my political life, I am not sufficiently familiar with all the minute details of political legislation to give solemn pledges to exert my influence, if I were President, to carry out this or that measure. I have no concealment. I hold no opinion which I would not readily proclaim to my assembled countrymen; but crude impressions upon matters of policy, which may be right to-day and wrong to-morrow, are, perhaps, not the best test of fitness for office. One who cannot be trusted without pledges, cannot be confided in merely on account of them.

"I will proceed, however, now to respond to your inquiries.

"*First.* I reiterate what I have often said—I am a Whig, but not an ultra Whig. If elected, I would not be the mere President of a party. I would endeavor to act independent of party domination. I should feel bound to administer the government untrammelled by party schemes.

"*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. Indeed, I have thought, that for

many years past, the known opinions and wishes of the Executive have exercised 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 true theory. *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.*

"Third. Upon the subject of the tariff, the currency, the improvement of our great highways, rivers, lakes, and harbors, the will of the people, as expressed through their representatives in Congress, ought to be respected and carried out by the Executive.

"Fourth. The Mexican war, I sincerely rejoice at the prospect of peace. My life has been devoted to arms, yet I look upon war, at all times and under all circumstances, as a national calamity, to be avoided, if compatible with national honor. *The principles of our government, as well as its true policy, are opposed to the subjugation of other nations, and the dismemberment of other countries by conquest.* In the language of the great Washington, 'Why should we quit our own, to stand on foreign ground?' In the Mexican war, our national honor has been vindicated—amply vindicated; and in dictating terms of peace, we may well afford to be forbearing, and even magnanimous, to our fallen foe.

"These are my opinions upon the subjects referred to by you; and any reports or publications, written or verbal, from any source, differing in any essential particular from what is here written, are unauthorized and untrue.

"I do not know that I shall again write upon the subject of national politics. I shall engage in no schemes, no combinations, no intrigues. If the American people have not confidence in me, they ought not to give me their suffrages. If they do not, you know me well enough to believe me when I declare I shall be content. I am too old a soldier to murmur against such high authority.

"Z. TAYLOR.

"To CAPTAIN J. S. ALLISON."

This is the letter which is to be used in persuading the simple-minded that General Taylor is a good Whig. Compare it with his other letters, and say whether it was written *by him or for him.* And, after all, let politicians twist it as they may, they cannot make it unsay what the General has repeatedly said. It does not retract a single one of his former declarations.

He had asserted his total independence of all parties. Does he take back the assertion? He had solemnly and repeatedly affirmed his "immutable" resolve to accept no nomination from party, unless free from all pledges of fidelity to the party or its measures. Does the Allison Letter annul this affirmation? He had announced that he would not withdraw his name as a candidate, who-ever might be the nominee of either of the old parties. Does the Allison Letter repeal this assertion? See the artfulness betrayed—certainly an attribute of character foreign to the habits of a simple-minded soldier, and out of keeping with the careless, confused, off-hand, unsophisticated style of General Taylor's epistolary correspondence. His avowals of ignorance on public subjects had excited much discussion, and had been used greatly to his prejudice as a candidate. The Allison Letter qualifies them with remarkable ingenuity: "While I hold great cardinal principles, which will regulate my political life, I am not sufficiently familiar with all the minute details of political legislation, to give solemn pledges to exert my influence, if I were President, to

carry out this or defeat that measure." Very handsomely said;—but compare this with his confessions of ignorance in the Delony and Ingersoll Letters! His declarations concerning the Mexican war are what any man, aspiring to the Presidency, especially if smacking with the blood of battle, might make, not only with entire safety, but great advantage to his popularity. There is something in the contrast between the soft words and hard hands of an old warrior that mightily tickles the sentimental bewailers of bloodshed. But wails of woe over the carnage of the battle-field, from one who is ready to flatten it with human flesh at the command of his government, without reference to the justice of the command, are as worthy of respect as the tears of Napoleon at the grief of the dog who was howling over the corpse of one of the thousand slain, whom his insatiable ambition doomed to destruction.

Besides, there is a great deal of ambiguity in this word "Whig." Mr. Berrien of Georgia is a good "Whig," and so is Mr. Mangum of North Carolina; and yet both of these gentlemen are opposed to the Wilmot Proviso. So is Mr. Hilliard of Alabama, Mr. Stephens of Georgia, Gov. Jones of Tennessee, and almost every prominent Southern "Whig" politician. Mr. Brown, a Tennessee "Whig," introduced into the House the form of the Resolution for the annexation of Texas, which was finally adopted by Congress. Mr. Berrien of Georgia was of the majority of the committee which reported the Resolution for the admission of Texas with a slaveholding constitution. A "Whig" from Pennsylvania moved to lay the Wilmot Proviso Resolution on the table in the Philadelphia Convention, and a vast majority of the so-called "Whigs" in that body supported the motion. The name has long ceased to convey any distinct meaning in regard to national politics.

As to the enunciation of principles concerning the Veto power, who believes that Gen. Taylor did any thing more than indorse it, as he did the views and sentiments expressed in the editorial of the Cincinnati Signal? And what, after all, does this enunciation amount to? The personal opinions of the occupant of the Presidential chair ought not to control the action of Congress! Wonderful recognition this, of the independence of the Law-Making Department! Again: The Veto power "should never be exercised except in cases of clear violation of the Constitution, or manifest haste and want of consideration by Congress!" Very true; but does not James K. Polk, did not John Tyler, hold the same doctrine? This is one of the "great cardinal principles" of the General, and, consequently, whatever specifications follow must be subject to its limitation. When he says that the will of the people, in relation to the Tariff, the Currency, the Improvement of Lakes, Rivers, and Harbors, as expressed through their representatives in Congress, ought to be respected and carried out by the Executive, he must mean with this qualification—so that this expression be not in clear violation of the Constitution, or the offspring of haste or want of consideration. This allows him all the latitude that even Mr. Calhoun could desire for the Chief Executive.

Further: It must not be forgotten that, while thus referring to the subjects of Tariffs, Currency, and In-

mental Improvements, *not one word is said about the greatest of all the questions now agitating the country — the extension of Slavery into free territory.* THE GENERAL HAS NEVER SUFFERED A LINE, A WORD, TO ESCAPE HIM, IN ALL HIS PUBLISHED LETTERS, WHICH INDICATES THAT HE DIFFERS FROM THE REST OF THE SLAVERHOLDING CASTE, IN REGARDING ANY ATTEMPT ON THE PART OF CONGRESS TO EXCLUDE SLAVERY FROM SUCH TERRITORY AS A CLEAR VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION.

As this is the doctrine of his Southern advocates, as with them it constitutes a question paramount to all others, and as they have made his nomination, in fact, an essential condition to their cooperation with the Whig party, no man in his senses can doubt that on this point he concurs with them. Grant, then, that his theory concerning the Veto power is correct, and that it may suffice for the safety of the interests involved in the Tariff, Currency, and Internal Improvement questions, still, it is obvious that it holds out no hope whatever as to the paramount question of the Wilmot Proviso. But of this hereafter.

Much stress is laid upon the sentence, "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 when questions of constitutional power have been settled by the various departments of government, and acquiesced in by the people."

The latter part of this high-sounding sentence is sheer nonsense. The "various departments of government" have nothing to do with "settling questions of constitutional power," nor is it of any consequence to the "constitutional power" whether it has been "acquiesced in by the people" or not. The Constitution of the United States has provided for all these things—as Gen. Taylor should know, if he aspires to be "the individual who may happen to occupy the Executive chair."

But, after all, what does this sentence mean? Is it intended to control the expression that the Veto power "*should never be exercised, except in cases of clear violation of the Constitution, or manifest haste and want of consideration by Congress*"? The two sentences do not agree very well together. Who shall judge of "a clear violation of the Constitution, or manifest haste and want of consideration by Congress"?

What sort of a pledge or assurance is this from a man who says in the Ingersoll Letter, "*I have had but little time to devote to the consideration or investigation of great questions or subjects, or to their discussion; nor have I attempted to do so,*" &c.

Turn back and read this clumsy, authentic, Ingersoll Letter, the undoubted work of Gen. Taylor's own hand, and say what this person can possibly know of the science of government, or what ability he is likely to possess for the arduous duties of the Presidency.

Bear in mind too that this question of the extension of the ordinance of 1787 over the south-western territories recently acquired from Mexico, is not a "question of constitutional power which has been set-

tled by the various departments of government, and acquiesced in by the people."

It has never been mooted till now. It comes up, *since Gen. Taylor's nomination*, for the first time. And the "people" of the South, refuse beforehand to "acquiesce" in it. Mr. Calhoun and his friends threaten the bugbear of disunion if the North presses this matter.

Should a bill pass Congress, after an angry conflict, prohibiting slavery in the Territories, *who can say that Gen. Taylor would not consider it "a case of clear violation of the Constitution, or manifest haste and want of consideration"?*

That the people of this country are widely divided on this subject, it is hardly necessary to state. In the recent debate in the Senate on the Oregon Bill, Mr. Corwin of Ohio used the following language:—

"What is there in the way, then, of my giving an intelligent vote on this subject? Nothing at all. I would take this bill in a moment if I had faith in the processes through which that law is to pass until it becomes law in the Chamber below. But I have not that faith, and I will tell the gentleman why. It is a sad commentary upon the perfection of human reason that, with but very few exceptions, gentlemen coming from Slave States—and I think I have one behind me who ought always to be before me [MR. BANGER]—with a very few exceptions, all eminent lawyers on this floor from that section of the country have argued that you have no right to prohibit the introduction of Slavery into Oregon, California, and New Mexico; while, on the other hand, there is not a man in the Free States, learned or unlearned, clerical or lay, who has any pretensions to legal knowledge, but believes in his conscience that you have a right to prohibit Slavery. Is not that a curious commentary upon that wonderful thing called human reason?"

"Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is regulated by a line!"

"MR. CORWIN. Yes, by 36° 30', and what is black on one side of the line is white on the other, turning to jet black again when restored to its original locality. How is that? Can I have confidence in the Supreme Court of the United States when my confidence fails in Senators around me here? Do I expect that the members of that body will be less careful than the Senators from Georgia and South Carolina to form their opinions without any regard to selfish considerations? Can I suppose that either of these gentlemen, or the gentleman from Georgia on the other side of the Chamber, [MR. JOHNSON,] or the learned Senator from Mississippi, [MR. DAVIS,] who thought it exceedingly infamous that we should attempt to restrain the Almighty in the execution of His purposes as revealed to us by Moses—can I suppose that these Senators, with all the terrible responsibilities which press upon us when engaged in legislating for a whole empire, came to their conclusions without the most anxious deliberation? And yet, on one side of the line, in the Slave States, the Constitution reads you—while on the other, after the exercise of an equal degree of intelligence, calmness, and deliberation, the Constitution is found to read nay."

Now, if Mr. Corwin will not trust the judges, why will he trust Gen. Taylor? If the opinions of Southern men are so invariably against the Wilmot Proviso, and against its constitutionality, how is Gen. Taylor excepted? Are not his interests more Southern than those of any of the judges?

Does he read the Constitution "Yea" or "Nay"? What are the presumptions? Are they not all against him?—And should they not be removed by positive proof?

However easily the Whigs of the North may be caught by this chaff, we may be assured that the South, Whigs and Democrats, understand themselves

and Gen. Taylor, without a chance of misapprehension.

We take a leaf out of their book for the benefit of greenhorns.

The following extract, taken from the Charleston Evening News, a Democratic print, is part of an article in favor of Gen. Taylor's nomination being supported by the Democrats of South Carolina:—

"1. Gen. Taylor's nomination was made by the Southern and Western votes almost exclusively, and their union in his support *will control and color his administration.*"

"2. South of Mason and Dixon's line, and the Ohio, Gen. T. got the vote of every State, also a majority of the Northwestern States who have supported our constitutional rights hitherto.

"3. The great majority of the votes of New England and the Middle States and Ohio—the section and hotbed of abolition and protection—went not only for Clay or Scott, but many denounced and repudiated him, [Gen. T.]

"4. With reference to the *Great Issue*, is not this *eminently significant to us?* Has it not divided upon the sectional line of Slavery—he being upon the Slavery and Constitutional side of it?

"5. Gen. Taylor stands unpledged specifically to the Whig party, and therefore *its avowed party doctrines and measures* are not forced upon us in his support. (!)

"6. All the great issues between the two parties have been in the main *determined*, and are nearly *obsolete.*

"7. In his Allison Letter he plants himself on the Constitution, and *recognizes properly the veto power* as a high conservative one.

"8. *His loose position, that the 'will of the people, as expressed through their representatives in Congress, as to the tariff, the currency, and internal improvements, ought to be respected and carried out by the Executive,' may turn out as much in our favor as against us.*

9. "But even if we support Taylor, can we not also maintain and struggle for our principles, as to measures? But all of these are now to us trifles to *the great issue—the slave question.*

"10. *If we cannot trust him who owns Southern Slaves and Western mules—lies in the heart of the slave section—who obtained his nomination by Southern and Western votes almost exclusively, and will only be elected by them, and who has always shown a Roman firmness—whom can we trust?*

"While we should *pledge* our support to him as a Southern man, and upon this issue [the Slave question] *we would give it only in this view, at the same time we could, and should, repudiate Whiggery* and party affiliation.

"11. By this course, we thus *use* all that is *available* to us of principles and men. We will thus *defeat* the NORTH and Cass—THE GREAT END."

We particularly commend the eighth section of the above extract to the attention of Wilmot Proviso Taylor Whigs. Gen. Taylor enumerates *three* subjects upon which he is willing that Congress should act independently. It is a rule of logic, and of law and common sense, that the enumeration or expression of one or more things of a certain class to which the writer's attention may be supposed to have been called in any way—is equal to an express exclusion of all other things of that class.

Let us try Gen. Taylor by this rule. By referring to the Signal editorial, to which Gen. Taylor's attention was expressly called, more than a year before the Allison Letter was written, we find the following remarkable sentence:—

"The Executive must no longer insist upon Legis-

lative influence. There are questions approaching, which the people must be allowed to settle in their own way, without the interference of Executive patronage or prerogative. The old political issues may be postponed, under the pressure of circumstances, and as for the new—those coming events which cast their shadows before—let it be understood that the only path of safety for those who may hereafter fill the Presidential office is to rest in the discharge of Executive functions, and let the legislative will of the people find utterance and enactment. The American people are about to assume the responsibility of framing the institutions of the Pacific States. We have no fears for the issue, if the arena of the debate is the assemblies of the people and their Representative Halls. *The extension over the continent beyond the Rio Grande of the ordinance of 1787, is an object too high and permanent to be baffled by Presidential Vetoes.* All that we ask of the incumbent of the highest office under the Constitution is to *hold his hand*, to bow to the will of the people as promulgated in legislative forms, and restrain the Executive action in its appropriate channels! Give us an honest administration of the government, and an end to all the cabals of the cabinet—all interference from the White House—designed to sway or thwart the action of the American people. If such simplicity and integrity should guide the administration of General Taylor, the North and West would yield to it a warm support and a hearty approval."

It is plain that the Signal editorial was in the mind of the writer of the Allison Letter. The letter is, in some sort, a response to the editorial, though inconclusive and insufficient. We defy any person to read the extract we have reprinted above, and the second and third divisions of the Allison Letter, without perceiving a relation and correspondence between them.

Why does not Gen. Taylor, then, include the "Extension of the ordinance of 1787, beyond the Rio Grande," among the subjects upon which "the will of the people, as expressed through their representatives in Congress, ought to be respected and carried out by the Executive"?

Depend upon it, this omission is significant.

We shall proceed to show that it was intentional.

Let us recur to dates. The Signal editorial was published April 13, 1847. Gen. Taylor replied to it May 18, 1847. The Allison Letter was written April 22, 1848.

We call particular attention to the following:—

The *Cincinnati Atlas* (a Taylor paper) contains the following communication, the name of Mr. McCockey being (the Atlas adds) "abundant authority for the publication."

"MR. EDITOR:—Last February, I addressed a letter to General Taylor, propounding three interrogatories. Two of them were immaterial at the present time; the third was as follows:—

"Should you become President of the United States, would you veto an act of Congress which should prohibit slavery or involuntary servitude forever, except for crime, in all the territories of the United States, where it does not now exist?"

"As General Taylor's reply may assist the interpreter of the Allison Letter, I offer it for publication. It is as follows:—

"BAXON ROUGE, La., Feb. 15, 1848.

"SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 3d inst.

"In reply to your inquiries, I have to inform you that I have laid it down as a principle, not to give my opinion upon, or prejudice in any way, the various questions of policy now at issue between the political

parties of the country, nor to promise what I would or would not do, were I elected to the Presidency of the United States: and that in the cases presented in your letter. I regret to add, I see no reason for departing from this principle.

"With my profound acknowledgments for the friendly sentiments towards me which you have been pleased to express,

"I remain, sir, with great respect,

"Your obt^d serv^t,

"Z. TAYLOR.

"MR. B. M. McCONKEY, Cincinnati."

This letter was written, it appears, Feb. 15, 1848, a little more than a month before the Allison Letter.

Compare the two letters. They are in flat contradiction with each other. On the 15th of February, Gen. Taylor had "laid it down as a principle not to give his opinions upon the various questions of policy at issue between the two parties."

On the 22d of April, he says "he has no concealment, and holds no opinions which he would not readily proclaim to his countrymen."

It is impossible to deny that Gen. Taylor's attention had been called to the subject of the extension of Slavery over the new Territories. The Signal editorial, and Mr. McConkey's recent letter, are proofs of this. Gen. Taylor is, in the last case, asked expressly whether he would use the veto power in a certain case, and he refuses to answer,—and a few days afterwards he writes an elaborate letter, pledging himself not to use the veto power, in three other certain cases, *to which it does not appear that his attention was ever specially and specifically called.*

Is there a man in the country who will say that this omission to notice the Wilnot Proviso in some way in the Allison Letter, was not intentional? Is it not apparent that Gen. Taylor has reserved to himself the right to act as he pleases on this subject?

Suppose Gen. Taylor to be elected, and a Territorial Bill to pass Congress, with the Wilnot Proviso annexed; has any Taylor Wilnot Proviso Whig any assurance that the President will not veto it. LET US SEE THE EVIDENCE.

On the other hand, if Gen. Taylor should veto such a bill, who could charge him with inconsistency? Where has he said that he would do otherwise? LET US SEE THE EVIDENCE.

Perhaps, however, Gen. Taylor considers this question of the extension of slavery over new territories as insignificant, and in that class where, in the language of the Allison Letter, "crude impressions upon matters of policy, which may be right to-day and wrong to-morrow, are, perhaps, not the best test of fitness for office."

The recent struggle in the Senate on the Oregon Bill is a sufficient answer to this suggestion.

We dismiss the consideration of this branch of the subject with an extract from Mr. Webster's speech on that occasion:—

"The honorable member from Georgia (Mr. Berrien), for whom I have great respect, and with whom it is my delight to cultivate personal friendship, has stated, with great propriety, the importance of this question. He has said that it is a question interesting to the South and to the North, and one which may very well, also, attract the attention of mankind. He has not stated all this too strongly. It is such a question. Without doubt, it is a ques-

tion which may well attract the attention of mankind. On the subjects involved in this debate, the whole world is not now asleep. It is wide awake; and I agree with the honorable member, that, if what is now proposed to be done by us who resist this amendment, is, as he supposes, unjust and injurious to any portion of this community, that injustice should be presented to the civilized world, and we, who concur in the proceeding, ought to submit ourselves to its rebuke. I am glad that the honorable gentleman proposes to refer this question to the great tribunal of modern civilization, as well as the great tribunal of the American people. It is proper. It is a question of magnitude enough—of interest enough—to all the civilized nations of the earth, to call from those who support one side or the other a statement of the grounds upon which they act."

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this subject. THE NEW TERRITORIES WE HAVE ACQUIRED FROM MEXICO CONTAIN NEARLY SIX HUNDRED MILLIONS OF ACRES OF LAND — A COUNTRY LARGER THAN ALL THE UNITED STATES EAST OF THE MISSISSIPPI, AND ONE HUNDRED TIMES AS LARGE AS THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

On the 26th of July, the *Democrats* of Charleston, S. C., in Convention, nominated General Taylor for President, and General William O. Butler, for Vice-President. General Taylor, upon being notified of these facts, wrote as follows:—

"BATON ROUGE, La., Aug. 9, 1848.

"SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 26th ultimo, officially announcing to me my nomination for the Presidency by a large meeting of the Democratic citizens of Charleston, S. C., held at that city on the 26th ult., and over which you were the presiding officer.

"This deliberate expression of the friendly feeling existing towards me among a large and respectable portion of the citizens of your distinguished State, has been received by me with emotions of profound gratitude; and though it be but a poor return for such a high and unmerited honor, I beg them to accept my heartfelt thanks.

"Concluding that this nomination, like all others which I have had the honor of receiving from assemblages of my fellow-citizens in various parts of the Union, has been generously offered me, without pledges or conditions, it is thankfully accepted; and I beg you to assure my friends, in whose behalf you are acting, that should it be my lot to fill the office for which I have been nominated, it shall be my unceasing effort, in the discharge of its responsible duties, to give satisfaction to my countrymen.

"With the assurances of my high esteem,

"I have the honor to be, your obedient servant,

"Z. TAYLOR.

"TO W. B. PRINGLE, ESQ."

Whigs, Democrats, Natives, Independents, every body and every thing—are alike to the "No Party" candidate. The object of the South in making this Democratic nomination is too apparent for comment.

The following letter closes this motley correspondence.

GENERAL TAYLOR'S LAST LETTER TO CAPTAIN ALLISON.

From the New Orleans Picayune Extra, of Sept. 6th.

"EAST PASCAGOULA, Sept. 4, 1848.

"DEAR SIR: On the 22d day of May last, I addressed you a letter explaining my views in regard to

various matters of public policy, lest my fellow-citizens might be misled by the many contradictory and conflicting statements in respect to them which appeared in the journals of the day, and were circulated throughout the country. I now find myself misrepresented and misunderstood upon another point, of such importance to myself personally, if not to the country at large, as to claim from me a candid and connected exposition of my relations to the public in regard to the pending Presidential canvass.

"The utmost ingenuity has been expended upon several letters and detached sentences of letters which have recently appeared over my signature, to show that I occupy an equivocal attitude towards the various parties into which the people are divided, and especially towards the Whig party, as represented by the National Convention which assembled in Philadelphia in June last. Had these letters and scraps of letters been published or construed in connection with what I have heretofore said upon this subject, I should not now have to complain of the speed with which my answers to isolated questions have been given up to the captious criticism of those who have been made my enemies by a nomination which has been tendered to me without solicitation or arrangement of mine; or of the manner in which selected passages in some of my letters, written in the freedom and carelessness of a confidential correspondence, have been communicated to the public press. But riven from the context, and separated from a series of explanatory facts and circumstances which are, in so far as this canvass is concerned, historical, they are as deceptive as though they were positive fabrications. I address you this letter to correct the injustice that has been done me, and the public, to the extent that I am an object of interest to them, by this illiberal process.

"I shall not weary you by an elaborate recital of every incident connected with the first presentation of my name as a candidate for the Presidency. I was then at the head of the American army in the Valley of the Rio Grande. I was surrounded by Whigs and Democrats, who had stood by me in the trying hours of my life, and whom it was my destiny to conduct through scenes of still greater trial. My duty to that army, and to the Republic whose battles we were waging, forbade my assuming a position of seeming hostility to any portion of the brave men under my command—all of whom knew I was a Whig in principle, for I made no concealment of my political sentiments or predilections.

"Such had been the violence of party struggles during our late Presidential elections, that the acceptance of a nomination under the various interpretations given to the obligations of a candidate presented to the public with a formulary of political principles, was equivalent almost to a declaration of uncompromising enmity to all who did not subscribe to its tenets. I was unwilling to hazard the effect of such relationship towards any of the soldiers under my command when in front of an enemy common to us all. It would have been unjust in itself, and it was as repugnant to my own feelings as it was to my duty. I wanted unity in the army, and forbore any act that might sow the seeds of distrust and discord in its ranks. I have not my letters written at the time before me, but they are all of one import, and in conformity with the views herein expressed.

"Meanwhile I was solicited by my personal friends and by strangers, by Whigs and Democrats, to consent to become a candidate. I was nominated by the people in primary assemblages—by Whigs, Democrats, and Natives, in separate and mixed meetings. I resisted them all, and continued to do so till led to believe that my opposition was assuming the aspect of a defiance of the popular wishes. I yielded only when it looked like presumption to resist longer, and even then I should not have done so had not the nomination been presented to me in a form unlikely to awaken acrimony or produce the bitterness of feeling which attends popular elections. I say it in sincerity and truth, that a part of the inducement to my consent was the hope that by going into the canvass it would

be conducted with candor, if not with kindness. It has been no fault of mine that this anticipation has proved a vain one.

"After I permitted myself to be announced for the Presidency, under the circumstances above noticed, I accepted nomination after nomination in the spirit in which they were tendered. They were made irrespective of parties, and so acknowledged. No one who joined in those nominations could have been deceived as to my political views. From the beginning till now, I have declared myself to be a Whig on all proper occasions. With this distinct avowal published to the world, I did not think I had a right to repel nominations from political opponents, any more than I had the right to refuse the vote of a Democrat at the polls; and I proclaimed it abroad, that I should not reject the proffered support of any body of my fellow-citizens. This was my position when in November last I returned to the United States; long before either of the great divisions of the people had held a national convention, and when it was thought doubtful if one of them would hold any.

"Matters stood in this attitude till spring, when there were so many statements in circulation concerning my views upon questions of national policy, that I felt constrained to correct the errors into which the public mind was falling, by a more explicit enunciation of principles, which I did in my letter to you in April last. That letter, and the facts which I have detailed as briefly as a proper understanding of them would permit, developed my whole position in relation to the Presidency, at the time.

"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 gratitude 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 couched 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 associating my name with that of the distinguished citizen of New York, whose acknowledged abilities and sound conservative opinions might have justly entitled him to the first place on the ticket.

"The Convention adopted me as it found me—a Whig—decided but not ultra in my opinions; and I would be without excuse if I were to shift the relationships which subsisted at the time. They took me with the declaration of principles I had published to the world, and I would be without defence if I were to say or do any thing to impair the force of that declaration.

"I have said that I would accept a nomination from Democrats; but in so doing I would not abate one jot or tittle of my opinions as written down. Such a nomination, as indicating a coincidence of opinion on the part of those making it, should not be regarded with disfavor by those who think with me; as a compliment personal to myself, it should not be expected that I would repulse them with insult. I shall not modify my views to entice them to my side: I shall not reject their aid when they join my friends voluntarily.

"I have said I was not a party candidate, not an I in that straitened and sectarian sense which would prevent my being the President of the whole people, in case of my election. I did not regard myself as one before the Convention met, and that body did not seek to make me different from what I was. They did not fetter me down to a series of pledges which were to be an iron rule of action in all, and in despite of all, the contingencies that might arise in the course of a Presidential term. I am not engaged to lay violent hands indiscriminately upon public officers, good or bad, who may differ in opinion with me. I am not expected to force Congress, by the coercion of the veto, to pass laws to suit me or pass none. This is what I mean by not being a party candidate.

And I understand this is good Whig doctrine. I could not be a *partisan* President, and hence should not be a party candidate in the sense that would make one. This is the sum and substance of my meaning, and this is the purport of the facts and circumstances attending my nomination, when considered in their connection with, and dependence upon, one another.

"I refer all persons, who are anxious on the subject, to this statement for the proper understanding of my position towards the Presidency and the people. If it is not intelligible, I cannot make it so, and shall cease to attempt it.

"In taking leave of the subject, I have only to add, that my two letters to you embrace all the topics I design to speak of pending this canvass. If I am elected, I shall do all that an honest zeal may effect to cement the bonds of our Union, and establish the happiness of my countrymen upon an enduring basis.

"Z. TAYLOR.

"TO CAPT. J. S. ALLISON."

This is a remarkable letter. If Gen. Taylor "never surrendered" before, he has now yielded at last. His friends at the North are alarmed at the burst of indignation which greeted the Pringle Letter, and the refusal of the Whigs of New York to support a man who is willing, "with emotions of profound gratitude," to run with Gen. Butler upon a ticket which is intended to defeat the election of Millard Fillmore.

Gen. Taylor, finding that there are no more "Native," "Democratic," or "Independent" Conventions, whose nominations he can accept "with emotions of profound gratitude," and seeing that the Whig party is, on the whole, more in his favor than any other, has concluded to eat all his former "no party" declarations, and come out "a Whig, decided but not ultra in his opinions."

Our limits will not permit us to notice this wordy epistle in detail. It is enough for us to call attention to a few of its principal features.

1st. It is in direct opposition to the Peter Sken Smith Letter, and to every other letter which Gen. Taylor has written.

2d. Admitting, for the sake of the argument, that Gen. Taylor concealed his opinions from the army, for politic reasons, previous to November last, when he returned to the United States, there is no excuse for such concealment since that time.

Let us look at the dates.

The *Peter Sken Smith* Letter was written from Baton Rouge, in Louisiana, Jan. 30, 1848. The Richmond Republican Letter was written at the same place, April 20, 1848; and the Allison Letter, in which Gen. Taylor vapors about his "readiness to proclaim his opinions to his assembled countrymen," bears date Baton Rouge, April 22, 1848. But more than all,—less than two months ago Gen. Taylor wrote the following letter:—

"BATON ROUGE, La., July 24, 1848.

"DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 5th inst., asking of me a line or two in regard to my position as a party candidate for the Presidency, has been duly received.

"In reply, I have to say, that I AM NOT A PARTY CANDIDATE, and if elected, shall not be the President of a party, but the President of the whole people.

"I am, dear sir, with the highest respect and regard, your most obedient servant,

"Z. TAYLOR.

"GEORGE LIPPARD, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa."

Verily, this is the era of short memories.

Gen. Taylor's definition of a "party candidate" is too absurd for a dignified notice. The Whigs of the North have never been a "spoils party." John Quincy Adams, the last Whig President,—for Gen. Harrison's short administration cannot be called a Presidency,—continued many political opponents in office; and the Whigs urged, as one of the reasons for electing Mr. Clay, in 1844, that he would put an end to the cowardly proscription for opinion's sake.

Gen. Taylor uses the word "Whig," without attaching any specific meaning to it. He is a Whig by association with Southern Whigs, like Mr. Mangum, Mr. Berrien, and the host who voted against the Wilmot Proviso in the last Congress. There was a time when to be a Whig meant something. It was not merely a name,—it was also a principle. Gen. Taylor is, undoubtedly, as far as he is any thing, allied to those Whigs of the South who admitted Texas, and tried hard to extend slavery over Oregon.

3d. It is unnecessary to add that this letter "is not intelligible" on the subject of the Wilmot Proviso.

If any Taylor Whig thinks that, after the Buffalo Convention, and the extraordinary position of Mr. Van Buren,—and the ferment which has been raised in the Whig and Democratic parties by the Free Soil agitation,—Gen. Taylor has not heard something of what is going on, he must be more credulous than wise. The omission to notice the Wilmot Proviso, in this last letter, is the best proof we can have of Gen. Taylor's unsoundness on the point. But we must leave the subject.

We have now done with Gen. Taylor's correspondence. The Signal Letter and the Allison Letter are those most relied on by Taylor Whigs in the North, to prove that he is a friend of the Wilmot Proviso.

We submit that these letters will not bear any such construction; and that all attempts to secure Whig support for Gen. Taylor, on this ground, are no better than fraud and dishonesty.

We take leave of this topic with a few obvious considerations.

THE POSITION OF GEN. TAYLOR IN RELATION TO FREE TERRITORY.

Gen. Taylor is a native of a slaveholding State, a citizen of a slaveholding State; he is a slaveholder of the largest class, owning some two hundred of his fellow-creatures; and there is not a line on record, an act of his life known, which can afford ground for even a guess, that he is in favor of emancipation, or dissenting in the slightest particular from the slaveholding caste in relation to the extension of slavery into free territory.

All his supporters in the South, without a single exception that is known, are inflexible opponents of the Wilmot Proviso. By them he was forced as a candidate upon the Philadelphia Convention; by them, acting in solid phalanx, his nomination was secured.

Does any man of common sense dream that they would have combined their forces in support of a

man hostile to them on what they regard as the paramount question, or whose views they had reason to distrust?

Repeated attempts to obtain from the Philadelphia Convention some expression of opinion against the extension of slavery—an opinion professedly cherished as vital by the whole Whig party at the North—utterly failed. That Convention, in nominating Gen. Taylor, did not dare to give any such expression of opinion, because it was known by his Southern friends, who procured his nomination, that he would never permit himself to be identified with such an issue, any more than they would.

If the leaders of the party at the North, professing to regard the question of the extension of slavery into free territory as of paramount importance, were sincere and consistent, they would not have consented to the nomination of a candidate of unknown opinions on this question; especially when, from his relations to slavery, his position in the South, and the character and policy of those who favored his nomination, there was every reason to believe that those opinions were adverse.

The single circumstance relied upon by these leaders as sufficient to overcome all opposing presumptions and probabilities, is, a forced construction of the *Signal* Letter, invested with a show of evidence by the process of garbling.

It is no part of the object of this pamphlet to say any thing about the late Mexican war. The House of Representatives, during the last session, by a decided vote, declared the war to be "unconstitutional and unnecessary." It is now execrated by a majority of the Taylor Whigs. It is not commonly known that Gen. Taylor is entitled to the credit of advising the unconstitutional and overt act by which hostilities were commenced. We invite attention to the following:—

Extract of a Letter from Gen. Taylor to the War Department, Oct. 4, 1845.

"It is with great deference that I make any suggestions on topics which may become matter of delicate negotiation; but if our government, in settling the question of boundary, makes the line of the Rio Grande an ultimatum, I cannot doubt that the settlement will be greatly facilitated and hastened by our taking possession at once of one or two suitable points on or quite near that river. Our strength and state of preparation should be displayed in a manner not to be mistaken. However salutary may be the effect produced upon the border people by our presence here, we are too far from the frontier to impress the government of Mexico with our readiness to vindicate, by force of arms, if necessary, our title to the country as far as the Rio Grande. The Army of Occupation will, in a few days, be concentrated at this point, in condition for vigorous and efficient service. Mexico having as yet made no positive declaration of war, or committed any overt act of hostilities, I do not feel at liberty, under my instructions, particularly those of July 8, to make a forward movement to the Rio Grande without authority from the War Department.

"In case a forward movement should be ordered or authorized, I would recommend the occupation of Point Isabel and Laredo, as best adapted to the purposes of observing the course of the river and covering the frontier settlements of Texas.

"I have deemed it my duty to make the above suggestions. Should they be favorably considered, and instructions based upon them, I will thank you to send the latter in duplicate to Lieut. Colonel Hunt—one copy to be despatched *direct* without delay; the other to be sent via Galveston, should a steamer be running to that port from New Orleans."

The following extracts from Southern papers are believed to be derived from authentic sources. They show, beyond a doubt, if any doubt ever existed on the subject, that Gen. Taylor's election is expressly advocated at the South on the ground, and none other, that he is uncompromisingly opposed to the Wilmot Proviso.

We commend these extracts to Taylor Wilmot Proviso Whigs in the Free States. One party or the other, the North or the South, must be deceived. Which is it? Both cannot be right.

We extract from the National Intelligencer the following account of the proceedings of the Philadelphia Convention:—

"MR. TILDEN, of Ohio. 'Will the gentleman give way for one moment? I have a resolution to offer which was drawn up by all the delegation from Ohio; and the vote of Ohio will depend considerably upon the consideration which the Convention may give to this resolution.'

The resolution was as follows:—

"Resolved, That while all power is denied to Congress, under the Constitution, to control or in any manner interfere with the institution of slavery within the several states of this Union, it nevertheless has the power, AND IT IS THE DUTY OF CONGRESS, to prohibit the introduction or existence of slavery in any territory now possessed, or which may hereafter be acquired, by the United States."

"MR. BROWN, of Pennsylvania, was surprised to see such a resolution offered to this Convention, and that gentlemen should come here with an evident determination to distract their counsels. They had listened to language which had been uttered by gentlemen with patience, but things might go so far that patience might cease to be a virtue. THEY WERE ASSEMBLED THERE TO CARRY OUT THE GLORIOUS WHIG PRINCIPLES, and were they to be diverted from their purpose by a SET OF FACTIONISTS? (Applause and hisses.) He moved that the resolution be laid on the table.

"The motion to lay on the table was agreed to."

The prohibiting of the introduction of slavery into new territories, it seems, then, is not a "glorious Whig principle," in the opinion of the Philadelphia Taylor Convention. And yet the so-called "Whig" party is endeavoring to deceive the voters of the Free States into the belief, that Taylor Whigs and their leader are, and have always been, in favor of Free Soil and the Wilmot Proviso. The absurdity of the profession is too apparent for argument, and its dishonesty too monstrous for a temperate rebuke. It is a juggle, a fraud, a lie; and should be so branded by every honest man.

We commend the following extracts to these Wilmot Proviso Taylor Whigs:—

"GLORIOUS NEWS—THE UNION PRESERVED—THE REPEAL OF THE WILMOT PROVISIO BY THE WHIG CONVENTION."

Under the above head the Montgomery (Alabama) Journal, a Whig paper, announces "with inexpress-

the satisfaction, that the Whig Convention promptly met the question of the Wilmot Proviso, and repudiated a resolution adopting that doctrine at once, by an overwhelming majority. It would not touch the unclean thing."

From the Macon (Ala.) Republican.

"WILMOT PROVISIO REPUDIATED BY THE WHIG CONVENTION.

"What will the Locofocos say now—they who have all along contended, against light and knowledge, and in utter contempt of truth, that Provisioism was chiefly confined to the Whig party? Who are now the friends of the South? Alas for Democracy! The Whigs of the Union have met and decided this momentous question—they have repudiated it like men, like patriots, like Whigs! They have indignantly refused to give it countenance! They have rejected it by a decided and overwhelming majority!

"A resolution was introduced into the Whig National Convention, recognizing and adopting the Wilmot Proviso; but it was rejected almost unanimously, without discussion. It was treated as a stranger—as a thing entirely out of place. The only wonder is, how it came there, being, as it is, a baiting of Locofoco paternity. The thing was generated and warmed into life by the Democracy, nurtured and sustained by its natural parent, and of course possessed no affinity with Whiggery, and, consequently, it was hooted out of the Convention.

"Not only has the Whig party in Convention recognized the rights of the South, but they have selected a Southern man as their candidate and standard-bearer—a man who was born in the South, and whose interest is, and ever has been, in the South, but whose patriotism is coextensive with the Union. Of all questions pertaining to civil polity, which have ever arisen or which can arise, the Slavery question is to the South by far the most important. No one can doubt the soundness of the Whig candidate in regard to this subject."

WHY GEN. TAYLOR WAS NOMINATED.

Northern Wilmot Proviso Whigs! read the following, from the Aberdeen (Ala.) Whig:—

"There is one important question to be considered in relation to Gen. Zachary Taylor as a candidate for President. He is the *only man south of Mason and Dixon's line who can be elected!* There is no other man upon whom the enthusiasm and boundless admiration of the whole nation are so completely centered, as upon Gen. Zachary Taylor.

"An awful, thrilling, and highly dangerous crisis has been forced upon the country by Locofoco demagogues, regardless of the sanctity of that Union which is so dear to every patriotic American citizen. *The Wilmot Proviso, as it is called, has opened a fearful mine beneath the foundations of the sacred Constitution. That mine may explode at the hour of midnight, and forever destroy the proudest fabric of human genius and virtue.* To avert this threatened evil, to close the mighty chasm that begins to yawn between the free and slave States, is a duty we owe to ourselves, to our posterity, to the memory of the illustrious dead. How shall this be done?

"We must elect a man for the President of the United States who lives in our own sunny South; who is willing to peril all for the Constitution, who LOVES THE SOUTH and HER CHERISHED INSTITUTIONS, and yet will do ample justice to the North. And last, though not least, we must, to insure success, support a candidate for the Presidency of such an overshadowing popularity; of a reputation that towers, as the Hiwaleh Mountains, above all others.

"Such a man is Gen. Zachary Taylor. HE LIVES IN THE SOUTH, AND MAKES 1200 BALES OF COTTON ON THE BANKS OF THE MISSISSIPPI. HIS INTERESTS, HIS FEELINGS, ARE ALL WITH US. Throughout the Northern and Free States he enjoys

the unbounded confidence of the entire people. His patriotism, his genius, his undoubted honesty and entire devotion to the constitution and the Union, will ever secure him the support of a large majority in every portion of the United States. Who shall say that Gen. Taylor has not been raised up at this eventful crisis, by an all-wise and overruling Providence, to quench the fires of discord, and prevent the downfall of the Republic?

"Where is there another man in the South who can receive even a respectable vote at the North? If we elect Gen. Taylor, his genius will enable him to guide our ship through the gathering storm; his honesty, his sterling integrity, will secure to us his best endeavors; his immense popularity will enable him to triumph over all opposition. Then we ask in all candor, Who will oppose Gen. Taylor?"

GENERAL TAYLOR'S POSITION—IMPOSITION EXPOSED.

Under this head, the Democratic Union, a Barnburner paper, published at Watertown, N. Y., publishes the following statements. Let the old "Whigs" read it, and the Wilmot Proviso men:—

"Henry E. Johnson, Esq., formerly a resident of this county, but now a resident of the State of Louisiana, addressed a Whig meeting in this village last Saturday evening. He has always been identified with the Whig party, spoke by special invitation, and we doubt not will be believed by those who invited him to address them.

"A portion of Mr. Johnson's speech was in substance as follows:—

"I reside in the adjoining parish to Gen. Taylor, and have the pleasure of his intimate personal acquaintance. I was a delegate to the Louisiana Convention that nominated him as an INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE, and am now the editor of the Taylor paper in the parish in which I reside. The Philadelphia Convention was *compelled* to nominate him—if they had not, he would run as an *independent candidate*. Taylor is not a party man. Two of the Presidential electors for my State are Democrats, and are active in promoting his election. *He was nominated for the express purpose of breaking up the old organizations!* Whigs and Democrats indiscriminately support him at the South. *He is identified with them, and is deemed more reliable than Cass for SOUTHERN INTERESTS.* They support him, not merely on these grounds, but because he has faithfully served his country, and, if elected, would do all in his power to break down the old parties. He was nominated to bring about a new state of things, and you may rest assured that, if elected, *he will have nothing to do with the principles of the old parties.*"

"Before Mr. Johnson took the stand, Mr. Mullen, M. C., from this district, had spoken an hour or more in a very disingenuous effort to convince the Whigs that Gen. Taylor was not only a faithful representative of Whig principles, but a reliable friend of the Wilmot Proviso. Mr. Johnson had listened to this speech, and, when called to the stand, he found himself incapable of becoming a party to so bold an imposture. With that high sense of honor, characteristic of Southern gentlemen, he promptly exposed the imposition, and frankly stated to his Whig friends the real position occupied by Gen. Taylor."

The *Macon (Ala.) Republican* comments on the Baltimore and Philadelphia Conventions as follows:—

"The time for holding the Baltimore Convention at last rolled round. Some of them had to yield the point—that was evident. We expected it would be the North, as she generally yields to the South; but this time she stood firm, twice refused to pass an anti-Wilmot Proviso resolution, passed one of which the rancid Abolitionist could approve, and saddled on the South, Cass, a candidate so exceptionable, and one who is in favor of one of the forms of excluding slavery from the Territories so pointedly spoken against in the celebrated Alabama platform.

"What has been the course of the Whig party? It is easily told. They met in Convention at Philadelphia, gave us for our candidate a Southern candidate, in whose hands we know the interests of the South will be safe. They also laid on the table, by a large majority, a Wilmot Proviso resolution — thus showing by acts, and not by empty vanities, how the great, conservative, and patriotic Whig party of the country stands on that question."

The Natchez (Miss.) Courier, a Whig paper, published almost in General Taylor's neighborhood, says of the charge that he would sign a Wilmot Proviso bill —

"This MONSTROUS assertion—so entirely at war with the character of the man and the tenor of his whole life—could only have been made by political leaders when in the LAST STAGES OF DESPERATION—when they saw that everlasting political rot and ruin was approaching them as fast as the course of time would permit."

New Orleans Delta, July 21, 1847.

"We understand there is a letter from Gen. Taylor, in this city, which puts forever at rest all doubts on this subject, and shows that he is true to Southern rights and principles—in other words, that he is *opposed to the Wilmot Proviso.*"

At a great meeting of South Carolina slaveholders, at Charleston, it was, among other things, resolved concerning Gen. Taylor —

"We know that in this great, paramount, and leading question of the Rights of the South, he is of us, he is with us, and he is for us."

And, at the same time, Gen. Taylor is "a good enough Morgan" for the Whigs of the North.

From the Merion (Ala.) News.

"The question of slavery is, with us, the question of questions. With our enemies we can hold no parley on this subject. It is our business, not theirs; and a desire to intrude their impertinent advice and measures upon the South, on this great question, surpasses, in impudence, a rude attempt of a self-created reformer to regulate the domestic concerns of any religious and well-regulated family. It is marvellous that the South has so long patiently submitted to such monstrous outrage and insult. Would cool and cunning Abolitionists, from any portion of the non-slaveholding States, quietly submit to similar offences? Let any Southern member of Congress rise in his place, and propose that any Territories north of the Missouri compromise line, which may hereafter apply for admission into the Union, shall contain in their constitution a provision in favor of slavery. How would this proposition be received by the members representing those States? Doubtless with scorn and contempt. And yet fanatical fools and political knaves are permitted, almost daily, to make, and gravely discuss, propositions affecting the South, conceived in a far more iniquitous spirit."

"Mr. Bots, member elect from Virginia, says:—

"What I will pledge myself to do, is, to vote for no man, as President or Vice-President, who is justly liable to the suspicion even of a disposition to interfere with the institution of slavery, in any manner whatever, as it exists under the Constitution. That I am *opposed to the principle of the Wilmot Proviso*, is certainly true. But why? Not because I think we have any right to ask the North to aid us in the extension of slavery, but because I *deny their right* to lend any such aid. If I acknowledge their right to aid in its extension by legislation, I cannot deny their right to curtail it by legislation. I *deny their right to legislate at all upon the subject.*"

From the Selma (Ala.) Reporter.

"GOOD WHIG DOCTRINE."

"On this point, these are the Whig principles. We hold that any territory this country may acquire, now or hereafter, whether by conquest or purchase from Mexico, belongs not to any State or any section

of country, but to the States at large; that the people of the South have as much right to move there with their slaves as the people of the North; that Congress has no power to interfere with that right, nor have the people who may have settled there before said territory belonged to this government; and that no power has any right to interfere with slavery there, except the people themselves—and they, not until they meet to be admitted as one of the States of our Union. This is good Whig doctrine. Is it not Southern doctrine also? We have a man for our candidate who will carry out this doctrine—one on whom you can depend in every emergency. People of the South, will you be recreant to your duty? Will you vote for a man entertaining sentiments so dangerous to your peace and the peace of your children? Will you suffer yourselves to be surrounded by a cordon of Free States, and fall into the snare so artfully laid for you, but against which you have been warned, and to which your eyes should now be opened?"

WHAT THEY THINK IN ALABAMA.

"At a Taylor ratification meeting in Tuscaloosa, on the 24th ultimo, the following resolution was adopted. The Taylor papers at the North will do well to copy it.

"Resolved, That Congress has no right whatever to legislate, directly or indirectly, mediately or immediately, upon the question of Slavery, nor to make any condition with regard to that subject in the acquisition of territory acquired by the nation, either in peace or war; nor have the settlers upon any such territory, while it is a Territory, the authority to interfere with, or prohibit the removal to it, of any property, whether slaves or otherwise, carried to it by emigrants from any State of this Union: That while we express the fullest confidence in our Northern brethren, and will not anticipate from them any governmental action violative of the principles herein declared, yet, in reference to it, we hereby solemnly declare that we are one upon it; that we will suffer no interference, submit to no concession, and make no compromise. That upon this subject we FEEL and will ACT as Southern men, maintain at all hazards, and defend at all points, our right in the matter, and stand or fall together in asserting and preserving it."

From the Matagorda (Texas) Tribune, of May 22.

Speaking of Taylor —

"If elected, our institution—we speak out—slavery, will fall under the protection of his eagle eye and his giant arm. Who does not know that that institution is in some shape or other under daily discussion in Congress, and that at this moment the Southern members are ill at ease, in consequence of new and fearful movements being made in relation to it? The old Nestor of the South, Mr. Calhoun, warns us that we are approaching a crisis pregnant with danger, and that before long we will have to toe the mark."

GREAT TAYLOR DEMOCRATIC MEETING.

The Taylor and Butler party of Charleston, have held a grand mass meeting, of which the Charleston Patriot gives the following account. Northern Wilmot Proviso Taylor men are particularly requested to take notice of these demonstrations.

We introduce the following extracts from remarks made by Messrs. Holmes and Macbeth, of S. Carolina, the former the most rabid defender of Slavery of the floor of Congress, always excepting Mr. Calhoun.

"The greatest unanimity pervaded the immense assemblage—but one feeling seemed to actuate them: that of determined resolution to stand by the cause of the South, and support the 'man of the South' as the candidate of their choice.

"Mr. Macbeth, on taking the chair, addressed the

meeting with the happiest effect, commencing by alluding to the position which the slaveholding states occupied. Now attacked on all sides, exposed to the assaults of an embodied spirit, coming from all classes and parties at the North and West. Their devotion to the cause of our ruin admonishes us at the South, irrespective of all ties, except those which spring from a Southern soil, to unite in our own defence. To expect that at home we were so distrustful of each other, as to ask pledges on the subject, would be to admit that the institution of slavery does not, of itself, create the bond that unites all who live under its influence.

"Mr. Holmes expressed his decided preference for General Taylor, who had every sympathy and interest in common with us, and who had the firmness of character and strength of will to insist that the rights of the South should be respected. He exhorted his fellow-citizens, in conclusion, to be firm without passion, in their support of General Taylor, and at all events, and in whatever result, to hold themselves ready to meet the great crisis which he believed was approaching with a sure and inevitable progress. Mr. Holmes was greeted at the close with hearty rounds of applause."

EXTRACT

From the Address of a large meeting of the citizens of Montgomery and adjoining counties, Alabama, held, without distinction of party, on the 16th October last.

"It cannot longer be disguised that we are approaching a fearful crisis in our national affairs. We should be insensible to the preservation of our dearest rights, regardless of our solemn duty as citizens and lovers of the Republic, if we longer delay, whilst the danger is so impending upon one great question, in the decision of which our most vital interests, as Southern men, and the perpetuity of the Union itself, are involved. The North, in the main, is united against us. This question is paramount to all others, and therefore, as we love the Union of the States, as friends of our Republican system, it behoves us to avert, if possible, the calamity we so much dread.

"This calamity may be averted in the result of the next Presidential election, if the South is but true to itself. If we divide amongst ourselves, while those who oppose us are united as one man, our energies will be frittered away in useless disputes, and our dearest rights under the present Constitution may be irretrievably lost. In our union will be found our strength and our safety as a people. How can we effect this union? We, who have been divided heretofore, must be divided no longer! We now have higher objects and holier purposes. The South must be united in the next Presidential election, and our union must be cordial and sincere. This union cannot be effected in the support of any of our old political favorites—party feuds would present an insurmountable barrier. The past must be forgotten for the sake of the future. Some man, who has never mingled in the strife and turmoil of partisan warfare—some man, whose honesty, and talents, and patriotism, cannot be gainsaid—some man, at the mention of whose name the whole nation will rally—must be selected to fill the chief place in the Council of the nation.

"Where can we find such a one? Need we point you to General Zachary Taylor?"

From the New Orleans Bee.

"THE REASON.

"One reason why the South should sustain Taylor for the Presidency with great unanimity, is—because his nomination affords a final and unlooked for chance of electing a Southern man to that office. The importance of placing at the head of the government one, who, from birth, association, and connection, is identified with the South, and will fearlessly uphold her rights, and guard her from oppression, cannot be to strike every mind. In this view, his election becomes a matter of vital moment to the slaveholding portion of the Confederacy."

From the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer.

"LOOK OUT.

"A desperate attempt is making, and will be made, to impress on the public mind the belief that Gen. Taylor is not thoroughly with the South on the subject of Slavery. Such an attempt will only prove to what resorts our opponents are driven, in order to injure him in the estimation of his admirers. Why, who is General Taylor? and where does he live? Everybody knows that he is a citizen of Louisiana—an extensive and successful farmer—and owns more slaves than the most of his slanderers can ever hope honestly to obtain. Is there any fear of such a man on this subject? Born in a Slave State, and still residing in one—with a large portion of his capital invested in this species of property—identified from interest, inclination, and education, with the institutions around us—will any sensible man hesitate on this subject to prefer him over his opponent?"

From the Marion (Ala.) Review of July 6.

"GEN. TAYLOR AND THE WILMOT PROVISIO.

"Democratic editors must be possessed with a feeling something akin to desperation, when they think it necessary, in order to sustain the Democratic cause, to accuse Gen. Taylor of unsoundness on the question of Slavery. The charge carries such an absurdity on its very face, as not to deserve a serious refutation. General Taylor, a Southern man, the destiny of himself and his children identified with that of the South, his immense wealth consisting in slaves, and land which has to be cultivated by slaves to render it valuable—he an enemy to the South!—he in favor of prostrating Southern rights and interests!! The very quintessence of absurdity! They might as well say that General Taylor is a free negro. They would be believed just about as soon, and exhibit fully as much reason and truth in making the charge."

EXTRACT

From the Proceedings of a Taylor Ratification Meeting in Selma, Ala., June 19.

After disposing of General Cass, they pass the following resolution in respect to Gen. Taylor:—

"Resolved, That we regard him as better qualified than his competitor for the office, as not entertaining those dangerous sentiments which the other avows—as one among us, possessing the same feelings and having the same interests in regard to slavery as ourselves. If we cannot confide in such a man, whom shall we trust? Surely not the favorite Senator of the most decided Abolition State in the Union—a man who is not of us, and who has no interests or feelings on this subject with us."

We ask the attention of our readers to some statements made by Mr. Hilliard, of Alabama, in the course of a debate in the House, on July 1st, as reported in the Congressional Globe. Let all who doubt whether it was the intention of the managers of the Convention at Philadelphia to sacrifice the rights of the Free States, ponder these statements. Mr. Hilliard, it will be recollected, is a distinguished Whig, was a delegate to that Convention, and is one of the fiercest friends of Gen. Taylor.

"Mr. Cobb of Georgia, asked the gentleman (Mr. Hilliard) if he believed a majority of the Philadelphia Convention were opposed to the Wilmot Proviso.

"Mr. Hilliard replied, [mark this,] that the Northern gentlemen of that body assured them, that the resolution should be put down if it was offered; and by the motion of a Northern man, a member from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Brown,) when the Wilmot Proviso was brought forward, it was bid on the table by an overwhelming vote. He asked if there could be a stronger expression of the sentiment of that body,

and of respect of Southern rights, than was shown on that vote.

"Mr. Cobb again asked, that there might be no equivocation, did the gentleman from Alabama believe that the majority of the Philadelphia Whig Convention were opposed to the principles of the Wilmot Proviso?"

"Mr. Hilliard said, that when that Convention, in the open light of day, thousands looking on, did vote to put down the Wilmot Proviso, it gave him the strongest assurance he could ask, that they would stand by the South against it."

The Macon (Ga.) Messenger, a Whig paper, held the following language immediately subsequent to the nomination of Gen. Taylor by the Georgia Whigs, last summer:—

"Fortunate is it that the Whigs are almost, if not quite, unanimous in his support. Still more fortunate is it, that there are scores and hundreds of Democrats in the country who are resolved to rally under the noble standard of 'Rough and Ready.' Under such circumstances, we cannot doubt the result. The Democrats of Georgia have greater reasons than their brethren of New Jersey and Pennsylvania to advocate Gen. Taylor. He is a Southern man, both in theory and in fact. Identified with our institutions and loving them, his character is such, nevertheless, as to enable him to accomplish great good for the nation at large. Let us, then, all forget past differences, and rally like brethren around him who can best protect and defend both our rights and our institutions."

We have before us a copy of the Richmond (Va.) Times, of June 13, in which we find in their leading article a confirmation of what every Northern man of common sense knew before—that Taylor is the Southern candidate, and, as the boys say, 'nothing else.' Says the Times:—

"We have as our candidate an honest citizen of Louisiana, THOROUGHLY IDENTIFIED WITH THE SOUTH IN FEELING AND INTEREST. Many Northern Whigs generously rewarded our forbearance by aiding to effect General Taylor's nomination, and only *four* members of the whole Convention hesitated to proffer him their active support; two of them were overheated enthusiasts from Ohio, possessing very little influence, and bound up themselves by ill-considered avowals at home, and the other two members of that 'Conscience' or 'Young Africa' party in Massachusetts, headed by John G. Palfrey and Charles Adams, who have been making ineffectual efforts to put down Mr. Robert C. Winthrop, for his enlarged views on these sectional issues.

"Another point in the proceedings of the Convention must not be forgotten. One of the Ohio dissentients moved a resolution, in substance the same with the Wilmot Proviso; and a motion to lay it on the table, being made by a Pennsylvania delegate, was carried with not more than a dozen votes in the negative. Let this fact be contrasted with the adoption, by the Baltimore Convention, of a resolution which the Burnburners of New York have solemnly reaffirmed, as not conflicting at all with the Wilmot Proviso!

"With Gen. Taylor to uphold the Whig banner, and such an antagonist as Lewis Cass, who can doubt on which side the Southern people will be found in November!"

The editor of the Southern Advocate, speaking of Capt. Davis's circular, says:—

"A sense of common danger has given a simultaneous direction to all Southern minds; and in Gen. Taylor they see the only man who can unite and harmonize the country, calm the Northern feeling, and compromise the question of Slavery in New Territory. This new and strange move shows the only hope of the South is in Gen. Taylor. He alone will be able to preserve harmony, and compromise the conflicting feelings of the two extremes of the Union."

The same number of the Southern Advocate contains a letter from Samuel F. Rice, a candidate for Congress, designated by the Jacksonville Republican as the chosen leader and standard-bearer of the Democratic party of his district, in which he makes the following avowal:—

"I am in favor of Gen. Taylor, as the Southern candidate for the Presidency. Many Democrats in other States are for him. Senator Nichols, who was once a United States' Senator, and is now a Senator in the Louisiana Legislature, and who has ever been a true Democrat, has nominated General Taylor for the Presidency in the Louisiana Senate. Senator Nichols lives in the same State with Gen. Taylor, and knows him well. And whilst Gen. Taylor is claimed to belong to both parties, with the evidences before me, and the great issue before us as to Abolition, I feel sure that he may be safely trusted by Southern Whigs and Democrats.

"He is a safe man. With him the South is safe against the dangers of abolition, and his country is safe against external and internal dangers. I believe that, as President, he would be as impartial and as just as Washington."

From the Natchez Courier, (Whig.)

"It is well understood by those who were in the secret of things at Washington last winter, that the Northern members, almost *en masse*, had demanded that no more slave territory should be annexed to the Confederation, and the Northern States possess the voting power to carry out their determination.

"The Southern States will not permit this territory to come into the Union as *free* territory; and, between the two contending interests, it is not likely that the smallest fraction of a Mexican desert, with its basest of mongrel populations, will be added to our already widely extended domain. On this question, and on all others affecting Southern interests, we believe Gen. Taylor to be as safe as any man in the South. He was born in the South—raised in the South—his interests are entirely identified with Southern interests—his closest sympathies and earliest recollections are all entwined around Southern institutions—his family, fortune, first and oldest friends, all bound up in the South—are all sure guarantees that he will be true to the land that gave him birth—as true as the magnet to the pole.

"* * * "We have not the slightest doubt but that OLD ZACK is as much opposed to the infamous proposition of that leading Locofoeo of Pennsylvania, Wilmot, who first introduced the resolution to exclude slavery from any territory that may be retained west of the Rio Grande, as any man in Mississippi."

The Southern (Ala.) Patriot contained a letter dated May 22, from "Many Terry Democrats of Limestone," addressed to the Hon. George W. Lane, a Terry Whig, calling upon him to stand as a candidate for the office of Governor. They say in their letter:—

"Parties in the South now differ more in name than in principle. Upon the deeply agitating question of the 'Wilmot Proviso,' there is with the South a unanimity of feeling and of action. And from the universal 'signs of the times,' it is quite evident that there is a SOUTHERN MAN who now almost, and soon will *entirely*, unite the whole South and West in his support for the Presidency; the blaze of whose deeds has lighted up the entire country; whose sagacity, skill, energy, ability, and military and civil genius, are only equalled by his rare modesty and disregard of self; whose whole life and action have been those of a PATRIOT, solely desirous of maintaining his country's honor, and of defending her interests."

"Mr. Lane, in his reply, declining the honor of a nomination, agrees with them as to the necessity of unanimity of action in the South, in relation to national affairs.

"Already," he says, "has the North arrayed herself in open hostility, as of old, against our institutions, and attempted to deprive us of our rights. Her 'Wilmot Proviso' is but an index of Northern feelings, the muttering of the storm, and from it Southern men have taken the hint; and by it will be secured a firmer bond of union than ever existed at any period of our history."

"An attempt will soon be made, we doubt not, to add territory to our country." * * * "If it had been won by strong arms and stout hearts — if purchased by the price of blood — we have claims, for not a battle-field in Mexico that has not been watered by the warm blood from Southern veins. We have rights, and we will maintain them — maintain them as did our fathers — first by expostulation, then by renouance, and lastly by force; for neither domestic troubles nor foreign foes can prostrate or overawe the fathers and brothers of our brave volunteers.

"If a crisis come, we have the same gallant old chief to whom we can look in the hour of danger. The same plain old man, with the stern self-possession of a Roman, and the discretion and wisdom of a sage, who could look upon contending armies unmoved, and pat his faithful 'old gray,' when the balls whistled through his mane, will not fear to assist us. We can hail him to the rescue, and Rough and Ready will be the motto of the South."

The Southern (Ala.) Advocate of July 2 contains an address from Nicholas Davis, a gubernatorial candidate, "to the voters of Alabama." He says, after denouncing the "abolition fanatics," and "loathsome Wilmot Proviso" of the North:—

"I sometimes think I can see the workings of a kind Providence in our behalf. If the Mexican war has exposed and made manifest the dangers which threatened the existence of our Union, it has also, I confidently hope and believe, in the hero of the war, the savior of the country. In little more than a year the whole country has witnessed with astonishment and pride, in the character of Gen. Taylor, much to remind us of the stern virtues and the simple grandeur of the Revolution. The public voice has already called him to the Presidential chair. He possesses, in advance, the unwavering confidence of his fellow-citizens. He is a Southern man and a slaveholder. An adaptation like this to the state of things around us, it seems to me, has occurred but rarely in the history of the world. May it prove to us the means of deliverance from impending dangers!"

GEN. TAYLOR ON THE WILMOT PROVISIO.

In January or February last, the New York Mirror, a paper among the first to advocate the nomination of General Taylor, published the following, with the remark by the editor, that it was from "an intimate friend and near neighbor of Gen. Taylor," who, in the course of a private conversation, gave his views as follows:—

"He argued, that so far as Mexico was concerned, the Wilmot Proviso was useless; but he continued, that its agitation before Congress was calculated to create sectional feelings, and injure parts of the Union with reference to each other. He said that he considered that any law passed prohibiting the annexation of slave territory, was making difficulties, for future years, of an almost insurmountable character; for, said he, Providence, by course of events, points out that at some future time Cuba must become either an integral part or a dependency upon the United States — that it was the only part of the North American Continent worth having that we do not possess — and as that country, if ever caused to be annexed to the United States by European interference, must be admitted as a Slave State, the Wilmot Proviso, without having any present value, is calculated to be a stumbling-block, with regard to Cuba, that may

embarrass our action as a government, and force us to violate our own laws to secure our borders from a foreign foe."

The following article is from the Charleston News (Loco Foco):—

"DEMOCRATIC MEETING ON THE NECK.

"A large and enthusiastic meeting of the Taylor Democrats was held at Oppenheim's Hall last night. The spacious room was densely crowded at an early hour, and numbers were compelled to go away for want of room. Our venerable and respected fellow-citizen, J. H. Tucker, was called to the chair, and Dr. Drayton appointed Secretary. A preamble and set of resolutions were introduced by Captain Della Torre, who prefaced them by a few strong remarks. Major Simons seconded them in a speech of great clearness and eloquence, and, being further supported by Col. Elliott and Mr. Sims, in addresses of spirit and power, they were unanimously adopted.

"The preamble and resolutions throughout breathe the proper spirit. They adopt the views of Mr. Calhoun, and carry them out with decided strength; recognizing the vital principle, that which is essential to our Union, and without which it cannot exist, that 'Southern men must feel a stronger affinity to each other, than to the citizens of the Non-Slaveholding States, no matter to which party they may belong.' These resolutions strongly urge the necessity of union at the South for the sake of the South. ON THIS GROUND DO THEY URGE THE NOMINATION OF GENERAL TAYLOR.

"The North has selected its man, and with no other man will that portion of the Union be satisfied, unless he comes from the North. We of the South, if indeed we love the South, must go for the man of the South. Let those who denounce us as Whigs, because we support Gen. Taylor, denounce Mr. Calhoun, who has fraternized with Mr. Berrien, and Mr. Butler, who has fraternized with Mr. Mangum. We have no doubt that the preamble and resolutions, when published, will exhibit the advocates of General Taylor in that light which reveals their true position. They go for the South, and for GEN. TAYLOR BECAUSE HE IS THE MAN OF THE SOUTH."

VIEWS OF SOUTHERN "WHIGS."

We take the following article from the Montgomery (Alabama) Journal, a Taylor paper:—

"THE BARNBURNERS' NOMINATIONS. — The ticket of the Barnburners is now complete by the nomination, at Buffalo, of Martin Van Buren, of New York, for President, and Charles F. Adams, of Massachusetts, for Vice President.

"Mr. Van Buren is too well known to require description. He has proved the selfish, unprincipled demagogue which the Whigs have always described him to be. This, we presume, there is now 'none to dispute.'

"Mr. Adams is less known, and will add little or nothing to the strength of the faction. He is a professed Abolitionist, of the *Garrison liberty school*. He is a man of ultra and violent feelings; of little ability, in fact with none of the qualities of his distinguished father, except his vindictiveness. He was, until within the last few years, a professed Whig, when, failing in his attempt to engrain his ultra opinions on the Whig party, at the Massachusetts State Convention in '45, he denounced Whiggism, and organized an opposition to its nominations — Winthrop, &c. Failing also in this, he embraced fully the doctrines and party of *Garrison*. He can effect little in his own State, and can add nothing to the strength of Mr. Van Buren.

"The Buffalo Convention is said to have been a demonstration of great numbers and enthusiasm, and if the spirit evinced there, which is said to pervade the masses of all the Free States, is real, IT IS EVIDENT THAT THE SOUTH MUST ENITE. There is but one opinion here among all parties, and nothing is

voting but union. THIS IS A MATTER WHICH OVERRIDES ALL PARTY CONSIDERATIONS, AND SHOULD BE MET BY ONE UNBROKEN FRONT. We speak on this subject calmly, for it is a matter which requires calmness; for when the minds of all are determined on their course, bluster is out of place. Our glorious Union is loved by all patriotic men; but aggression will be repelled, and the consequences will be on the heads of the factionists who are deliberately plying the axe at its foundations, laid in the spirit of justice and equal rights by our republican fathers. We have no doubt but this aggression will be resisted triumphantly, and the republic preserved.

"Many believe that the 'Free Soil' movement will sweep the Democracy of the North—that Cass will be lost sight of, and the whole contest will be between Van Buren and Taylor. It is time that men of all parties were thinking of these things."

CORRESPONDENCE OF THE MOBILE (GA.) HERALD,

"EAST PASCAGOULA, Aug. 19, 1848.

"The old man [Gen. Taylor] seems to be frank and without craft. He shuns no topic, and, as far as I could discover, is accustomed to utter his opinions without regard to politicians or newspaper editors. Last evening, a group of some dozen or more of us was gathered round him, eagerly listening to an animated conversation, in which his *naïve* simplicity of manner was quite charming. He ran through various topics, which he illustrated with excellent sense and varied information. Speaking of the 'Free Soil' movement in the North, he expressed fears that it would be the absorbing question in the present canvass, and engross all other questions. He said that he considered the 'Missouri Compromise' a fair and liberal line for settling the slave question, and he was willing to see it adopted. He did not hesitate to pronounce slavery an evil, and blighting in its effects upon the agricultural and commercial prosperity of the South. To this he attributed the decay of Virginia, and he thought it would extend to other Slave States. He spoke at some length on this point, and drew many of his illustrations from ancient history. While, however, he regretted the system, he deprecated the foreign attempts to abolish slavery. He thought the agitation on the subject pernicious to both whites and blacks. The two races could not exist together, and a mixed race, such as obtains in Mexico, was the greatest evil that society could be subjected to. No plan of eradicating slavery met his approbation, unless the freed negroes could be removed from the country. He would not emancipate his own slaves, except on condition that they were willing to go to Africa. To the Northern States he would not send them; their condition there would be worse than that of bondage. He thought that if the really philanthropic men of the North, whose efforts to abolish the system are restricting the privileges of the slave, could see its practical operation, the agitation would cease, and there would be less zeal and more wisdom exhibited in the cause. As he expressed it, they would better observe the 'cleventh commandment,' which prescribes that every man shall attend to his own business.

"My object was to see 'Old Zack,' and I gathered enough of what I saw of him to believe that he is an honest man—not politic—not afraid—resolute—moderate—steering between the ultras, and Southern enough in his nature to be quite worthy of as much honor as we can lay on his shoulders."

In a political discussion between Henry A. Wise and Joseph Segar, at Hampton, Virginia, during the month of August last, Mr. Segar is reported by the Richmond Republican to have held the following language:—

"Gen. Taylor took the true view of the veto power—was not for its abrogation—would not veto bills relating to the currency, fiscal operations, the tariff, and internal improvements, because, like Madison in regard to the bank, he regarded those questions as settled, constitutionally speaking, by repeated adjudication and long acquiescence. But in cases of palpably unconstitutional and hasty and inconsiderate legislation, he would exercise the veto, and under this reservation, he might be safely relied on to VETO ANY BILL CONTAINING THE PROVISIONS OF THE WILMOT PROVISIO."

From the Richmond Whig.

TAYLOR AND FILLMORE IN THE SOUTH.

"In looking over the accounts of the Whig meetings through the State, we discover that those persons who constitute them, are composed, in a very great degree, of the LARGEST SLAVEHOLDERS AMONG US. They, it seems, are perfectly willing to trust Taylor and Fillmore—they have no fears for the safety of their property—they do not believe that the Whig candidates will, if elected, do any thing to impair their right to their property, or to weaken their grasp upon it. It is those disinterested gentlemen, who have no slaves themselves, that are principally alarmed on the subject.

"Those who really would be injured by any assault upon Southern rights or Southern property, feel themselves assured, if other assurances were wanting, by the fact that Zachary Taylor is himself a slaveholder, and that he can do nothing to injure them which will not also injure himself at the same time. If a man goes on board of a ship to cross the Atlantic, does he require bond and security—does he ask pledges of the captain that he will carry him safe to the end of his voyage? Certainly he does not. He knows that the danger of the one is the danger of the other also. He knows that if the ship go to the bottom, the captain and crew must go along with the passengers. COMMUNITY OF INTEREST AND OF DANGER IS THE STRONGEST PLEDGE HE COULD POSSIBLY GIVE, AND THAT HE GIVES BY THE VERY TERMS OF HIS UNDERTAKING.

"So it is with Zachary Taylor. WHY ASK PLEDGES OF HIM UPON THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY, WHEN THE FACT THAT HIS WHOLE ESTATE CONSISTS OF LAND AND NEGROES, AND THAT WHEN THEY GO HE MUST BE A BEGGAR, IS THE VERY STRONGEST PLEDGE HE COULD POSSIBLY GIVE? Has Lewis Cass given any such pledges as this? Is his interest the same with that of the slaveholder? If every slave in the Union should be liberated to-morrow, does he lose any thing by it?

"If it can be supposed that he will be a watchful guardian over the interests of the South, IS IT NOT FAIR TO SUPPOSE THAT ZACHARY TAYLOR WILL BE FAR MORE SO?"

The following extract from a recent speech in Congress of MR. FLOURNEY, of Virginia, a Whig member, shows that there is a secret understanding among Whigs to abandon the Proviso so far as this caucus is concerned. We quote from the N. Y. Herald, a furious supporter of Taylor.

"MR. FLOURNEY contended that the course of the Whigs will stand the test before the country, and was more favorable than that of the Democrats on the subject of slavery.

"He protested against its being brought into the political arena, as the Baltimore Convention had there placed it. There are divisions in the Democratic party. Mr. Van Buren has placed himself prominently upon an isolated sectional question, and has thereby shown the impropriety of such a movement. If any one should be elected on this ground, he would be the cause of internal discord, and generations to come would heap on his memory bitter and lasting curses, not only in the South, but in the North. For this reason, the agitation of the slave

question should be kept out of the party contests of the day. *The Whigs have agreed to abandon it, so far as this canvass is concerned.* At a recent meeting of twenty thousand persons, held in the city of New York, they passed a resolution deprecating sectional issues as dangerous to the Union."

Finally, we have DIRECT TESTIMONY of General Taylor's opposition to the Wilmot Proviso.

Shortly after his return from Mexico, the Legislature of Mississippi appointed a committee to wait upon him and invite him to Jackson, to partake of the hospitalities of the State. This committee had a conversation with him. At the instance of the Hon. John M. Botts, Whig member of Congress from Virginia, Mr. Jacob Thompson, member of Congress from Mississippi, wrote a letter to Mr. Boone, the Chairman of the committee, to ascertain precisely what was said by General Taylor. Mr. Boone replied to Mr. Thompson, and the latter handed the letter to Mr. Botts, who published the following extract from it, in his address to the whole Whig party of the United States. (p. 8.)

"In regard to the conversation had with General Taylor, I have to say, we did not talk on the tariff—we did on the war. He expressed himself IN FAVOR OF THE WAR; HE SAID THAT HE WAS DECIDEDLY IN FAVOR OF PROSECUTING IT VIGOROUSLY, till they should yield to an honorable peace; he was for indemnity certain, and that territorial; was not wedded to any line particularly, but thought perhaps, as a kind of compromise with the Wilmot Proviso men, we had better go up to thirty-two degrees, making the Rio Grande the western boundary up to that degree, and said THE SOUTH SHOULD NEVER AGREE TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE WILMOT PROVISIO; although he did not believe there ever would be slavery there, yet if the country was acquired, THE CITIZENS SHOULD BE LEFT FREE ON THAT SUBJECT. HE SAYS THAT ALL MEXICO WILL EVENTUALLY COME INTO OUR GOVERNMENT BY DEGREES; THAT IT CANNOT BE AVOIDED. On the subject of politics, he said he was no politician; had been three fourths of his life in the army; devoted his time and mind to that service, and paid but little attention to any thing else."

GENERAL TAYLOR ON THE SLAVE QUESTION.

A great deal has been said about the proper interpretation to be given to General Taylor's answer to what is known as the "Signal Letter." Upon that subject, the Independent Monitor (published at Tuscaloosa, Alabama) says:—

"At any rate, we have in our possession an original private letter, in manuscript, written by General Taylor seven months and a half ago, in reply to a specific question on this very point, in which he states that it was not his intention to intimate his concurrence with, nor opposition to, any views of the editor of the Signal; that the 'Signal Letter' was not written for publication; and that, under the impression that it would not go beyond the person addressed, it was written without that critical attention to the terms employed which politicians seem so much to require. He replied, he says, to the editor only as a matter of courtesy; and, as is always his custom, he signified his respect for opinions honestly entertained, and his approbation of the course of a man who manfully defends what he sincerely believes.

"This letter, which now lies before us, we are not at liberty to publish in full; but when we see efforts making to produce the most injurious impressions in regard to its distinguished author, we should be rec-

reant both to truth and to duty if we did not, on our own responsibility, make use of the means in our possession, at least so far as may be necessary to correct the misrepresentations."

In order that there might be no mistake about this conversation, the following letter was sent to Mr. Botts:—

BOSTON, Sept. 5, 1818.

"DEAR SIR: Will you be kind enough to inform me whether the conversation between General Taylor and the committee of the Mississippi Legislature, of which an account is enclosed, actually occurred as stated? and whether you have ever published it in the newspapers, or in any address as genuine.

"So many stories are in circulation that one hardly knows what to believe. Pardon me for troubling you, but if you will answer the above questions, it will serve to remove some difficulties in the path of many persons, who do not know whether or not General Taylor ever said the South ought not to consent to the provisions of the Wilmot Proviso.

"Respectfully yours,

"WILLIAM I. BOWDITCH."

In answer, Mr. Bowditch received, through the post-office, a pamphlet copy of the address to the Whig party, above referred to, from the Hon. John M. Botts, and on the first page was written the following: "The passage marked on pp. 7, 8, contains all that I know on this subject. *The original letter of Mr. Boone, the writer, is in my possession,--the conversation related has never been denied, that I am aware of. J. M. B.*" The passage on pp. 7, 8, is the extract from Mr. Boone's letter, just given.

Speaking of this letter, Hon. J. R. Giddings, in his speech at the Buffalo Convention, said:—

"I will tell you about another letter, written by Col. Boone to the Hon. Jacob Thompson, member of Congress from Mississippi. I have the word of Mr. Thompson for saying, that Col. Boone's integrity was never doubted and never will be denied. He said to me that I was at full liberty to say, that he, Mr. Thompson, fully indorsed him as a man of truth and unsullied honor. It will be remembered that Col. Boone was one of a committee of five deputed by the Legislature of Mississippi to invite General Taylor to visit that body. The conversation detailed in the letter was had in the presence of that committee, two of whom were Whigs. These Whigs, having seen the letter in print, have suffered it to pass as true and correct. COL. BOONE SAYS IN THE LETTER THAT GENERAL TAYLOR EXPRESSED HIMSELF IN FAVOR OF THE WAR, AND OF PROSECUTING IT UNTIL HE COULD OBTAIN TERRITORIAL INDEMNITY, AND THAT THE SOUTH OUGHT NEVER TO SUBMIT TO THE WILMOT PROVISIO. Do you believe this? I know you will admit its correctness. While General Taylor nor his Whig friends who were present and heard the remarks, dare deny its accuracy, you will give credit to Col. Boone's statement. And if any Taylor men undertake to say that he is opposed to the extension of slavery, just tell them to get General Taylor's denial, or the denial of his friends, of the statements of this letter."

Can any further proof be necessary? Has not General Taylor said enough to show his hostility to the Wilmot Proviso? And is there a "Whig" professing to be in favor of Free Soil, who can vote for this man?

GENERAL TAYLOR AND THE SIGNAL LETTER.

The Lynchburg (Va.) Patriot contains the following extract of a letter from General Taylor, written

to the President of a Rough and Ready Club of Charlotte county, Virginia. This letter was received since the printing of this pamphlet was commenced, which fact will account for its being inserted out of place. Our readers will refer to page 7.

"In relation to my reply to the editor of the Cincinnati Signal, I must be permitted to say, that it has generally been greatly misconstrued. It was not my purpose to give my opinion to the editor on any topic embraced in his article, or to any one who has addressed me on that and kindred topics. My approbation of the general spirit which pervaded his views has been greatly distorted in its application to his particular views and opinions, which it never was my intention to express. (*If this I am confident my friends are well assured.*)"

We are obliged to defer further extracts for want of space, simply inquiring, Do not the South know their man? Have they, with united voice, brought forward General Taylor, and enforced him upon the Whigs of the Union, to defeat the cherished purposes of those with whom he is connected by every consideration of birth, education, habit, interest, and principle? It is madness and folly to indulge the thought.

We have now stated the argument and the evidence upon General Taylor's position on the Wilnot Proviso.

We think our readers are prepared to admit the force of the following remarks, which we introduce without comment.

"For the Republican.

"GENERAL TAYLOR AND DISHONESTY.

"General Taylor is an honest man; the noblest work of God! This parrot cry is about all that we hear in defence of General Taylor in New England, and it is time that it was well put an end to. We do not want to introduce personal denunciation into this campaign for principle, in imitation of our opponents. But this cloak should be stripped off Gen. Taylor at once. The position of a man who stands before the public, allowing opposite statements to be believed concerning him, upon a vital question, and who is to receive the advantage of the deception, to which one side or the other will be the victim, is not honest, — is not honorable, — is not respectable. A man who passively permits such a deception is not honest. A man who evades inquiry, and takes active part in concealing his real opinions, in anticipation of such a result, is still less honest. General Taylor has done both of these. He stands in a bad pre-eminence in this respect among the three candidates. He is the most dishonest of the three. General Cass, God knows, has come out plainly enough on the only vital question before the country. Martin Van Buren has been too frank even for his own interest. He deserves for it the respect of friend and foe. What shall be said of General Taylor, who is trying to deceive either the South or the North, on the question of the extension of Slavery, allowing his friends South of Mason and Dixon's line to represent him in favor of Slavery extension, and those North against it: so poisoning himself in his correspondence meantime between the two, as to contradict or affirm neither statement. No matter whether it is to be the North, as it always has been, or the South, who is to be cheated in the central issue of the campaign: it is a **FRAND**, and one which should drive from General Taylor every honest supporter at the North. He is the dishonest candidate, *par excellence*, in this campaign. Let this spurious claim for honesty, then, be disposed of at once and for all. General Taylor alone occupies a position of falsehood and fraud before the people."

PARTY SWINDLING.

The following manly and straightforward rebuke of "party swindling" is from the Blackstone Chronicle, an independent paper: —

"The New York Express, (Taylor Whig,) alluding to Horace Greeley's demand that General Taylor shall come out with a distinct declaration that he will not veto a bill prohibiting the extension of Slavery, says: —

"The Tribune demands that General Taylor shall write a letter that will *lose every Southern vote.*"

"And yet in the same paragraph it declares that 'in the Allison Letter, he (Gen. T.) is pledged to approve any Free Soil bill that Congress may pass.'

"Now, if General Taylor cannot write such a letter as Mr. Greeley demands, without losing every Southern vote, it follows indubitably that his supporters at the South do not understand him to have given such a pledge as the Express says he has given in his Allison Letter. If they *did* understand him thus, and were still determined to vote for him, what possible objection would they have to his writing another letter saying the same thing? If they do *not* so understand him, then his position at the very best is equivocal, and there is a deliberate intention to cheat either the North or the South, and that, too, upon a point which both parties regard as vital. Now, we are a 'outsider,' and shall not vote for either of the Presidential candidates now before the people; but as a spectator we insist upon fair play. Gen. Taylor is either in favor of extending Slavery into the new territory, or he is not. If he *is* in favor of such extension, then there is a determined purpose to CHEAT THE NORTH: if he is not, but would, if elected, sign a bill *prohibiting* such extension, then it is equally clear that there is a design to CHEAT THE SOUTH. Now we give all the parties to understand that, when we catch them in tricks like this, we will expose and denounce them. This shuffling, thimble-rigging game, whether practised by Whigs or Democrats, Free Soil men or Abolitionists, we utterly loathe and despise, and whatever may be the consequences to ourselves personally or to our paper, it shall have no mercy at our hands. If General Taylor is for Free Soil, let him say so, and not attempt to swindle his supporters at the South; if he is in favor of extending Slavery, let him take his ground accordingly, and not attempt to cheat the aroused and indignant North.

"The friends of Gen. Taylor tell us that in straightforward honesty he rivals Washington. We put it to their consciences if they would not lose their reverence for the Father of his country, if they knew that he was ever guilty of concealing his opinions on a great public question, for the sake of obtaining votes."

"THEY DESERVE TO BE CHEATED."

We find in the Washington correspondence of the New York Herald, the following, which we commend to the attention of Massachusetts Wilnot Proviso Taylor Whigs: —

"On Thursday, the Rough and Ready Club, as you have already been informed, held a meeting in the Olympic Theatre, where Gen. Taylor was lauded, and Gen. Cass abused, by the Whig members of Congress. Last night, *per contra*, a large crowd was on the 'Free Soil' in front of the platform, near the Union office, where, among other subjects, the 'Federal party's ancestry' were fully exposed by two other members of Congress, Messrs. Henley and Bowdon. These gentlemen are bold, loud, double-twisted, indomitable *Loeo Peco* stumpers, and let off considerable oratory, to the delight of the auditors. The former pronounced the Whig party scattered all over the country, engaged in a guerilla war on the Democracy, and rejoiced at the bright political prospects in the future; while the latter occasioned much laugh-

ter by frequently speaking of Martin Van Bawlin. He reported a conversation which he had with Governor Gayle, of the House of Representatives, several weeks ago, as follows:—

"Mr. Bowdon. Well, Governor, you go for Gen. Taylor?"

"The Governor. O, yes. If we elect him, we can take our niggers every where—all over New Mexico and California.

"Mr. Bowdon. How do you know that Gen. Taylor is in favor of permitting the extension of Slavery?"

"The Governor. Why, he owns three hundred niggers himself.

"Mr. Bowdon. But, sir, the Northern Whigs think that Gen. Taylor is in favor of the restriction of Slavery.

"The Governor. Very well.

"Mr. Bowdon. If Gen. Taylor sanctions the extension of Slavery, the Northern Whigs will be cheated.

"The Governor, [earnestly.] D—n them, let them be cheated; they deserve it, any how, for their past sins. [Laughter.]

"Mr. Bowdon. Would it not be well to get Gen. Taylor to say what he is in favor of with regard to the question? If he is in favor of Slavery extension, let the North know it.

"The Governor. That would never do; there are Webster, Davis, Ashmun, Corwin, and others, who possess a great deal of influence in the North, and it would never do.

"Mr. Bowdon. Governor, you and I differ. I think it is better to know the sentiments of a candidate, so that neither the South nor the North may be deceived and cheated.

"The Governor. Taylor will take care of the South; the North ought to be punished for former transgressions. [Ha! ha! ha! ha—a—a, ha! 'Good!' 'At him again!']

"Mr. Bowdon, until a late hour, spoke about Martin Van Bawlin. There was a band of music in attendance, and much enthusiasm among the Democrats was manifested."

We commend the following document and commentary to the "born Abolitionists" and original "Anti-slavery men" of the Taylor party:—

GEN. TAYLOR A BUYER OF MEN AND WOMEN.

People have not forgotten the blustering and affectingly indignant manner in which the Taylor papers denied that their candidate had bought \$10,000 worth of slaves in Washington for a plantation on the Rio Grande. Gen. Taylor himself appeared only to regret that the story was not correct—that he had not the money to expend; but the virtuous Taylor papers talked in a very violent fashion about the infamous slanders upon the General. Now, if a man is convicted of stealing a gray mare, and the newspapers report him as having stolen a black horse, it is not considered that the mistake of the newspapers is much of a *slander*. So it will be a hard matter to convict the opponents of Gen. Taylor of doing him injustice, by saying that he has bought slaves in one market for one plantation, when the truth happens to be that he has bought them in *another* market for *another* plantation. That General Taylor has bought slaves, cannot be denied. The proof is at hand. Here it is, as we find it in the Columbus (Ohio) Standard:—

"CINCINNATUS AND HIS FARM.

"To a friend in the South we are indebted for the information and documents below. General Taylor ap-

pears in a new and interesting position. The candidate for the Presidency of this free country, in the slave market, purchasing human beings with money drawn from the National Treasury! On the sixth of June, while Southern bullies and Northern douglifaces are on their way to Philadelphia, the candidate they in their purity select, spends the day in the negro auctions, examining the limbs and trying the soundness of his purchases. And this slave trader even Northern men have been sacrilegious enough to compare with Washington, have been dishonest enough to claim for him a position similar to Jefferson's; and have even argued that Henry Clay, whose noble life has been one continued exertion in the cause of freedom, is no better than he.

"Of the numerous letters Taylor has written, can any man show one containing even a single line expressing his regret that slavery should exist? Taylor men of this city of Columbus have letters from him they dare not show; do they contain any thing in favor of freedom? one word that indicates even the least liberality on the subject? Has he ever yet offered liberty to a single one of those human beings, the fruit of whose uncompensated labors he enjoys? Has he ever done any one thing that would recommend him to a Christian community of free people? No, he is a slave trader, a sugar and cotton planter, with all the interests and prejudices of his peculiar situation. In fine, he stands confessed an ignorant, slave trading soldier, owing his nomination to the fraudulent acts of the Louisiana delegation, and trusting to concealment and deception for success."

"NEW ORLEANS, Aug. 4, 1848.

"DEAR SIR: I herewith transmit to you a copy of the Deed of Sale, from John Hagard, Senior, to General Taylor, of a plantation, horses, and slaves, &c. * * * * * "Since Gen. Taylor's return from Mexico he has also purchased slaves. In May last he purchased, in the name of his son Richard Taylor, four slaves of W. M. Williams. On the 6th of June last he purchased of B. M. Campbell, two slaves, for the sum of \$1500. He inspected the negroes and examined them to see if they were sound; gave his draft on the Canal Bank, of this city. * * * * *

DEED OF SALE.

"JOHN HAGARD, SR. }
To }
ZACHARIAH TAYLOR. } DEED. { Rec'd for Record,
13th Feb., 1848.

"THIS INDENTURE, made this twenty-first day of April, eighteen hundred and forty-two, between John Hagard, Sr., of the City of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, of one part, and Zachariah Taylor of the other part, WITNESSES, that the said John Hagard, Sr., for and in consideration of the sum of Ninety-five Thousand Dollars to him in hand paid and secured to be paid, as hereinafter stated by the said Zachariah Taylor, at and before the sealing and delivering of these presents, has this day bargained, sold, delivered, conveyed and confirmed, and by these presents does bargain, sell, deliver and confirm unto the said Zachariah Taylor, his heirs and assigns, forever, all that plantation and tract of land:— * * * * *

"ALSO, the following slaves—Nelson, Milley, Peggy, Polden, Mason, Willis, Rachel, Caroline, Lucinda, Randall, Wyma, Carson, Little Ann, Wyma, Jane, Tom, Sally, Grace, Big Jane, Louisa, Maria, Charles, Bernard, Mary, Sally, Carson, Paul, Susford, Mansfield, Harry Oden, Harry Horley, Carter, Henrietta, Ben, Charlotte, Wood, Dick, Henrietta, Charissa, Ben, Anthony, Jacob, Hodge, Jim, Gabriel, Emeline, Armstrong, George, Wilson, Cherry, Peggy, Wallace, Jane, Wallace, Bartlett, Martha, Letitia, Barbara, Matilda, Lucy, John, Sarah, Bet Ann, Allen, Tom, George, John, Dick, Fiddling, Nelson or Leon, Wyma, Stephen, Lidney, Little Cherry, Puck, Sam, Hannah or Anna, Mary, Ellen, Henrietta, and two small children; Also, all the Horses, Mules, Cattle, Hogs, Farming utensils and tools now on said plantation, together with all and singular the hereditaments, accoutrements, privileges and advantages unto the said land and slaves, before or appertaining. To have and to hold the said plantation

and tract of land and slaves, and other property above described, unto the said Zachariah Taylor, his heirs and assigns, forever, and to his and their only proper use, benefit, and behoof, forever. And the said John Hagard, Sr., himself, for his heirs, executors and administrators, does covenant, promise and agree to and with the said Zachariah Taylor, his heirs and assigns, that the aforesaid plantation and tract of land and slaves, and other property, with the appurtenances, unto the said Zachariah Taylor, his heirs and assigns, against the claim or claims of all persons whomsoever claiming or to claim the same, or any part or parcel thereof, shall and will warrant, and by these presents forever defend. And the said John Hagard, Sr., hereby reserves a special lien and mortgage of all the before-described lands, tenements, hereditaments, slaves and other property, to secure the full and punctual payments of the following promissory notes, to wit: Six promissory notes made by said Zachariah Taylor, in favor of and endorsed by Mannel White & Co., all dated New Orleans, the thirty-first day of December, Eighteen Hundred and Forty-One. Four of them for the sum of four thousand six hundred and three dollars, with ten per cent. interest from date. Two payable twelve months after date, and two payable two years after date. Two other notes for eight thousand two hundred and twenty-four dollars, with ten per cent. interest from date, one payable twelve months after date, the other payable two years after date. Now, if the said Zachariah Taylor, his heirs, executors, or assigns, shall well and truly pay said several sums of money in said promissory notes specified, with all interest which may be due thereon, to the holder or holders of said notes, then this lien or mortgage is to cease and determine, and the estate of the said Taylor in the said land, plantation, slaves, and other property, shall become absolute and unconditional.

"In testimony whereof, the said John Hagard, Sr., has hereto set his hand and seal, the day and year first above written."

"State of Mississippi,

"Jefferson County, ss.

"I, Edwin McKey, Clerk of the Probate Court in and for said county, do hereby certify that the within and foregoing instrument of writing is a true and perfect copy taken from the Records recorded in my office in Book E, of Deeds, &c., pages 1, 221, 222.

"SEAL. } Given under my hand and seal of office, this 24th day of July, A. D. 1818.
[Signed,] "EDWIN McKEY, CLK.

"By A. W. FORD, D. C."

"Taxable property of Zachariah Taylor for the year 1818, being in Jefferson county, Mississippi, as estimated by the Tax Assessor of said county.

"Number of Slaves	114,	Tax	\$169 44.
"Number of acres of Taxable Land,	2100,	Tax	\$1 80.

"I certify the foregoing estimate of the State, County and School Tax on the above-mentioned property in Jefferson county, state of Mississippi, for the year 1818, to be true and correct.

[Signed,] "O. S. MILES,

"Tax Assessor, Jefferson County."

The New Orleans correspondent of the Boston Post confirms the statement, making an unimportant variation in the name. He says:—

"I perceive that Gen. Taylor has come out in a letter addressed to Col. Mitchell, denying the statement that he had sent on to Washington \$10,000 to purchase slaves. Well, I do not doubt his statement; but what difference is there in expending, from time to time, large sums of money in New Orleans, in the purchase of slaves, or sending it to Washington for the same purpose—it is as broad as it is long. It is well known that Gen. Taylor is constantly engaged thus, and invests every cent he can

raise in purchasing land and slaves. Since his return from Mexico he has settled the suit between himself and John Hogan, Sr., of this city, for the purchase of a plantation and slaves, for which he paid \$25,000; besides, he has purchased a number of slaves since his return, independent of those from Mr. Hogan. Will he or his friends deny that? They dare not, as the proof is on hand. Was the denial of one \$10,000 intended as a cover for the other purchases? Duplicity, it is said by his friends, forms no part of his composition. I am afraid they are so dyed in the wool themselves, that they cannot distinguish the difference between duplicity and a course and manly course. They should blush for themselves—if they indeed can—as also for Gen. Taylor, when they examine and read his numerous letters now before the country, and hereafter hold their peace."

Now, we suppose that there are many men who oppose Taylor on anti-slavery grounds, who do not make it an insuperable objection to him that he holds slaves. They would be willing to vote for a slaveholder, much as they dislike the employment he is engaged in, if he would give them security that he would not consent to the extension of the institution. But for all this, we think that these men will admit, it is not a very respectable thing for this Republic of the United States, to elect, as its great man, one who is engaged in this business of buying men and women! Does it not look a little improper for this free and enlightened nation to pass over men of pure character, great mind, and republican, democratic habits, for the purpose of selecting a man to rule over them, who every day in his life outrages the very idea of democracy which they all love—rejects it, spurns it, buys men, women, and children in the market, enslaves them, and puts them upon a plantation to labor there, and fill his pockets may be filled? How does it look? Cannot the country do a more respectable thing than this?

It will be well for the laboring men to think of these things—the tillers of the soil, the mechanics, the manufacturers. Is it altogether the best thing they can do to give their votes for a man who, when he wants an agriculturist, buys him; when he wants a blacksmith, buys him—pays several hundred dollars for him, uses him as long as he pleases, and then sells him again? Is the laborer of the Northern Free States likely to advance the cause of the laborer every where, likely to increase the "dignity of labor," which they talk so much about, by casting a vote for this Zachary Taylor? Hosea Biglow somewhere remarks:—

"Folks that make black slaves of niggers
Want to make white slaves of YOU."

This is true. The man who buys Peter, and Jack, and Nelson—black men—to work and die for him, would just as readily buy Johnson, and Thompson, and Smith, and Jones—white men—if he could do so. What sort of a President is this for a free Republic of laboring men?

Perhaps there would be some excuse for voting even for such a man as this, if he had served the country in her hour of need; if he had obtained a national reputation for statesmanship and patriotism; if he was the ablest, or one of the ablest, men in the land. But so far from being thus qualified, Gen. Taylor has less of these qualifications than any

other man who was ever named, by any considerable body of men, for the Presidency. He has not experience; he has not ability; it is very doubtful whether he has honesty of purpose—a thing required, to be sure, in a President, but only one of the things required. We should really like to see a satisfactory reason for taking up Gen. Taylor and putting him in the Presidential chair.

LETTER FROM HON. JOHN M. BOTTS.

After the larger part of this pamphlet was in type, the mails brought us the *Richmond Whig*, containing the following letter from the Hon. John M. Botts. We deem it so direct and conclusive upon the point we have been endeavoring to establish, that we insert it here, though out of the connected order, and at the risk of wearying the reader with too much proof of the "No Party," *un-Whig*, position of General Taylor.

The introductory part of this letter we have omitted, as it contains nothing but an explanation of the manner in which a previous letter written by Mr. Botts, and addressed to the Clay committee, happened to be printed.

"That I have always preferred Mr. Clay to General Taylor, I suppose, is no secret. That I do so now, and would rejoice in his election, I fearlessly proclaim—let him shrink from it who may—and let those denounce me for it who think proper. What little popularity I have enjoyed has been obtained by an honest, upright, fearless and independent course; what I shall retain shall be by the same course; and if I cannot hold it without a sacrifice of my political integrity or personal independence, the sooner it leaves me the better. There are a plenty that will court it, and fawn, and flatter, and change their opinions and principles with every political current, to obtain it—but I will not; and if the people of this district desire one of that sort to represent them in Congress, they can find them in town as thick as blackberries in August, and I dare say more than one or two in the country, all of whom can come well indorsed.

"The proud oak that cannot resist a summer cloud, is not likely to endure a winter storm; and the public man who is frightened from his propriety, or seduced from his integrity, and yields to every temporary wave of popular excitement, is unworthy of confidence or trust. I hope I am not that man; and I should be sorry if I ever have been so far misunderstood as to have been taken for one of that class. But suppose I were to say to the Whigs of this district next spring, that I would as soon accept a nomination at the hands of the Low Foes as from them, and that I would make no pledges, and would not be the exponent of their party principles; and that, if they elected me, it must be on their own responsibility—I beg to know what twenty years of laborious work to the Whig cause would avail me?—And why should I not have as much right to take that ground as General Taylor?

"My struggle has been for the people; I have respected the politicians, because I believed they disregarded the popular will. I have fought for what I believed to be a great principle: I looked upon this boasted government of ours as a representative government; and when I saw a nation of people, consisting of some twenty millions, nearly equally divided in their political principles, I thought one or the other of the parties, whichever might be able to obtain a majority at the polls, was entitled to be represented in the Chief Magistrate of the nation; and when I saw a soldier from the camp, whom all must acknowledge to be without civil experience or practical knowledge, either in regard to our foreign or do-

mestic relations, stepping forward as a candidate to fill this high and responsible office, I thought it but just and proper that the people, in the language of the Richmond Whig, were entitled to know the opinions of a candidate before they voted. I do not subscribe to the doctrine laid down in his McCoukey Letter, when he says, 'I have laid it down as a principle not to give my opinions upon the various questions of policy now at issue between the political parties of the country.'

"But when he was asked, Which of these two parties, General, will you represent? he answered, substantially, Neither! I will not be the exponent of either party or of their principles. If the people elect me, they must take me on their own responsibility. I will administer the government as I think best, according to my own judgment and my own will! This was something novel, I think *unsound*, if not alarming in the history of our party warfare. It was establishing a precedent that might lead to a Dictatorship and a Despotism. This came from a mere soldier, whose fame and name were alike unknown to the country only two years ago, who has not since travelled farther from Mexico than to his own plantation in Louisiana, but who is now known, personally, to every simpleton in the streets as the most honest man alive, and the only one who deserves to be classed with the Father of his country. This may all be true. I will not deny it. I can only say I have had no means of finding it out. True, General Taylor had said he would have voted for Mr. Clay in 1841, but I thought perhaps the General was mistaken in that, as he said another thing in the same letter, in which I am sure he was mistaken, and that was, that he would prefer Mr. Clay's election to his own; for he could have been gratified if he had preferred it; but no man labored harder to defeat him, even to the extent of saying afterwards he should be a candidate, if Mr. Clay should be nominated by the Convention—which he afterwards forgot and denied. For these, and a variety of other reasons, which shall be given in due time, I resisted his nomination, and have not cooperated heartily in his election.

"I have rejoiced to hear of any prospect of electing that man who has given all the life, and soul, and strength, and energy, to the party; that has been so unceremoniously sacrificed upon the shrine of supposed "availability." His name has become a by-word and a reproach among his idolizers and worshippers a few years ago, except when it becomes necessary to mention his name for effect; and those who are the first to destroy, are now the most ready to pay him an empty compliment, either in an editorial or public speech, to hide their own hypocrisy and ingratitude! Mr. Clay's reputation is quite as safe in the hands of his constant friends as those who have bitterly opposed him from the first.

"For my own course, I shall, as I have heretofore done, trust to time and circumstances for my vindication. My Whiggery cannot be affected by milk-sop politicians, carping, vacillating, and fault-finding editors; nor can I be driven from my principles by any harsh or unjust course that can be pursued towards me by those whose rights and interests I feel satisfied I am defending. I am fighting for the people, and if the people choose to take up arms against me, I will fight for them still. When I cease to be a Whig, it will be time to call the roll and see how many remain in the ranks.

"I have not yet said I would not vote for Gen. Taylor. If there is no regular organized ticket in Virginia for Mr. Clay, and I presume there will not be, for I fear there is not Whig spirit and energy enough left in the State to get up one, I certainly shall vote for him, upon the ground that I prefer to take the CHANCE of having the government administered on sound principles, rather than the certainty of having it administered on unsound principles; but when I give that vote, it must be borne in mind that it is my individual vote, that no man has a right to control. I am as free to exercise my judgment upon Gen. Taylor's qualifications and Whiggery as any other man in the district; and I shall give i

as I choose; but if the election should come to the House, it will then be the vote of the district, and I shall give it as my constituents choose; but if I yield my vote to Taylor, I will not yield to 'Taylorism,' which is more ruthless and proscriptive than Jacksonism ever was. Jacksonism only proscribed its enemies; Taylorism proscribes its friends. Jacksonism proscribed those who did not subscribe to the principles it avowed; Taylorism proscribes those who adhere most rigidly to them. Jacksonism proscribed those who left THEM; Taylorism proscribes those whom they have left. Jacksonism suffered a man to think for himself, if he voted right; Taylorism requires ONE not only to vote, but to think, and SPEAK with them and FOR them.

"I am threatened by many that they will not vote for me unless I will make a Taylor speech. I look upon it as an exaction never before made; as an infringement on my personal rights, my personal honor, and my personal independence, and I will not yield to it, if I lose every vote in the district. 'If speeches were as plenty as blackberries, I would not make one under compulsion.'

"I may not be able to retain a seat in Congress—that is a small matter—but I can take care of my own honor against the world.

"Now in regard to the Allison Letter, No. 2, which I have read since the above was written, I am free to confess that the opinions therein expressed, and the positions adopted, no matter at whose suggestion, are more satisfactory to me than any other that has preceded it—and if this had been the only one, it would have been entirely so. If what Gen. Taylor means to say is, what I infer from this letter he does say, that when he said he was 'not an ultra Whig,' and 'would not be the exponent of any party principles,' and 'would not be the candidate of any party,' and 'would accept no party nomination,' and 'would look to no party doctrines as the rule of his action,' and 'would express no opinions on any political subject,' and 'that the people must take him on their own responsibility,' and 'that he would as soon accept a nomination from the Democrats as the Whigs,' and 'that he would only accept a nomination of the spontaneous and unanimous voice of the whole people,' and 'that he would look to the Constitution, (which all Presidents are sworn to do,) and not to the views of either of the great parties of the country as his guide,'—if by all this he only meant to say what he now says he did mean, that he was not a party candidate in that straitened and sectarian sense that would prevent his being the President of the whole people, and that he would not be fettered down with pledges that were to be an iron rule of action, IN DESPITE OF ALL CONTINGENCIES, and that he would not be required to lay violent hands indiscriminately on ALL PUBLIC OFFICERS, GOOD OR BAD, who might differ with him in opinion, and that he would not force Congress, by the coercion of the veto power, to PASS LAWS TO SUIT HIM, OR NONE AT ALL,—then I must say he has written a great many letters to very little purpose, because nobody expected or required it of him; he cannot blame me or anybody else for not understanding what he meant. I never should have guessed it, for to my mind his letters have borne a very different reading. That is certainly not what I should have understood as 'an ultra Whig' to mean. I should think any man who *would* give such pledges was nearer an ultra DEMOCRAT than an ultra WHIG, and nearer an FLORA POOL than either; and no man in his senses would either give them himself or require them of another. When he spoke of an ultra Whig, I naturally concluded that he had reference to some one or more measures or principles of the Whig party, and I never understood that any of these were.

"The truth is, and it cannot be disguised, that Gen. Taylor has had bad advisers. If he had relied on the great Whig party, and struck for the Whig vote only, and not 'spread his net to catch birds of every feather,' he would have been elected without difficulty or doubt; there would then have

been no disposition to bring Mr. Clay forward in the first instance, and still less to have opposed his election after he was nominated; and if he is not elected now, he has nobody to blame but himself and those by whose advice he has been governed; but whether, in the language of the French people to Louis Philippe, 'IT HAS COME TOO LATE,' is a question yet to be solved. I apprehend it has.

"But why are we left in the dark upon another subject? Why are we not permitted to know what are Gen. Taylor's views of the Wilmot Provision? It is very evident that every press and every man at the North that supports Gen. Taylor, does it on the ground that he will not, and is pledged not to vote that measure. Mr. Webster, Mr. Ashmun, Mr. Corwin, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Truman Smith, Thaddeus Stevens, Mr. Caleb Smith, (who has repented, in his speech in Cincinnati, that he was assured by the Hon. William Ballard Preston, of Virginia, that he would not veto it, and that he would be sustained in the South if he signed it,) all take that ground; while it is equally certain that at the South he is as generally and universally sustained on the ground that he is a Southern man, a slaveholder, and that he will veto it. Now, I say, in this case, both sections of the country cannot be right, and one or the other must be cheated; and the only way to avoid it, is for Gen. Taylor to say what he will do. The people are entitled to know it before they vote. I think perhaps too much importance is attached to this question both North and South; but that is their business. If it is of half the importance that they ascribe to it, the fact ought to be known.

"Why did we complain of the cheat that was put upon us in Pennsylvania, in 1844, in regard to Mr. Polk's Kane letter, that he had one construction in the South and another in the North? Why did we denounce our political opponents for a trick that was unworthy of a great party, and discreditable to them as men of honor? Was it only that we might follow their example in four short years? I complained of it and denounced it as a miserable and unworthy cheat practised on the intelligence or ignorance of the people; so did we all; the whole Whig party denounced it; and now I am denounced for not lending my aid in practising a similar cheat upon them. I will not do it, let the consequences be what they may. I have lived an honest and an unselfish politician, and if I am to suffer political martyrdom for my honesty and independence, and for my preference for Henry Clay over General Taylor, and for preference for Whig principles over no principles, but the principle of availability, and for contending for the RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE to know the opinions of their candidates before they are required to vote, then I shall have an epitaph inscribed on my tomb, that the proudest and most ambitious might covet.

"One thing, however, the Allison Letter, No. 2, certainly does prove; and that is, that neither General Taylor nor the friends who stood at his elbow were at all satisfied with the position into which he had written himself, and therefore the necessity of explaining all that he had said before; and if they were not satisfied, it shows clearly that I had reason for not being satisfied, also.

"This evening I received, by mail, a letter from the gentleman to whom my letter was addressed in New York, in which he apologizes for its publication in the following terms:—

"Your letter was *violently seized*, and by the dictators ordered to be published, they assuming the responsibility, contending that the good to be accomplished by it was too great to stand upon ordinary punctilio."

"To which I have to say, in answer, that while I had cautiously guarded against the publication of the views embraced in that letter, yet if it will do any good towards the election of Mr. Clay, in any constitutional and fair mode, that I shall meet any sacrifice that may await me with perfect composure and without a murmur, though I confess I should have preferred the publication of the whole, instead of a part. I have no copy by which I can supply the omission.

but one thing I recollect, and that was that I recommended, if it was not too late, the nomination of General Scott, instead of Mr. Fillmore, as the ticket that I believed to be the strongest, and the one the people most wanted.

"Ever since the Buffalo Convention I have been satisfied that the election would unavoidably go to the House; if it should, does any reasonable man calculate on the election of General Taylor? I suppose not one. But if we can get Mr. Clay before the House, I believe he could be elected. Why? Because we have already twelve States represented by a majority of Whigs, which of itself is not sufficient to elect him; but while there is not a Cass man or a Van Buren man that would, under any circumstances, vote for General Taylor, I believe there is hardly one of either that would not vote for Mr. Clay to defeat the other.

"I may not be patriot enough to lay down my life to see Mr. Clay elected, as I have often heard many of his present denouncers and revilers express their willingness to do, but I AM patriot enough to lay down all my popularity, be it little or much, and all the hopes and aspirations that my most ambitious thoughts may have indulged, if by such sacrifice I can secure to my country the value of his services, in the trying period of the next four years, as the Chief Magistrate of this Union; for I believe, while others may suggest as wise and conciliatory terms for the adjustment of our domestic troubles, yet I believe he is the only man in the entire country who has the popularity, the confidence, and the love of all sections of the country, to a sufficient degree to insure a safe and harmonious settlement of this great disturbing question of slavery. He is the only man who can play the part of an efficient Pacificator—and for that, I am willing to sacrifice any thing earthly, connected with my own person, save my life and my honor; and while there is a prospect of his election, I say again, 'All right; go ahead;' and if there be treason in it, make the most of it.

"JNO. M. DOTTS.

"September 14, 1848."

We here take leave of this subject. If any Whig in the Free States can read the argument and the evidence which we have here produced, and still support General Taylor, nothing that we can add will be likely to affect his mind.

We think, however, that honest men will concur with us in thinking that a nomination, which Mr. Webster says he is "FIRMLY OF OPINION WAS NOT FIT TO BE MADE,"—is surely NOT FIT TO BE SUPPORTED.

While we write Mr. Webster's name, we are reminded of a passage in one of his speeches, with which we appropriately close this pamphlet.

We quote from Mr. Webster's Speech in the Senate, January 11, 1836, on Mr. Benton's Resolutions for appropriating the Surplus Revenue to National Defence.

"Sir: If there be any philosophy in history; if human blood still runs in human veins; if man still conforms to the identity of his nature, the institutions which secure constitutional liberty can never stand long against this excessive personal confidence, against this devotion to men,—in utter disregard both of principle and experience,—which seems to me to be strongly characteristic of our times. This vote came to us, sir, from the popular branch of the legislature; and that such a vote should come to us from such a branch of the legislature, was amongst the circumstances which excited in me the greatest surprise and the deepest concern. Certainly, sir—certainly, I was not, on that account, the more inclined to concur. It was no argument with me, that others seemed to be rushing,—with such heedless, headlong trust, such impetuosity of confidence,—into the arms of executive power. I held back the stronger, and would hold back the longer. I see, or I think I see,—it is either a true vision of the future, revealed by the history of the past, or, if it be an illusion, it is an illusion which appears to me in all the brightness and sunlight of broad noon,—that it is in this career of *man-worship*, marked every furlong by the fragments of other free governments, that our own system is making progress to its close. A personal popularity,—honorably earned, at first, by military achievements, and sustained now by party, by patronage, and by enthusiasm, which looks for us ill, because it means no ill itself,—seems to render men willing to gratify power, even before its demands are made, and to surfeit executive discretion, even in anticipation of its own appetite. * * *

"Mr. President, it is the misfortune of the Senate to have differed with the President on many great questions, during the last four or five years. I have regretted this state of things deeply, both on personal and on public accounts; but it has been unavoidable. It is no pleasant employment, it is no holiday business, to maintain opposition against power and against majorities; and to contend for stern and sturdy principle against personal popularity, against a rushing and overwhelming confidence, that, by wave upon wave, and cataract after cataract, seems to be bearing away and destroying whatsoever would withstand it. How much longer we may be able to support this opposition in any degree, or whether we can possibly hold out till the public intelligence and the public patriotism shall be awakened to a due sense of the public danger, it is not for me to foretell. I shall not despair to the last, if, in the mean time, we be true to our own principles. If there be a steadfast adherence to these principles, both here and elsewhere; if, one and all, they continue the rule of our conduct in the Senate, and the rallying point of those who think with us and support us out of the Senate, I am content to hope on and to struggle on. While it remains a contest for the preservation of the Constitution, for the security of public liberty, for the ascendancy of principles over men, I am willing to bear my part of it. If we can maintain the Constitution; if we can preserve this security for liberty; if we can thus give to true principle its just superiority over party, over persons, over names, our labors will be richly rewarded. If we fail in all this, they are already among the living who will write the history of this government from its commencement to its close."